

No. 16-712

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OIL STATES ENERGY SERVICES, LLC,

Petitioner,

v.

GREENE'S ENERGY GROUP, LLC, ET AL.,

Respondents.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

**BRIEF OF *AMICUS CURIAE* MYLAN
PHARMACEUTICALS INC. IN SUPPORT OF
RESPONDENT GREENE'S ENERGY GROUP, LLC**

WILLIAM A. RAKOCZY
Counsel of Record
PETER J. CURTIN
TRANG D. HOANG
CHRISTOPHER P. GALLIGAN
RAKOCZY MOLINO MAZZOCHI
SIWIK LLP
6 West Hubbard Street
Suite 500
Chicago, IL 60654
(312) 527-2157
wrakoczy@rmmslegal.com

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae
Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTEREST OF THE <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i>	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	2
ARGUMENT	6
I. <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Benefits the Public as a Key Safeguard of a Strong Patent System Intended to Ensure High-Quality Patents and Reward True Innovation.	6
II. Congress Created <i>Inter Partes</i> Review to Allow the PTO to Reconsider its Prior Administrative Decisions.	11
A. The PTO First Assesses Patentability and Examines Applications <i>Ex Parte</i> , with Limited Resources.....	12
B. <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, Like Other Post-Issuance Proceedings, Exercises the PTO’s Clear and Broad Responsibility to Examine Patentability.	18
C. Continued Agency Examination in <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Differs in Purpose and Function From Litigation in Article III Courts.....	23
D. <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Does Not Preclude Adjudication By Article III District Courts.	26

III. Mylan’s Experience Confirms *Inter Partes* Reviews are an Important Tool to Promote Patent Quality and Competition in the Pharmaceutical Industry. 28

A. *Inter Partes* Reviews Help Promote Generic and Biosimilar Competition by Weeding Out Improperly Granted Patents. 30

1. *Inter Partes* Review Allows Generics To Challenge Patents That Could Unlawfully Delay Competition Under The Hatch-Waxman Act. 31

2. *Inter Partes* Review Also Allows Biosimilar Applicants To Clear The Patent Thicket. ... 34

B. Mylan’s *Inter Partes* Review Petitions Have Resulted in the PTO Canceling Improperly Issued Patents, and Potential Earlier Entry of Lower Cost Generic and Biosimilar Products. 36

CONCLUSION 39

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Federal Cases

<i>Apotex Inc. v. Thompson</i> , 347 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	32
<i>Bonito Boats, Inc. v. Thunder-Craft Boats, Inc.</i> , 489 U.S. 141 (1989).....	6
<i>Cooper Techs. Co. v. Dudas</i> , 536 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	19
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	passim
<i>FTC v. Actavis, Inc.</i> , 133 S. Ct. 2223 (2013).....	33
<i>Gayler v. Wilder</i> , 51 U.S. 477 (1851).....	6
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	6, 13
<i>Hill-Ram Servs. v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	26
<i>In re Apotex, Inc.</i> , 49 F. App'x 902 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	27
<i>In re Etter</i> , 756 F.2d 852 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	24
<i>In re Swanson</i> , 540 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	24
<i>In re Yamamoto</i> , 740 F.2d 1569 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....	25
<i>Kappos v. Hyatt</i> , 566 U.S. 431 (2012).....	12, 13
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	25
<i>Lear, Inc. v. Adkins</i> , 395 U.S. 653 (1969).....	16

<i>Microsoft Corp. v. i4i Ltd. P'ship</i> , 564 U.S. 91 (2011).....	13
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2120 (2014).....	6, 25
<i>Neuro Corp. v. Boston Sci. Corp.</i> , No. 16-cv-06830 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 4, 2017)	15
<i>Novartis AG v. Noven Pharm. Inc.</i> , 853 F.3d 1289 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	27
<i>Patlex Corp. v. Mossinghoff</i> , 758 F.2d 594 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	21
<i>Precision Instrument Mfg. Co. v. Automotive Maintenance Machinery Co.</i> , 324 U.S. 806 (1945).....	7
<i>Redline Detection, LLC v. Star Envirotech, Inc.</i> , 811 F.3d 435 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	27
<i>Rhine v. Casio, Inc.</i> , 183 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	26
<i>Sandoz Inc. v. Amgen Inc.</i> , 137 S. Ct. 1664 (2017).....	34, 35
<i>Sears, Roebuck & Co. v. Stiffel Co.</i> , 376 U.S. 225 (1964).....	6
Federal Statutes and Constitutions	
21 U.S.C. § 355.....	33
21 U.S.C. § 355(b)(1)	32
21 U.S.C. § 355(c)(2).....	32
21 U.S.C. § 355(j)(2)(A)(vii).....	32
21 U.S.C. § 355(j)(2)(A)(vii)(IV)	33
21 U.S.C. § 355(j)(5)(B)(iii)(I).....	33
35 U.S.C. § 102.....	13
35 U.S.C. § 103.....	13
35 U.S.C. § 131.....	13
35 U.S.C. § 132(a).....	13

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.