

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SAMSUNG BIOEPIS CO., LTD.,  
Petitioner,

v.

GENENTECH, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2017-01960  
Patent US 7,892,549 B2

---

Before ZHENYU YANG, CHRISTOPHER G. PAULRAJ, and  
ROBERT A. POLLOCK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

POLLOCK, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Instituting *Inter Partes* Review and Granting Motion for Joinder  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.108; 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b)*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Samsung Bioepis Co., LTD (“Bioepis”) filed a Petition requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 1–17 of U.S. Patent No. 7,892,549 B2 (“the ’549 patent”). Paper 2 (“Pet.”). By email dated November 9, 2017, Patent Owner Genentech, Inc. (“Genentech”) has waived its right to file a Preliminary response to the Petition. Ex. 3001.

Along with its Petition, Bioepis filed a Motion for Joinder to join this proceeding with IPR2017-00737. Paper 1 (“Mot.”). Bioepis filed the Petition and Motion for Joinder in the present proceeding on August 25, 2017, within one month after we instituted trial in IPR2017-00737. Genentech opposes the Motion. Paper 7.

As explained further below, we institute trial on the same grounds as instituted in IPR2017-00737 and grant Bioepis’s Motion for Joinder.

## II. DISCUSSION

In IPR2017-00737, Hospira, Inc., (“Hospira”) challenged claims 1–17 of the ’549 Patent on the following grounds:

Ground	Claim(s)	References	Basis
1	1–11 and 14–17	Baselga ’97 <sup>1</sup> and Gelmon <sup>2</sup>	§ 103
2	12	Baselga ’97, Gelmon, and Drebin <sup>3</sup>	§ 103
3	13	Baselga ’97, Gelmon, and Presta <sup>4</sup>	§ 103
4	1–11 and 14–17	Baselga ’96, <sup>5</sup> Baselga ’94, <sup>6</sup> and Gelmon	§ 103
5	12	Baselga ’96, Baselga ’94, Gelmon, and Drebin	§ 103
6	13	Baselga ’96, Baselga ’94, Gelmon, and Presta	§ 103

After considering the Petition and Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response, we instituted trial in IPR2017-00737 on each of the six asserted grounds. IPR2017-00737, Paper 19, 25–26.

Bioepis’s Petition is substantively identical to Hospira’s Petition, challenging the same claims based on the same art and the same grounds. *Compare* IPR2017-01960, Paper 2, *with* IPR2017-00737, Paper 1. For the same reasons stated in our Decision on Institution in IPR2017-00737, we institute trial in this proceeding on the same six grounds.

---

<sup>1</sup> Baselga et al., 11(3) (Suppl. 2) ONCOLOGY 43–48 (1997). Ex. 1007.

<sup>2</sup> Gelmon et al., 14(4) J. CLIN. ONCOL. 1185–91 (1996). Ex. 1025.

<sup>3</sup> Drebin et al., 2(3) ONCOGENE 273–77 (1988). Ex. 1010.

<sup>4</sup> Presta et al., 57(20) CANCER RES. 4593–99 (1997). Ex. 1012.

<sup>5</sup> Baselga et al., 14(3) J. CLIN. ONCOL. 737–44 (1996). Ex. 1005.

<sup>6</sup> Baselga et al., 13 Proc. AM. SOC. CLIN. ONCOL. 63 (Abstract 53) (1994). Ex. 1006.

Having determined that institution is appropriate, we now turn to Bioepis's Motion for Joinder. 35 U.S.C. § 315(c). Section 315(c) provides, in relevant part, that "[i]f the Director institutes an inter partes review, the Director, in his or her discretion, may join as a party to that inter partes review any person who properly files a petition under section 311." *Id.* When determining whether to grant a motion for joinder we consider factors such as timing and impact of joinder on the trial schedule, cost, discovery, and potential simplification of briefing. *Kyocera Corp. v. SoftView, LLC*, Case IPR2013-00004, slip op. at 4 (PTAB Apr. 24, 2013) (Paper 15). Under the circumstances of this case, we determine that joinder is appropriate.

Bioepis avers that joinder will "create no additional burden for the Board, Genentech, or Hospira," "have no impact on the trial schedule of IPR2017-00737," and result in no prejudice to either Genentech or Hospira. Mot. 1–3. In particular, Bioepis asserts that its Petition raises no new grounds of unpatentability from IPR2017-00737, and is "essentially a copy of the Hospira Petition," relying "on the same prior art analysis, the same expert testimony, and the same arguments that Hospira presented." *See id.* at 1, 3, 4. Bioepis further asserts that it "anticipates participating in the proceeding in a limited 'understudy' capacity," unless Hospira is terminated as a party. *Id.* at 2; *see also id.* at 6 (agreeing that, "as long as Hospira remains a party . . . the Board may order petitioners to consolidate filings, and limit Bioepis to . . . [an] understudy role"); *id.* at 3, n1, 5 (stating that it may rely on the testimony of its own expert if Hospira's expert becomes unavailable).

In response, Genentech argues that "Bioepis offers no real assurances that its role will be so limited as to prevent prejudice to Patent Owner."

Paper 7, 1. Genentech asserts, for example, that as long as Hospira remains a party to IPR2017-00737, Bioepis should be precluded from any “right to its own briefing or oral argument,” “proceed based solely on the arguments and evidence presented and maintained by Hospira,” undertake no additional discovery or ask any questions during deposition, “not attempt to alter the Hospira IRP trial schedule,” and “acknowledge[] that the estoppel provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 315(e) will be applicable to it even if it remains in a circumscribed secondary role.” *Id.* at 2–3. We do not find Genentech’s arguments persuasive.

Where, as in the present case, a party seeks to take a secondary role in an on-going IPR, joinder promotes economy and efficiency, thereby reducing the burden on the Patent Owner and on the limited resources of the Board, as compared to distinct, parallel proceedings. Counterintuitively, Genentech’s proposed conditions seem designed to discourage petitioners from seeking joinder under these circumstances and, thus, incompatible with “the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution of every proceeding.” *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b).

For example, although Bioepis “anticipates” taking an understudy role in this proceeding, we can envision circumstances in which it “strongly disagrees” with a position that Hospira adopts (or repudiates) subsequent to the filing of Hospira Petition. *See* Mot. 6. Under these circumstances, this panel may wish to entertain requests for additional briefing, additional discovery, or an opportunity for Bioepis to ask questions at a deposition.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Parties are reminded that communications regarding these and all other matters are conducted with courtesy, candor, good faith. 37 C.F.R. § 42.1(c), 42.11(a).

# 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.