

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

REGENERON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

**NOVARTIS PHARMA AG,
NOVARTIS TECHNOLOGY LLC,
NOVARTIS PHARMACEUTICALS CORPORATION,**
Patent Owners

Case IPR2021-00816
Patent No. 9,220,631

**NOVARTIS PHARMA AG, NOVARTIS TECHNOLOGY LLC, AND
NOVARTIS PHARMACEUTICALS CORPORATION'S
PATENT OWNER RESPONSE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	6
III.	The Claims of the '631 Patent Are Entitled to Priority to July 3, 2012, and an Invention Date of October 2011	7
IV.	Ground 1: Petitioner Has Failed to Meet Its Burden of Proving The Challenged Claims Obvious Over Sigg Combined with Boulange	8
A.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine Sigg and Boulange to Arrive at the Claimed Invention	9
1.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Use Boulange Syringe B1 Because of its Parylene-C Coating.....	10
2.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Use Boulange Syringe C Because of Its Force Profile	13
3.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Use a Solution Having No More than Two Particles Greater than 50 μm in Diameter per mL.....	18
B.	A POSA Would Not Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Combining Sigg and Boulange.....	20
1.	A POSA Would Not Have Reasonably Expected Boulange's Syringes to be Compatible with VHP	20
C.	Sigg's VHP Method Is Not Enabled	25
D.	Certain Dependent Claims are Separately Patentable over Sigg and Boulange.....	32
1.	Claim 14.....	32
2.	Claim 17	33
3.	Claim 21	35
1.	Claim 22.....	39
2.	Claim 24.....	39
V.	Ground 2: Petitioner has Failed to Meet Its Burden of Proving The Challenged Claims Obvious Over Lam Combined with Boulange	41

A.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine Lam with Boulange to Arrive at the Claimed Inventions and Would Not Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success	42
B.	Lam’s Method of ETO Terminal Sterilization Is Not Enabled.....	43
C.	Certain Dependent Claims are Separately Patentable Over Lam and Boulange.....	44
1.	Claim 21	44
2.	Claims 14, 22 and 24–26	46
VI.	Objective Indicia of Nonobviousness Strongly Support the Patentability of the Claims	46
A.	Record Evidence Shows a Clear Nexus Between Lucentis PFS and Certain Claims of the ’631 Patent	49
1.	A Presumption of Nexus Applies on the Facts Here	50
2.	The Evidence Proves Nexus Independent of Any Presumption	54
B.	Lucentis PFS Has Enjoyed Significant Commercial Success.....	55
C.	Long-Felt but Unmet Need	56
D.	Failure of Others.....	58
E.	Skepticism	59
F.	Licensing	60
VII.	Conclusion	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>3M Co. v. Evergreen Adhesives, Inc.</i> , 860 F. App'x 724 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	32
<i>ALZA Corp. v. Andrx Pharm., LLC</i> , 603 F.3d 935 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	27, 31, 44
<i>Amgen, Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc.</i> , 457 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	30
<i>Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Recreational Prods. Inc.</i> , 876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	15
<i>AstraZeneca AB v. Mylan Pharm. Inc.</i> , 19 F.4th 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	16
<i>ATD Corp. v. Lydall, Inc.</i> , 159 F.3d 534 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	18
<i>Crocs, Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 598 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	17, 54
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	49, 58, 59
<i>Demaco Corp. v. F. Von Langsdorff Licensing Ltd.</i> , 851 F.2d 1387 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	53
<i>Elan Pharms. v. Mayo Found.</i> , 346 F.3d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	31
<i>Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Calgene, Inc.</i> , 188 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	27, 44
<i>Fidelity Nat'l Info. Serv., Inc. v. Datatransury Corp.</i> , IPR2014-00491, Paper No. 9 (August 13, 2014)	7

<i>Fox Factory, Inc. v. SRAM, LLC</i> , 944 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	50, 52, 53
<i>Henny Penny Corp. v. Frymaster LLC</i> , 938 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	49
<i>In re Huai-Hung Kao</i> , 639 F.3d 1057 (2011).....	54
<i>Impax Lab'ys Inc. v. Lannett Holdings Inc.</i> , 893 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	60
<i>Indivior Inc. v. Dr. Reddy's Labs.</i> , 930 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	6
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	31
<i>Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.</i> , 481 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	44
<i>Lupin Ltd. v. Pozen Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01775, Paper No. 15 (Mar. 1, 2016)	7
<i>Millennium Pharms., Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , 862 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	47
<i>In re Mouttet</i> , 686 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	16
<i>Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech., Inc.</i> , 498 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	27, 44
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Lab'ys, Inc.</i> , 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	47
<i>Polaris Indus., Inc. v. Arctic Cat, Inc.</i> , 882 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	50
<i>Power Integrations, Inc. v. Fairchild Semiconductor Int'l, Inc.</i> , 711 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	47

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.