

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC., TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA,  
INC., and AKORN INC.,<sup>1</sup>  
Petitioners,

v.

SAINT REGIS MOHAWK TRIBE and ALLERGAN, INC.,  
Patent Owner.<sup>2</sup>

---

Case IPR2016-01127 (8,685,930 B2)

Case IPR2016-01128 (8,629,111 B2)

Case IPR2016-01129 (8,642,556 B2)

Case IPR2016-01130 (8,633,162 B2)

Case IPR2016-01131 (8,648,048 B2)

Case IPR2016-01132 (9,248,191 B2)

---

**COMBINED NOTICE OF APPEAL TO THE UNITED STATES COURT  
OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT BY SAINT REGIS  
MOHAWK TRIBE AND ALLERGAN, INC.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Cases IPR2017-00576 and IPR2017-00594, IPR2017-00578 and IPR2017-00596, IPR2017-00579 and IPR2017-00598, IPR2017-00583 and IPR2017-00599, IPR2017-00585 and IPR2017-00600, and IPR2017-00586 and IPR2017-00601, have respectively been joined with the captioned proceedings (collectively the “Proceedings”). The word-for-word identical paper is filed in each proceeding identified in the caption pursuant to the Board’s Scheduling Order (Paper 10).

<sup>2</sup> The caption used in this Notice of Appeal was intended only to comply with the Board’s order that the “caption for these proceedings shall reflect both Allergan’s and the Tribe’s status as ‘Patent Owners.’” Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe is the Patent Owner. By using this caption, neither Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe nor Allergan concede that Allergan is a “Patent Owner.”

Notice is hereby given, under 35 U.S.C. § 141, 28 U.S.C. § 1295(a)(4)(A) and 37 C.F.R. § 90.2, that Patent Owner St. Regis Mohawk Tribe (the “Tribe”) hereby appeals to The United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit from the Patent Trial and Appeal Board’s (the “Board”) Decision Denying the Tribe’s Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction Based on Tribal Sovereign Immunity entered on February 23, 2018 as Paper No. 130 in IPR2016-01127, Paper No. 132 in IPR2016-01128, Paper No. 127 in IPR2016-01129, Paper No. 127 in IPR2016-01130, Paper No. 129 in IPR2016-01131, and Paper No. 127 in IPR2016-01132, and any other orders factually intertwined with the Order denying the Tribe’s Motion to Dismiss.

Notice is hereby given, under 35 U.S.C. § 141, 28 U.S.C. § 1295(a)(4)(A) and 37 C.F.R. § 90.2, that Allergan, Inc. (“Allergan”) hereby appeals to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit from the Board’s Order denying Allergan’s Motion to Withdraw entered on February 23, 2018 as Paper No. 132 in IPR2016-01127, Paper No. 134 in IPR2016-01128, Paper No. 129 in IPR2016-01129, Paper No. 129 in IPR2016-01130, Paper No. 131 in IPR2016-01131, and Paper No. 129 in IPR2016-01132, and any other orders factually intertwined with the Order denying Allergan’s Motion to Withdraw, including but not limited to the Orders appealed by the Tribe. This combined notice is timely filed within 63 days of the Board’s decisions. 37 C.F.R. § 90.3(a)(1).

It is undisputed that the Tribe is a federally recognized, sovereign American Indian Tribe that did not waive its sovereign immunity from participation in the Proceedings. EX. 2091 at 4. The Board erred as a matter of law in holding that the Tribe's assertion of its sovereign immunity does not serve as a basis to terminate the Proceedings and that Allergan can adequately represent the Tribe in the Proceedings in the Tribe's absence.

The Board's decisions in the Proceedings are immediately appealable under 28 U.S.C. § 1295(a)(4)(A) via the Collateral Order Doctrine, which applies to agency adjudications rejecting sovereign immunity claims. *See, e.g., Chehazeh v. Attorney Gen. of U.S.*, 666 F.3d 118, 136 (3d Cir. 2012) (collecting cases from nine Courts of Appeals that found the Collateral Order Doctrine applies to judicial review of agency decisions); *Burlington N. & Santa Fe Ry. Co. v. Vaughn*, 509 F.3d 1085, 1094 (9th Cir. 2007) (holding that denial of tribal immunity is an immediately appealable collateral order); *Osage Tribal Council ex rel. Osage Tribe of Indians v. U.S. Dep't of Labor*, 187 F.3d 1174, 1179 (10th Cir. 1999) (holding that the denial of tribal immunity in an agency proceeding is an immediately appealable collateral order); *see In re Board of Regents of Univ. of Texas Sys.*, 435 F. App'x 945, 947-48 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (holding that denial of Eleventh Amendment sovereign immunity allows for immediate appeal under Collateral

Order Doctrine); *Baum Research & Dev. Co. v. Univ. of Massachusetts at Lowell*, 503 F.3d 1367, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (same).

