

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

AMNEAL PHARMACEUTICALS, LLC  
Petitioner

v.

SUPERNUS PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

IPR2013-00368 (Patent 8,206,740)  
IPR2013-00371 (Patent 8,394,405)  
IPR2013-00372 (Patent 8,394,406)

---

Before SCOTT E. KAMHOLZ, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION  
Patent Owner's Motions to Seal  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.54*

IPR2013-00368 (Patent 8,206,740)

IPR2013-00371 (Patent 8,394,405)

IPR2013-00372 (Patent 8,394,406)

Supernus has filed several Motions to Seal. *E.g.*, IPR2013-00368, Paper 37; Paper 75; Paper 81.<sup>1,2</sup> Supernus proposes entry of the default protective order to govern the treatment and filing of confidential information in these proceedings. *E.g.*, Paper 37, 1-2. The default protective order, signed by both Amneal and Supernus, was filed as Exhibit 2171 in each case. Amneal has not filed an opposition to any of the Motions to Seal. For the reasons that follow, we grant the motions and enter the default protective order.

The record for an *inter partes* review shall be made available to the public, except as otherwise ordered, and a document filed with a motion to seal shall be treated as sealed until the motion is decided. 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(1); 37 C.F.R. § 42.14. The standard for granting a motion to seal is “good cause.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.54. There is a strong public policy that favors making information filed in *inter partes* review proceedings open to the public. *See Garmin International v. Cuozzo Speed Technologies, LLC*, Case IPR2012-00001, slip op. at 1-2 (PTAB March 14, 2013) (Paper 34) (discussing the standards of the Board applied to motions to seal). The moving party bears the burden of showing that the relief requested should be granted. 37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c). That includes showing that the information is truly confidential, and that such confidentiality outweighs the strong public interest in having an open record. In addition, a motion to seal is required to include a certification that the moving party has, in good faith,

---

<sup>1</sup> Essentially identical motions were filed in IPR2013-00371 (Paper 38; Paper 75; Paper 83) and in IPR2013-00372 (Paper 36; Paper 72; Paper 79).

<sup>2</sup> All further references to papers are directed to IPR2013-00368.

IPR2013-00368 (Patent 8,206,740)

IPR2013-00371 (Patent 8,394,405)

IPR2013-00372 (Patent 8,394,406)

conferred, or attempted to confer, with the opposing party in an effort to come to an agreement on the scope of the protection sought. *See Garmin*, Paper 34 at 3.

*A. First Motion to Seal*

Supernus's first Motion to Seal accompanies the Patent Owner Response. Paper 37, 1. Supernus seeks to protect portions of the Patent Owner Response, declarations of its witnesses, and certain other evidentiary exhibits. *Id.* Supernus identifies the types of information in each document that warrant sealing. *Id.* at 7-13.

*B. Second Motion to Seal*

Supernus's second Motion to Seal accompanies its Motion for Observations. Paper 75, 1. Supernus seeks to seal portions of the deposition transcripts of Petitioner's witnesses. *Id.* at 2. Supernus also seeks to seal portions of declarations and deposition transcripts, along with certain other evidentiary exhibits, filed under seal by Amneal with its Reply but without a Motion to Seal. *Id.* Supernus identifies the types of information in each document that warrant sealing. *Id.* at 7-9.

*C. Third Motion to Seal*

Supernus's third Motion to Seal accompanies its Opposition to Amneal's Motion to Exclude Evidence. Paper 81, 1. Supernus seeks to seal portions of the Opposition, a witness declaration, and one other evidentiary exhibit. *Id.* at 2. Supernus identifies the types of information in each document that warrant sealing. *Id.* at 6.

IPR2013-00368 (Patent 8,206,740)

IPR2013-00371 (Patent 8,394,405)

IPR2013-00372 (Patent 8,394,406)

*D. Analysis*

Supernus's proposed redactions in the Response, Motion for Observations, Opposition, the declarations, and the deposition transcripts are reasonable and are limited strictly to isolated passages consisting entirely of confidential information, such that the thrust of the underlying argument or evidence is clearly discernable from the redacted versions. The redactions in the other evidentiary exhibits are more extensive, in many cases complete, but appropriate given the nature of the information sought to be protected. Supernus has explained satisfactorily the nature of the redacted information sought to be sealed, the nonpublication of the information, and Supernus's efforts to confer with Amneal on the scope of protection.

Upon consideration of Supernus's representations as to the nature of the redacted information, the appropriate use of redaction, and Amneal's acquiescence, we determine that Supernus has shown good cause that maintaining the confidentiality of the information outweighs the public interest in having access to it.

Supernus is reminded that the information subject to the protective order will become public if identified in a final written decision in this proceeding and that a motion to expunge the information will not necessarily prevail over the public interest in maintaining a complete and understandable file history. *See* Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,761 (Aug. 14, 2012); Paper 17, 2-3; Paper 34, 3.

IPR2013-00368 (Patent 8,206,740)

IPR2013-00371 (Patent 8,394,405)

IPR2013-00372 (Patent 8,394,406)

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Supernus's first, second, and third Motions to Seal in each of IPR2013-00368, IPR2013-00371, and IPR2013-00372 are *granted*; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the proposed protective order, submitted as Exhibit 2171 in each proceeding, is entered, and governs the treatment and filing of confidential information in each proceeding.

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.