

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.: IPR2021-00881<sup>1</sup>  
U.S. Patent No. 9,254,338 B2

---

**EXPERT DECLARATION OF DR. THOMAS A. ALBINI  
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER REPLY**

---

<sup>1</sup> IPR2022-00258 and IPR2022-00298 have been joined with this proceeding.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. QUALIFICATIONS AND BACKGROUND.....	1
A. EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE.....	1
B. BASES FOR OPINIONS AND MATERIALS CONSIDERED.....	1
C. SCOPE OF WORK.....	1
II. LEGAL STANDARDS.....	2
III. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.....	2
IV. MISREPRESENTATIONS OF MY OPENING DECLARATION OPINIONS AND DEPOSITION TESTIMONY.....	3
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	3
A. PREAMBLE: “A METHOD FOR TREATING AN ANGIOGENIC EYE DISORDER IN A PATIENT.”.....	3
1. The Board correctly found that the preamble, although limiting, does not require any particular level of efficacy.....	3
2. Dr. Do’s proposed construction for the “method for treating” preamble contradicts how a POSA would understand the claim language within the context of the intrinsic evidence.....	4
a. <i>Dr. Do’s proposed “high level of efficacy that is non-inferior to the standard of care” added limitation is not consistent with the intrinsic record.....</i>	6
b. <i>Dr. Do’s proposed construction admittedly varies with respect to each of the “angiogenic eye disorders” covered by the claimed “method for treating.”.....</i>	17

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
**(continued)**

	<u>Page</u>
3. Dr. Do’s Proposed Construction Adds Substantial Ambiguity To The Claims. ....	20
4. Regeneron’s Proposed Construction Relies Entirely on Extrinsic Evidence. ....	29
B. “TERTIARY DOSE.” .....	31
1. The Board correctly found that “the Specification expressly defines the terms ‘initial dose,’ ‘secondary doses,’ and ‘tertiary doses.’” .....	31
2. PO and Dr. Do’s proposed construction for “tertiary dose(s)” is unsupported by the intrinsic evidence. ....	32
C. “VEGF Trap-Eye.” .....	37
VI. GROUND 6: THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE OBVIOUS BASED ON DIXON.....	42
A. The POSA Would Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success That Q8 Dosing Regimen Would Be Effective.....	42
B. The Fact That Regeneron Initiated Phase 3 Testing Would Have Provided the POSA with a Reasonable Expectation of Success.....	43
C. The Results of CLEAR-IT-2 Would Have Provided the POSA With a Reasonable Expectation of Success. ....	49
D. Dixon Would Have Provided the POSA With a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Achieving the Extended Dosing Regimen.....	52
VII. NEITHER THE EYLEA LABEL NOR PHYSICIAN’S ADMINISTRATION OF EYLEA PRACTICE THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS. ....	53
VIII. SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS.....	54

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
**(continued)**

	<u>Page</u>
IX. CERTAIN REGENERON PATENTS WOULD HAVE DISCOURAGED AND DISINCENTIVIZED OTHERS FROM DEVELOPING THE '338 PATENT CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER.....	59
X. OPHTHALMOLOGISTS CHOOSE EYLEA BASED ON ITS PHARMACOKINETIC PROPERTIES.....	63

1. My name is Dr. Thomas A. Albini and I have been retained by counsel for Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (“Mylan” or “Petitioner”), to provide my opinions in support of Petitioners Reply. I am the same Dr. Albini who wrote declarations in support of Mylan’s Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent Nos. 9,669,069 B2 (“the ’069 patent”) and 9,254,338 B2 (“the ’338 patent”), instituted as IPR2021-00880 and IPR2021-00881, respectively. I also have been asked to reply to the opinions and views of Patent Owner’s (“PO”) declarants, Diana V. Do, M.D., David M. Brown, M.D., and Lucian V. Del Priore, M.D., Ph.D.

## **I. QUALIFICATIONS AND BACKGROUND.**

### **A. EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE.**

2. My qualifications, education, and experience are set forth in my previous report, Exhibit 1002, and my *curriculum vitae* is attached as Exhibit 1038.

### **B. BASES FOR OPINIONS AND MATERIALS CONSIDERED.**

3. In addition to my education, knowledge of the relevant published art, training, and experience, in forming the opinions I provide in this declaration, I have also considered the exhibits cited herein.

### **C. SCOPE OF WORK.**

4. I have been retained by Petitioner as an expert in this matter to provide various opinions regarding the ’338 patent. I receive \$500 per hour for my services.

# 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.