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 90.2(a)(3)(ii), the Tribe anticipates that the issues on appeal may include, but are not limited to, one or more of the following, as well as any underlying findings, determinations, rulings, decisions, opinions, or other related issues:

- Whether the Board erred in denying the Tribe’s Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction Based on Tribal Sovereign Immunity.
- Whether the Board erred in finding that *inter partes* review is not the type of “suit” to which an Indian tribe would traditionally enjoy immunity under common law, declining to find the holding in *Federal Maritime Commission v. South Carolina State Ports Authority*, 535 U.S. 743, 754-56 (2002) applies to Tribal sovereigns as it does State university sovereigns.
- Whether the Tribe is entitled to a dismissal of the Proceedings under tribal sovereign immunity because an IPR is adjudicative in nature, Tribes have inherent immunity from suit, and absent express abrogation, there is no indication that Congress intended the Tribe be subject to actions in this forum.

- Whether the Board’s conclusion that it is not adjudicating claims and that it has no authority to provide a remedy against the Tribe in the Proceedings means the Board also lacked statutory authority to proclaim the Tribe lacks immunity from participation in the Proceedings.
- Whether the Board erred in concluding that tribal sovereign immunity is a defense that may only be raised by statutory authority, rather than a jurisdictional threshold issue that can be raised at any time in the Proceedings.
- Whether the Board erred in holding that the Tribe may not assert immunity from participation in the Proceedings based on the Board’s conclusion that the Proceedings are “federal administrative proceedings” despite the fact that the Proceedings were instituted and prosecuted by private parties and as such, were private actions brought by Petitioners.
- Whether the Board erred in holding that it does not exercise personal jurisdiction over the Tribe as a patent owner.
- Whether the Board erred in finding that the Tribe’s assertion of its sovereign immunity does not serve as a basis to terminate these *inter parte* review Proceedings.
- Whether the Board erred in finding that the Tribe is not an indispensable party to the Proceedings.

- Whether the Board erred in finding that Allergan obtained all substantial rights in the patents at issue in these Proceedings.
- Whether the Board’s Decision should be found unlawful due to any of the statutory reasons set forth in 5 U.S.C. § 706(2).
- Whether *inter partes* review violates the Constitution by extinguishing private property rights through a non-Article III forum.
- Whether the rules applied or misapplied and decisions rendered during the Proceedings violated the Tribe’s due process rights to a fair hearing.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 90.2(a)(3)(ii), Allergan anticipates that the issues on appeal may include, but are not limited to, one or more of the following, as well as any underlying findings, determinations, rulings, decisions, opinions, or other related issues:

- Whether the Board erred in finding that Allergan obtained all substantial rights in the patents at issue in these Proceedings.
- Whether the Board erred in finding that Allergan “remains an effective ‘patent owner’ of the challenged patents in these proceedings” and erred in denying Allergan’s requests and motion to withdraw from the Proceedings.

In accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 142 and 37 C.F.R. §§ 90.2 and 90.3, copies of this Notice of Appeal are being timely filed simultaneously with the Director of the

United States Patent and Trademark Office and the Patent Trial and Appeal Board.

In addition, a copy of this Notice of Appeal, along with the required docketing fees, are being filed electronically with the Clerk's Office of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit via CM/ECF. A copy of this Notice of Appeal is also being served on Petitioners.

