

Filed on behalf of: Corcept Therapeutics, Inc.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.,  
*Petitioner*

v.

CORCEPT THERAPEUTICS, INC.,  
*Patent Owner*

---

Case PGR2019-00048  
U.S. Patent No. 10,195,214

---

PATENT OWNER'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Exhibit 1075 Lacks Foundation and Should Be Excluded.....	1
III. Conclusion .....	5

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page**

**Cases**

*Apotex Inc. v. Celgene Corp.*,  
IPR2018-00685, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 27, 2018) .....2

*Conoco Inc. v. Dep’t of Energy*,  
99 F.3d 387 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....1

*Ford Motor Co. v. Versata Dev. Grp.*,  
IPR2016-01019, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 4, 2016) .....2

*In re Cronyn*,  
890 F.2d 1158 (Fed. Cir. 1989) .....3, 5

*In re Hall*,  
781 F.2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....2, 5

*Kayak Software Corp. v. International Business Machines Corp.*,  
CBM2016-00076, Paper 16 at 8 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 15, 2016)..... *passim*

*Eli Lilly & Co. v. Teva Pharm. Int’l*,  
IPR2018-01710, Paper 69 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 31, 2020) .....4

*Open Text S.A. v. Box, Inc.*,  
No. 13-cv-04910, 2015 WL 428365 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 30, 2015) .....1

**Rules and Regulations**

37 C.F.R. § 42.62 .....1

37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c).....1

Fed. R. Evid. 901 .....1, 5

**Other**

Motion to Exclude, *Eli Lilly & Co. v. Teva Pharm. Int’l*,  
IPR2018-01710, Paper 51 at 6 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 11, 2019).....4

## **I. Introduction**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.62 and 42.64(c), Patent Owner Corcept Therapeutics, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) submits this motion to exclude Exhibit 1075. Patent Owner timely objected to this Exhibit through written Objections to Evidence on June 11, 2020.

The Federal Rules of Evidence (“FRE”) govern the admissibility of evidence in post-grant review proceedings. 37 C.F.R. § 42.62. As shown herein, the challenged exhibit is unauthenticated in violation of FRE 901. Accordingly, the Board should exclude the objected-to exhibit for the reasons that follow.

## **II. Exhibit 1075 Lacks Foundation and Should Be Excluded**

Exhibit 1075 should be excluded pursuant to FRE 901 because Petitioner has failed to offer sufficient information establishing its authenticity as a publicly accessible document as of the priority date of the '214 patent. The public accessibility of Exhibit 1075 is an essential part of the foundation analysis under FRE 901 because “the sufficiency of the foundation evidence must be assessed in light of the nature of the documents at issue.” *Conoco Inc. v. Dep’t of Energy*, 99 F.3d 387, 392 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *see also Open Text S.A. v. Box, Inc.*, No. 13-cv-04910, 2015 WL 428365, \*2 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 30, 2015) (granting patentee summary judgment that a computer program could not be used as prior art because the accused infringer failed to authenticate the documentary evidence). Patent Owner

objected to Exhibit 1075 in a timely manner, and Petitioner's efforts to correct the evidentiary deficiencies with supplemental evidence only serve to highlight why Exhibit 1075 should be excluded.

Petitioner represents that Exhibit 1075 is a doctoral thesis written by Dr. Aart Johannes van der Lelij while attending Erasmus University in Rotterdam, Netherlands. Petitioner has failed to establish that this thesis was publicly available before the March 2017 priority date. Indeed, while the thesis bears a date of "Woensdag 27 Mei 1992," the Board has held on numerous occasions that a purported copyright or publication date, "standing alone, does not establish public availability as of that date." *See Apotex Inc. v. Celgene Corp.*, IPR2018-00685, Paper 8 at 29-30 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 27, 2018) (citing *Ford Motor Co. v. Versata Dev. Grp.*, IPR2016-01019, Paper 9 at 5-6 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 4, 2016)). Instead, in order to prove that a thesis was publicly available, the Petitioner must provide evidence regarding "when the thesis was indexed in the library catalog" and the "general library procedure as to indexing, cataloging, and shelving of theses." *In re Hall*, 781 F.2d 897, 899 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The Board has therefore held that "[d]etermining public accessibility of a thesis for prior art purposes requires a showing of both shelving and meaningful indexing/cataloging" at the relevant library as of the priority date. *Kayak Software Corp. v. International Business Machines Corp.*, CBM2016-00076, Paper 16 at 8 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 15, 2016)

# 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.