Page 1

| | Page I |
|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD |
| | JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS,) INC., and JANSSEN) PHARMACEUTICA NV,) |
| |) Patent Owner,) IPR2020-00440 |
| | vs.) |
| ı |) MYLAN LABORATORIES INC.,) |
| | Petitioner. |
| _ |) |
| | |
| | |
| | REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS |
| | JUNE 30, 2020 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS via teleconference of |
| | the above-entitled cause before the Honorable John |
| | G. New, Robert A. Pollock, and Kristina M. Kalan, |
| | Judges of said Panel, on the 30th day of June 2020 |
| | at the hour of 1:00 p.m. |
| | |
| | Certification No. 084-003435 |
| | |

GregoryEdwards com | 866-4Team GF



Page 2

| | ı agc | |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| 1 | APPEARANCES: | |
| 2 | AN I EANOMOLO. | |
| | KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP | |
| 3 | By: MR. JITENDRA MALIK 550 South Tyron Street, Suite 2900 | |
| 4 | Charlotte, North Carolina 28202-4213 704.344.3185 | |
| 5 | jitty.malik@katten.com | |
| 6 | −and− | |
| 7 | KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP By: MS. GUYLAINE HACHE | |
| 8 | 525 West Monroe Street | |
| 9 | Chicago, Illinois 60606 312.092.5000 | |
| 10 | guylaine.hache@katten.com | |
| 11 | appeared on behalf of the Petitioner; | |
| 12 | , oct of one, | |
| 13 | PATTERSON BELKNAP WEBB AND TYLER LLP By: MR. ANDREW D. COHEN | |
| 14 | MS. BARBARA L. MULLIN 1133 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10036-6710 | |
| 15 | 212. 336. 2605 | |
| 16 | acohen@pbwt.com bmullin@pbwt.com | |
| 17 | -and- | |
| 18 | AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP By: MR. RUBEN MUNOZ | |
| 19 | Two Commerce Square 2001 Market Street, Suite 4100 | |
| 20 | Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103 | |
| 21 | appeared on behalf of the Patent Owner. | |
| 22 | ratent Owner. | |
| 23 | Also Present: | |
| 24 | Ms. Jennifer Reda, Janssen In-House Counsel | |
| 25 | (All parties appeared via teleconference.) | |
| | | |

GregoryEdwards com | 866-4Team GF



| 1 | JUDGE NEW: Good afternoon, everybody. Are |
|----|------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | counsel for both parties present? |
| 3 | MR. MALIK: Yes, Your Honor. |
| 4 | JUDGE NEW: Great. My name is Judge John |
| 5 | New. I'm joined here by my colleagues, Judge Robert |
| 6 | Pollock and Judge Kristina Kalan. |
| 7 | Could parties or counsel for both parties |
| 8 | please identify themselves for the record. |
| 9 | MR. MALIK: Your Honor, this is Jitendra |
| 10 | Malik, lead counsel for Mylan. With me is backup |
| 11 | counsel, Guylaine Hache. |
| 12 | MR. COHEN: And then for Patent Owner, this |
| 13 | is Andrew Cohen from Patterson Belknap, backup |
| 14 | counsel. With me is Barbara Mullin from Patterson |
| 15 | Belknap, lead counsel; Ruben Munoz from Akin Gump, |
| 16 | backup counsel and listening in is Jen Reda, |
| 17 | in-house counsel for the Patent Owner. |
| 18 | JUDGE NEW: Great. Thank you. Welcome |
| 19 | everybody. Good afternoon. We have a couple of |
| 20 | issues before us today as I understand correctly |
| 21 | from the email that I received. The first is the |
| 22 | easy one, so let's do that one first. And that is |
| 23 | that counsel for Petitioner has requested additional |
| 24 | briefing on the 314(a), 325(d) issue with specific |
| 25 | reference to Apple factor 6 and requested a one-week |
| | |

| 1 | deadline for a five-page reply. |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | Patent Owner does not oppose that as long as |
| 3 | they can grant they can file a similar one-week, |
| 4 | following week five-page surreply. Do I understand |
| 5 | that correctly? |
| 6 | MR. MALIK: Your Honor, I think generally |
| 7 | yes. I think what the request is is to address all |
| 8 | the Apple factors. The reason we specifically noted |
| 9 | 325 because Janssen's discussion of 325 normally |
| 10 | 325 is a stand-alone section separate from 314, but |
| 11 | they incorporated 325 in connection with Apple |
| 12 | factor 6, so we just wanted to notify the PTAB why |
| 13 | we were talking about 325 when if you look at their |
| 14 | table of contents, you don't see a specific section |
| 15 | for 325. |
| 16 | So the request is for actually ten pages for |
| 17 | 325 well, 314, Apple factors 1 through 6, which |
| 18 | would incorporate a discussion of 325. And to the |
| 19 | extent the PTAB is inclined to discuss also what I |
| 20 | call the umbrella term "inventorship," ten pages |
| 21 | total across the board. |
| 22 | JUDGE NEW: We'll get to inventorship in a |
| 23 | moment, but this is the unopposed portion of this, |
| 24 | right, is dealing with the Apple factors. And you |
| 25 | wanted five pages for that in one week and we'll |

| 1 | deal with the inventorship next. |
|----|------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | MR. MALIK: I think what we're asking for is |
| 3 | what I envision is us spending about if we get |
| 4 | ten pages, us spending seven pages on the Apple |
| 5 | factors and about three on the inventorship issues, |
| 6 | the vast majority. So we're asking for a little bit |
| 7 | more than five, not necessarily not that much |
| 8 | more, but just a couple more pages just so we can |
| 9 | address those issues. |
| 10 | And I'll note that that request for, you |
| 11 | know, around about ten pages is typical for 314, 325 |
| 12 | and I can provide more cases, IPR cases, where a |
| 13 | similar request was granted. In fact, in one of the |
| 14 | Mylan cases it was granted. |
| 15 | JUDGE NEW: All right. So I understand |
| 16 | that Mr. Cohen, that Janssen doesn't oppose |
| 17 | briefing on that particular issue, additional |
| 18 | briefing. |
| 19 | MR. COHEN: Yeah. This is Andrew. That is |
| 20 | correct, provided it's limited to the Apple factors. |
| 21 | We recognize that the Petitioner didn't have the |
| 22 | benefit of the Apple decision when it filed its |
| 23 | petition. So we are okay with that. |
| 24 | We don't view it as an opportunity to for |
| 25 | a wide-ranging reply to address all the |

DOCKET A L A R M

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.

