UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CHENGDU KANGHONG BIOTECHNOLOGY CO., LTD.
Petitioner

v.

REGENERON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.
Patent Owner

Case PGR2021-00035
Patent 10,828,345

PRELIMINARY RESPONSE OF PATENT OWNER REGENERON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

Contents

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND 4

A. The ’345 Patent Claims 4

III. THE LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART 5

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 6

A. Claim 1’s Preamble Is a Positive Limitation That Requires A Therapeutically Effective Method of Treatment 7

B. The “Tertiary Dose” Must Maintain the Therapeutic Effect During Treatment 9

V. THE ’345 PATENT IS NOT ELIGIBLE FOR POST-GRANT REVIEW 11

A. The Examiner Already Determined That the ’345 Patent Should Be Reviewed Under Pre-AIA Standards 12

B. The 2011 Provisional Applications Describe Treatment of Branch Retinal Vein Occlusion (BRVO) 14

1. Because the 2011 Provisional Applications Support the Challenged Claims, the ’345 Patent Is Not PGR Eligible 14

2. Treatment of Branch Retinal Vein Occlusion (BRVO) Was Described by the 2011 Provisional Applications 16

C. The Claimed Twelve-Week Dosing Regimen Is Fully Supported by the 2011 Provisional Applications 21

VI. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) 21

A. The Examiner Considered the Same or Substantially the Same Art and Arguments During Prosecution (*Becton, Dickinson* factors (a), (b), and (d)) 23

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

1. Shams (Ex. 1004).....23
2. 2009 Press Release (Ex. 1005).....25
3. Written Description.....26
B. Petitioner Fails to Show That the Examiner Erred in a Manner Material to Patentability (*Becton, Dickinson* factors (c), (e), and (f)).....31
1. Petitioner Fails to Show That the Examiner Erred in a Manner Material to Patentability in His Analysis of Shams (Ground 1).....31
2. Petitioner Does Not Argue That the Examiner Erred in a Manner Material to Patentability as to the 2009 Press Release or Written Description (Grounds 2 and 3) 34
VII. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION BECAUSE PETITIONER FAILS TO MAKE ITS THRESHOLD SHOWING THAT AT LEAST ONE CHALLENGED CLAIM IS UNPATENTABLE.....37
A. Ground 1: Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate That It Is More Likely Than Not That At Least One of the Challenged Claims Is Anticipated 38
1. Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate That Shams' Treatment Schema Discloses the Recited Fusion Protein.....39
2. Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate That Shams' Reference to "VEGF-Trap (Regeneron)" Discloses the Recited Fusion Protein 41
3. Shams Does Not Disclose the '345 Patented Invention As Arranged in the Claims 45
4. Petitioner Fails to Show That Shams Discloses or Enables A Therapeutically Effective Method of Treating an Angiogenic Eye Disorder.....50
5. Shams Fails to Disclose A Tertiary Dose That Maintains the Therapeutic Effect Throughout the Course of Treatment When Administered 12 Weeks After the Immediately Preceding Dose 57

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

B. Ground 2: Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate That It Is More Likely Than Not That At Least One of the Challenged Claims Is Obvious....58

1. The Board Should Deny Institution Under 35 U.S.C. § 324(a) Because Petitioner Has Failed to Address, Let Alone Overcome, the Examiner's Finding of Unexpected Results....59

2. A POSA Would Not Reasonably Expect to Treat an Angiogenic Eye Disorder Using the Claimed Regimen by Combining the 2009 Press Release and Shams....61

C. Ground 3: Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate That It Is More Likely Than Not That At Least One of the Challenged Claims Lacks Written Description....69

1. Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate That the Claims More Likely Than Not Lack Written Description Because the '345 Patent Specification Discloses as a Specific Example the Exact Dosing Regimen Claimed....70

2. None of Petitioner's Cases Involve a Specification That Actually Discloses the Claimed Species....72

3. Petitioner's Argument Based on the Prosecution History Is Legally Irrelevant to Written Description and Factually Unsupported....76

VIII. CONCLUSION....79

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH,
IPR2019-01469, 2020 WL 740292 (Feb. 13, 2020) ..... passim

Align Tech., Inc. v. 3Shape A/S,
PGR2018-00103, 2019 WL 2112182 (May 13, 2019) 43

Am. Hoist & Derrick Co. v. Sowa & Sons, Inc.,
725 F.2d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....59

Amgen Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc.,
314 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....57

Apotex Inc. v. Celgene Corp.,
IPR2018-00685, 2020 WL 2095846 (Apr. 30. 2020).....42

Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.,
598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 79, 86

Balt USA, LLC v. Microvention, Inc.,
IPR2020-01259, 2021 WL 219251 (Jan. 21, 2021)..... 29, 39

Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG,
IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (Dec. 15, 2017)..... 25, 26, 35

Biocon Pharma Ltd. v. Novartis Pharms. Corp.,
IPR2020-01263, 2021 WL 608300 (Feb. 16, 2021) 28, 42

Boehringer Ingelheim Vetmedica, Inc. v. Schering-Plough Corp.,
320 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....8

Boragen, Inc. v. Syngenta Participations AG,
IPR2020-00124, 2020 WL 2206972 (May 5, 2020).....30

Boston Sci. Corp. v. Johnson & Johnson,
647 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....84

Coalition for Affordable Drugs V LLC v. Hoffmann-La Roche Inc.,
IPR2015-01792, Paper 14 (Mar. 11, 2016)..... 67, 69

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.