| UNITED STAT | ES PATENT . | AND TRAD | EMARK OF | FICE |
|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------------|------|
| BEFORE THE | PATENT TR | IAL AND A | – APPEAL BOA | ARD |
| | | | | |

REGENERON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., Petitioner,

V.

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

> Case IPR2021-00816 Patent Number: 9,220,631

REPLY DECLARATION OF HORST KOLLER



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | | | | Page |
|------|--|----------------------------|---|---|------|
| I. | INTI | RODU | CTIO | N | 1 |
| II. | ADD | ADDITIONAL LEGAL STANDARDS | | | |
| | A. | Moti | on to A | Amend | 1 |
| | B. | Enab | lemen | t | 1 |
| | C. | Inde | finiten | ess | 2 |
| III. | DEF | INITIO | ON OF | POSITA | 2 |
| IV. | | | | ASSERTIONS BY NOVARTIS'S EXPERTS THE ORIGINAL CLAIMS OF THE '631 PATENT | 5 |
| | A. | FRE | E V. T | OTAL SILICONE OIL | 5 |
| | B. A POSITA Would Have Had A Reasonable Expectation Success In Combining Boulange With Sigg Or Lam To A At The Claimed Invention | | Combining Boulange With Sigg Or Lam To Arrive | 6 | |
| | | 1. | | OSITA Would Have Been Motivated To Use ange's Stopper B1 | 6 |
| | | | a. | A POSITA Would Not Be Deterred from Using Parylene C | 6 |
| | | | b. | Parylene C Would Not Come in Contact with the VEGF-Antagonist | 10 |
| | | 2. | | OSITA Would Have Been Motivated to Use ange's Stopper C | 12 |
| | | 3. | Anta | OSA Would Have Been Motivated to Make a VEGF- gonist Solution Having No More Than 2 Particles ter Than 50 µm in Diameter per Milliliter | 18 |
| | C. | Succ | ess In | Would Have Had A Reasonable Expectation Of Combining Boulange With Sigg Or Lam To Arrive imed Invention | 19 |
| | | 1. | | ange Discloses Components that Ensure A ciently Tight Seal | 20 |
| | | 2. | | Prior Art Taught How to Prevent Stopper Movement ng Sterilization | 23 |



| | 3. | Sigg Discloses Terminal Sterilization with Minimal Pressure Change, Eliminating Any Problems Created by Pressure Changes during Terminal Sterilization | 26 |
|------|------|--|----|
| | 4. | Macugen PFS Demonstrates that a POSITA Would Have Expected to Succeed in Terminally Sterilizing a PFS | |
| | 5. | Eylea PFS Demonstrates a POSITA Would Have Reasonably Expected to Succeed with Terminal Sterilization | 28 |
| D. | | And Lam Enable a Terminally Sterilized PFS In View of Prior Art | 29 |
| | 1. | Sigg Is Enabled | 29 |
| | 2. | Lam Is Enabled | 32 |
| Е. | | Potency Data in Lam Would Not Have Deterred a POSITA Using Its Method | 33 |
| F. | | Additional Limitations In Claims 17 and 21 Are Obvious Sigg In View Of Boulange | 34 |
| | 1. | Claim 17 | 34 |
| | 2. | Claim 21 | 35 |
| G. | | Additional Limitations In Claims 17 and 21 Are Obvious Lam In View Of Boulange | 36 |
| Н. | | Additional Limitations In Claims 24-26 Are Obvious Over Or Lam In View Of Boulange | 38 |
| | 1. | Claim 24 | 39 |
| | 2. | Claim 25 | 39 |
| | 3. | Claim 26 | 40 |
| SECO | ONDA | ARY CONSIDERATIONS | 41 |
| A. | Com | mercial Success | 41 |
| | 1. | Ophthalmologists Do Not Use Lucentis PFS Because Of The Features Claimed In The '631 Patent | 41 |
| | 2. | There Is No Nexus Between Lucentis PFS And The '631 Patent | 42 |
| B. | Long | Felt. Unmet Need | 46 |

