

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Before the Honorable Clark S. Cheney
Administrative Law Judge

In the Matter of

CERTAIN PRE-FILLED SYRINGES
FOR INTRAVITREAL INJECTION
AND COMPONENTS THEREOF

Investigation No. 337-TA-1207

COMPLAINANTS' OPENING *MARKMAN* BRIEF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	3
A. The Invention of the '631 Patent	3
B. The Disputed Claim Terms	6
C. Relevant Prosecution History of the '631 Patent	7
D. Procedural History	9
III. LEGAL STANDARDS	10
A. Claim Construction	10
B. Indefiniteness	10
IV. ARGUMENT	12
A. The Term “About” Has a Clear Meaning in the Relevant Claims, Particularly Given the Specification’s Express Guidance	12
i. A Skilled Artisan Would Apply the $\pm 10\%$ Meaning of “About” to the Silicone Oil Claims	14
ii. A Skilled Artisan Would Apply the $\pm 10\%$ Meaning of “About” to the Force Claims. 16	
B. Regeneron’s Attempt To Manufacture Uncertainty as to the use of “About” in Certain Claims Is Baseless	18
V. CONCLUSION	21

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES:	
<i>Acumed LLC v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 483 F.3d 800 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	11
<i>Allergan Sales, LLC v. Lupin Ltd.</i> , No. 11-cv-530, 2013 WL 4519609 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 21, 2013).....	2
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , No. 15-cv-1455, 2016 WL 7210837 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 13, 2016)	12, 18
<i>BJ Servs. Co. v. Halliburton Energy Servs., Inc.</i> , 338 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	2, 13
<i>Cargill, Inc. v. Canbra Foods, Ltd.</i> , No. 03-cv-1209, 2005 WL 8177016 (D. Or. Nov. 22, 2005)	2
<i>In re Certain Liquid Crystal Display Devices & Prods. Containing the Same</i> , No. 337-TA-631, Order No. 29, 2010 WL 5642163 (Dec. 2010).....	2
<i>In the Matter of Certain Magnetic Tape Cartridges & Components Thereof</i> , Inv. No. 337-TA-1036, Initial Determination, 2018 WL 4634919 (Jan. 25, 2018).....	2, 20
<i>In the Matter of Certain Microelectromechanical Sys. (Mems Devices) & Prod.</i> <i>Containing the Same</i> , Inv. No. 337-TA-876, Order No. 53, 2014 WL 507477 (Jan. 29, 2014).....	2
<i>In the Matter of Certain Reduced Ignition Proclivity Cigarette Paper Wrappers &</i> <i>Prod. Containing Same</i> , Inv. No. 337-TA-756, Order No. 15, 2011 WL 3646182 (Aug. 18, 2011)	2
<i>Cohesive Techs., Inc. v. Waters Corp.</i> , 543 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	2, 13
<i>Cox Commc 'ns, Inc. v. Sprint Commc 'ns Co. LP</i> , 838 F.3d 1224 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	11
<i>Duraflame, Inc. v. Hearthmark, LLC</i> , No. 12-cv-1205, 2013 WL 594241 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 14, 2013).....	2, 19
<i>Eiselstein v. Frank</i> , 52 F.3d 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	12

<i>Exmark Manuf. Co. v. Birggs & Stratton Power Prods. Grp., LLC</i> , 879 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	11
<i>Ferring B.V. v. Watson Labs., Inc.</i> , No. 11-cv-481, 2013 WL 499158 (D. Nev. Feb. 6, 2013).....	2
<i>General Hosp. Corp. v. Sienna Biopharms., Inc.</i> , 888 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	18, 19
<i>Glaxo, Inc. v. Novopharm, Ltd.</i> , 110 F.3d 1562 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	10
<i>Guangdong Alison Hi-Tech Co. v. ITC</i> , 936 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	11
<i>Kluhsman Mach., Inc. v. Dino Paoli SRL</i> , No. 19-cv-20, 2020 WL 422740 (W.D.N.C. July 23, 2020)	12
<i>Laryngeal Mask Co. v. Ambu</i> , 618 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	10
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	10
<i>Merck & Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	2, 3, 12, 19
<i>Modine Mfg. Co. v. U.S. Int’ Trade Comm’n</i> , 75 F.3d 1545 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	2, 12
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , 572 U.S. 898 (2014).....	10, 11
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Caraco Pharm. Lab, Ltd.</i> , 476 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	2, 12, 13, 18
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	10
<i>Sonix Tech. Co. v. Publ’ns Int’l, Ltd.</i> , 844 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	11, 21
<i>Telcorida Techs., Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 612 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	11
<i>TransWeb, LLC v. 3M Innovative Properties Co.</i> , No. 10-4413, 2011 WL 5825782 (D. N.J. Nov. 16, 2011)	2, 20

Young v. Lumenis, Inc.,
492 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....2, 20

STATUTES:

35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 210

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.