Date: February 28, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

Dorothy P. Whelan

Dorothy P. Whelan  
Reg. No. 33,814  
Michael J. Kane  
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
60 South Sixth Street, Suite 3200  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Telephone: (612) 337-2508  
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696  
[whelan@fish.com](mailto:whelan@fish.com)  
[kane@fish.com](mailto:kane@fish.com)

*Attorneys for Allergan, Inc.*

/Alfonso Chan /

Alfonso Chan  
Reg. No. 45,964  
achan@shorechan.com  
Michael Shore\*  
mshore@shorechan.com  
Christopher Evans\*  
cevans@shorechan.com  
SHORE CHAN DEPUMPO LLP  
901 Main Street, Suite 3300  
Dallas, TX 75202  
Tel: (214) 593-9110  
Fax: (214) 593-9111

Marsha Schmidt\*  
Attorney at Law  
14928 Perrywood Drive  
Burtonsville, MD 20866  
marsha@mkschmidtlaw.com  
Tel: (301) 949-5176  
\*admitted pro hac vice

*Attorneys for Patent Owner  
Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe*

## **CERTIFICATE OF FILING**

I certify that on February 28, 2018, in addition to being filed electronically through the Patent Trial and Appeal Board's PTABE2E System, the original version of the foregoing Notice of Appeal was mailed via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested (No. 7196 9008 9111 2423 2300) to the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, at the following address:

Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office  
c/o Office of General Counsel  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

## **CERTIFICATE OF FILING**

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Combined Notice of Appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit by the Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe and Allergan, Inc. was filed with the Clerk's Office of the United States Court of Appeal for the Federal Circuit through the federal courts' Case Management and Electronic Case Files (CM/ECF) system on February 28, 2018, along with the requisite fee. One copy was sent to the Clerk by Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested (No. 9414 7266 9904 2080 2701 94) at the following address:

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit  
717 Madison Place, N.W., Room 401  
Washington, DC 20439



## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 37 CFR §§ 42.6(e)(4), 42.205(b) and 90.2, the undersigned certifies that on February 28, 2018, a complete and entire copy of *Combined Notice of Appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit by the Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe and Allergan, Inc.* was filed electronically through the Patent Trial and Appeal Board's PTABE2E System and provided, via electronic service, to the Petitioners by serving the correspondence address of record as follows:

Steven W. Parmelee  
Michael T. Rosato  
Jad A. Mills  
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5100  
Seattle, WA 98104-7036  
[sparmelee@wsgr.com](mailto:sparmelee@wsgr.com)  
[mrosato@wsgr.com](mailto:mrosato@wsgr.com)  
[jmills@wsgr.com](mailto:jmills@wsgr.com)

Wendy L. Devine  
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
One Market Street, Spear Tower Floor 33  
San Francisco, CA 94105-1126  
wdevine@wsgr.com

Douglas H. Carsten  
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
12235 El Camino Real, Suite 200  
San Diego, CA 92130  
[dcarsten@wsgr.com](mailto:dcarsten@wsgr.com)

Richard Torczon  
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
1700 K Street NW, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, DC 20006  
[rtorczon@wsgr.com](mailto:rtorczon@wsgr.com)

Brandon M. White  
Crystal Canterbury  
Charles G. Curtis, Jr.  
Jennifer MacLean  
Benjamin S. Sharp  
Shannon M. Bloodworth  
PERKINS COIE LLP  
700 13<sup>th</sup> Street NW  
Washington DC 20005  
bmwhite@perkinscoie.com  
ccanterbury@perkinscoie.com  
ccurtis@perkinscoie.com  
jmaclean@perkinscoie.com  
bsharp@perkinscoie.com  
sbloodworth@perkinscoie.com

Eric D. Miller  
PERKINS COIE LLP  
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900  
Seattle, WA 98101-3099  
[emiller@perkinscoie.com](mailto:emiller@perkinscoie.com)

*Counsel for Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*

And upon the remaining Petitioners as follows:

Michael R. Dzwonczyk  
Azy S. Kokabi  
Travis B. Ribar  
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
2100 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20037  
mdzwonczyk@sughrue.com  
akokabi@sughrue.com  
tribar@sughrue.com

*Attorneys for Akorn Inc.*

Gary J. Speier  
Mark D. Schuman  
CARLSON, CASPERS, VANDENBURGH, LINDQUIST & SCHUMAN, P.A.  
225 South Sixth Street, Suite 4200  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
gspeier@carlsoncaspers.com  
mschuman@carlsoncaspers.com  
IPRCyclosporine@carlsoncaspers.com

*Attorneys for Teva Pharmaceuticals*

*/Alfonso G. Chan/*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Alfonso G. Chan  
SHORE CHAN DEPUMPO LLP  
901 Main Street, Suite 3300  
Dallas, Texas 75202  
(214) 593-9110