V.

| | C. | Skep | cicism | | 50 | |
|-----|----|---|--------------------------|--|----|--|
| | D. | Failı | re Of Others | | 52 | |
| | E. | Lice | sing | | 53 | |
| VI. | | EACH SUBSTITUTE CLAIMS PROPOSED BY NOVARTIS IS UNPATENTABLE | | | | |
| | A. | Nov | rtis's Proposed S | ubstitute Claims | 59 | |
|] | В. | | | al Prior Art References to Proposed | 61 | |
| | | 1. | • • | k 1 mL LLA EZGTC syringe offered for Dickinson ("BD 1 mL Hypak") | 61 | |
| | | 2. | Macugen Pre-Fi | illed Syringe | 66 | |
| | | 3. | Pharmaceutical | eep Nema & John D. Ludwig, Dosage Forms: Parenteral Medication, d ed. 2010) | 76 | |
| | C. | Reno | ers Obvious the S | inge or BD 1 mL Hypak and Nema Substitute Claims 27-29, 31-35, 40-48, | 77 | |
| | | 1. | | Combine Sigg, Boulange or BD 1 mL | 78 | |
| | | | a. Silicone (| Oil and Break Loose / Slide Forces | 78 | |
| | | | b. Particulat | te Content | 78 | |
| | | | c. Terminal | Sterilization | 79 | |
| | | | d. Twelve-N | Month Shelf-life | 79 | |
| | | 2. | Reasonable Ex | pectation of Success | 80 | |
| | | | a. Silicone (| Oil Level Below about 25 μg | 81 | |
| | | | b. Twelve-N | Month Shelf Life | 85 | |
| | | 3. | | Boulange or BD 1 mL Hypak and Nema | 97 | |
| | | | Discloses Each | Limitation of Substitute Claim 27 | | |
| | | | a. [27.a] A ₁ | Limitation of Substitute Claim 27 pre-filled, terminally sterilized syringe for al injection | | |



| | | C. | which comprises a VEGF-antagonist, wherein: | 99 |
|----|---|--|--|-----|
| | | d. | [27.d] the syringe has a nominal maximum fill volume of between about 0.5 ml and about 1 ml | 100 |
| | | e. | [27.e] the syringe barrel comprises from about 1 μg to about 25 μg silicone oil | 100 |
| | | f. | [27.f] the VEGF antagonist solution comprises no more than 2 particles >50 µm in diameter per ml | 102 |
| | | g. | [27.g] and wherein the syringe has a stopper break loose force of less than about 11N | 102 |
| | | h. | [27.h] and has a shelf life of at least twelve months after terminal sterilization. | 106 |
| | 4. | Subst | itute Claim 28 | 106 |
| | 5. | Subst | itute Claims 29 and 48 | 107 |
| | 6. | Subst | itute Claims 31-35 | 108 |
| | 7. | Subst | itute Claim 40 | 108 |
| | 8. | Subst | itute Claim 41 | 111 |
| | 9. | Subst | itute Claim 42 | 112 |
| | 10. | Subst | itute Claims 43-47 | 115 |
| | 11. | Subst | itute Claim 50 | 115 |
| D. | Furth | in View of Boulange or BD 1 mL Hypak, Nema, and her in View of Fries, Renders Obvious Substitute Claims 36, and 49 | | |
| E. | Sigg in View of Boulange or BD 1 mL Hypak, Nema, and Further in View of Furfine, Renders Obvious Substitute Claims 37-39 | | | 117 |
| F. | Sigg in View of Boulange or BD 1 mL Hypak, Nema, and Further in View of Macugen PFS 2008 Label, Renders Obvious Substitute Claim 51 | | | |
| G. | Furth | er in V | w of Boulange or BD 1 mL Hypak, Nema, and Yiew of Dixon, Renders Obvious Substitute Claim | 119 |



DOCKET

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.

