

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC., CELLTRION, INC.,  
and APOTEX, INC.,  
Petitioners

v.

REGENERON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2021-00880<sup>1</sup>  
Patent No. 9,669,069 B2

---

**PATENT OWNER RESPONSE**

---

<sup>1</sup> IPR2022-00257 and IPR2022-00301 have been joined with this proceeding.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
<b>TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>TABLE OF EXHIBITS .....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>I. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. THE STATE OF THE ART .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>III. THE '069 PATENT .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>V. GROUNDS 1-4: PETITIONER FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE THAT “VEGF TRAP-EYE” WAS KNOWN TO CORRESPOND TO SEQ ID NO:1 OR SEQ ID NO:2.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>A. Petitioner’s Grounds 1-4 References Do Not Expressly Disclose the Amino Acid or Nucleic Acid Sequence of VEGF Trap-Eye.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>B. Petitioner’s Grounds 1-4 References Do Not Inherently Disclose the Amino Acid or Nucleic Acid Sequence of VEGF Trap-Eye.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>1. Dixon Does Not Disclose That VEGF Trap-Eye Shares the Same Amino Acid Sequence of Aflibercept .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>2. The POSA Would Have Had Reason to Doubt That VEGF Trap-Eye Corresponded to Only Aflibercept .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>VI. GROUND 4: PETITIONER FAILS TO ESTABLISH THAT CLAIMS 1 AND 8-12 ARE UNPATENTABLE BASED ON DIXON’S DISCLOSURE OF THE VIEW DOSING REGIMEN .....</b>	<b>22</b>

A.	<b>Petitioner Fails to Establish That the 8-Week Dosing Arm of the VIEW Clinical Trial Anticipates the Claimed PRN Dosing Regimen (All Challenged Claims).....</b>	<b>22</b>
B.	<b>Petitioner Fails to Establish That the 8-Week Dosing Arm of the VIEW Clinical Trial Renders Obvious the Claimed PRN Dosing Regimen (All Challenged Claims).....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>GROUND 5: PETITIONER FAILS TO ESTABLISH THAT ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM IS RENDERED OBVIOUS BY HEIER-2009 IN VIEW OF MITCHELL OR DIXON .....</b>	<b>28</b>
A.	<b>Heier-2009 in View of Mitchell or Dixon Does Not Render Obvious Claims 1 and 8-12.....</b>	<b>29</b>
B.	<b>Claim 8 Is Nonobvious for the Additional Reason That the POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Decrease the Number of Loading Doses from Four to Three Based on the CLEAR-IT 2 Data .....</b>	<b>30</b>
1.	<b>Ranibizumab Dosing Regimens as Reported in Mitchell....</b>	<b>34</b>
2.	<b>Prospective View Dosing Regimens as Reported in Dixon.....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>43</b>

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Advanced Display Sys., Inc. v. Kent State Univ.</i> , 212 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	23
<i>Amgen, Inc. v. Alexion Pharms.</i> , IPR2019-00741, Paper 15, 20 (PTAB Aug. 30, 2019).....	12, 13
<i>AstraZeneca AB v. Aurobindo Pharma Ltd.</i> , 232 F. Supp. 3d 636 (D. Del. 2017).....	28
<i>AstraZeneca LP v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 633 F.3d 1042 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	22
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk–Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	33
<i>Bettcher Indus., Inc. v. Bunzl USA, Inc.</i> , 661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	11
<i>Cheese Sys., Inc. v. Tetra Pak Cheese &amp; Powder Sys.</i> , 725 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	42
<i>Continental Can Co. USA v. Monsanto</i> , 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991) .....	11
<i>Endo Pharms. Sols., Inc. v. Custopharm Inc.</i> , 894 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	12, 13, 21, 22
<i>Henny Penny Corp. v. Frymaster LLC</i> , 938 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....	28, 43
<i>Impax Lab’ys. Inc. v. Lannett Holdings Inc.</i> , 893 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	33, 36
<i>Innogenics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	33

<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	26, 43
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	33
<i>King Pharms., Inc. v. Eon Labs, Inc.</i> , 616 F.3d 1267 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	10
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	33
<i>Nidec Motor Corp. v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co.</i> , 868 F.3d 1013 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	8, 9
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	42
<i>In re Oelrich</i> , 666 F.2d 578 (C.C.P.A. 1981).....	11, 21, 22
<i>Pers. Web Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	33
<i>Rexnord Indus., LLC v. Kappos</i> , 705 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	11
<i>Rosco, Inc. v. Mirror Lite Co.</i> , 304 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	12
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Elm 3DS Innovations, LLC</i> , 925 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....	8
<i>Sanofi Aventis U.S., LLC v. Dr. Reddy’s Lab’ys, Inc.</i> , 933 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....	42
<i>Schering Corp. v. Amgen Inc.</i> , 222 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	18
<i>Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of Cal.</i> , 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987) .....	23

# 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.