

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.

Inter Partes Review No.: IPR2021-00880¹

U.S. Patent No. 9,669,069 B2
Filed: December 17, 2015
Issued: June 6, 2017
Inventor: George D. Yancopoulos

Title: USE OF A VEGF ANTAGONIST TO TREAT
ANGIOGENIC EYE DISORDERS

**PETITIONER'S OPPOSITION TO PATENT OWNER'S
MOTION TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE**

¹ IPR2022-00257 and IPR2022-00301 have been joined with this proceeding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	LEGAL STANDARD.....	1
III.	PO’S MOTION IS PROCEDURALLY DEFICIENT.....	1
	A. PO Has Not Made Timely Objections to Evidence.....	1
	B. PO’s Motion Is an Unauthorized (and Previously-Denied) Motion To Strike.....	4
IV.	PETITIONER’S REPLY PROPERLY RESPONDS TO PO’S RESPONSE ARGUMENTS.....	6
	A. VEGF Trap-Eye Was Publicly Distributed.....	7
	B. Ground 4 Anticipation Argument.....	8
	C. Ground 5 Obviousness Arguments.....	9
V.	PO HAS NOT MADE A SUFFICIENT CASE FOR EXCLUSION OF UNCITED EXHIBITS AND EXPERT TESTIMONY.....	12
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>ABB Inc. v. Roy-G-Biv Corp.</i> , IPR2013-00062 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 11, 2014)	3, 5, 11
<i>Aisin Seiki Co. v. Intell. Ventures II LLC</i> , IPR2017-01539 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 12, 2018)	6, 9
<i>Apple Inc. v. Achates Reference Publ'g, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00080 (P.T.A.B. June 2, 2014)	2
<i>Apple v. Andrea Elecs. Corp.</i> , 949 F.3d 697 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	6
<i>Avaya Inc. v. Network-1 Sec. Sols., Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00071 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 2, 2013)	2, 11
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	5, 6, 7
<i>Ericsson Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC</i> , 901 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	9, 12
<i>Google Inc. v. Visual Real Estate, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01340 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 25, 2016)	5
<i>Idemitsu Kosan Co. v. SFC Co.</i> , 870 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	7, 11
<i>Invue Sec. Prods., Inc. v. Merch. Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00122 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 10, 2013)	6
<i>K-40 Elecs., LLC v. Escort, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00203 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 27, 2014)	2
<i>Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.</i> , CBM2012-00002 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 23, 2014)	1
<i>Peabody Coal Co. v. McCandless</i> , 255 F.3d 465 (7th Cir. 2001)	13

<i>Puzhen Life USA, LLC, v. Esip Series 2, LLC,</i> IPR2017-02197 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 27, 2019).....	5, 6
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC,</i> IPR2014-01181 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 28, 2016)	8, 9
<i>Square Inc. v. 4361423 Canada Inc.,</i> IPR2019-01649 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 22, 2021)	13
<i>Twitter, Inc. v. Vidstream, LLC,</i> IPR2017-00829 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 28, 2019)	4
<i>Volkswagen Grp. of Am., Inc. v. Emerachem Holdings, LLC,</i> IPR2014-01555 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 9, 2015).....	8, 12

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c).....	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b)	8
37 C.F.R. § 42.62(a).....	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.64	1, 2, 3, 4, 11
37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)	11
37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1).....	2
37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(2).....	2, 3
37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c).....	11, 12

I. Introduction.

Patent Owner (“PO”) has moved for the “extraordinary relief” that the Board exclude Petitioner’s Reply arguments and evidence. (*See* Paper 77). But, PO has not carried its burden to establish that any portion of Petitioner’s Reply, nor any of its evidence, should be excluded. PO’s Motion should be denied.

II. Legal Standard.

Exclusion “is an exceptional remedy that the Board expects will be granted rarely.” (Consolidated Trial Practice Guide Update (Nov. 2019) (“TPG”), 80). The party moving to exclude evidence bears the burden of proof to establish that it is entitled to the relief requested—namely, that the objected-to material is inadmissible under the Federal Rules of Evidence. 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.20(c), 42.62(a). The Board has emphasized that “[t]here is a strong public policy for making all information filed in a non-jury, quasi-judicial administrative proceeding available to the public, especially in an [IPR] which determines the patentability of claim[s] in an issued patent.” *Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.*, CBM2012-00002, Paper 66, 60 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 23, 2014).

III. PO’s Motion Is Procedurally Deficient.

A. PO Has Not Made Timely Objections to Evidence.

PO’s Motion does not comply with the procedural requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 42.64. As a threshold matter, PO seeks exclusion of Petitioner’s Reply, (Mot., 1-8, 11), but Rule 42.64 pertains to evidence, not pleadings.

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.