

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,
Petitioner

v.

REGENERON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2021-00881
Patent No. 9,254,338 B2

**PRELIMINARY RESPONSE OF PATENT OWNER
REGENERON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE PETITION SHOULD BE REJECTED FOR CIRCUMVENTING THE WORD LIMIT AND OBFUSCATING ITS GROUNDS	4
A. The Petition Violates the Word Limit.....	4
B. The Petition Fails the Particularity Requirement.....	5
C. Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Is a Real Party-in-Interest.....	8
III. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	9
A. Petitioner Mischaracterizes the Prosecution History of the '338 Patent and its Foreign Counterpart.....	9
B. Because the Examiner Considered Substantially the Same Art and Petitioner Does Not Allege Any Error, Institution Should Be Denied.....	11
1. The Examiner Considered Substantially the Same Art (<i>Becton, Dickinson</i> Factors (a), (b), and (d))	11
a. Grounds 1-5	12
b. Ground 6	14
2. Petitioner Fails to Argue that the Examiner Erred in a Manner Material to Patentability (<i>Becton, Dickinson</i> Factors (c), (e), and (f)).....	16
IV. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION BECAUSE PETITIONER FAILS TO MAKE ITS THRESHOLD SHOWING THAT AT LEAST ONE CHALLENGED CLAIM IS UNPATENTABLE.....	17

A.	Grounds 1, 3-5: Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate that “VEGF Trap-Eye” Was Known in the Art to Correspond to SEQ ID NO: 2 or SEQ ID NO:1	18
1.	Petitioner Fails to Establish that “VEGF Trap-Eye” Was Known in the Art to Comprise SEQ ID NO: 2 (Claims 1, 3-11, and 13).....	18
a.	Petitioner and Its Expert Repeatedly Equate “Aflibercept” with All Variations of “VEGF Trap”	21
b.	Petitioner Fails to Address Uncertainty in the Art as to the Amino Acid Sequence of “VEGF Trap-Eye”	24
2.	Petitioner Fails to Establish that “VEGF Trap-Eye” Was Known in the Art to Be Encoded by SEQ ID NO:1	26
B.	Ground 2: Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate that There Is a Reasonable Likelihood that at Least One of the Challenged Clams Is Anticipated by Adis.....	28
C.	Grounds 1-5: Petitioner Fails to Establish Any of Its References Disclose a “Method of Treating” and “Tertiary Dose”.....	30
1.	Claim Construction	31
a.	The Preamble of the Independent Claims Is a Limitation of the Claim	32
b.	The Preamble Reflects the Efficacy Required by the Body of the Claim.....	36
c.	The “Tertiary Dose” Must Maintain the Efficacy Gain Achieved After the Initial and Secondary Doses...38	
2.	Petitioner’s References Fail To Disclose A “Method Of Treating” Or A “Tertiary Dose”	46
D.	Ground 6: Petitioner Fails to Make a Threshold Showing that Any Challenged Claim Is Obvious Based on Dixon.....	49

1.	Petitioner Fails to Show that the POSA Would Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success.....	50
2.	Petitioner’s Argument Against Objective Evidence Should Be Rejected	57
V.	CONCLUSION.....	62

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Abraxis Bioscience, Inc. v. Mayne Pharma (USA) Inc.</i> , 467 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	39
<i>ABS Global, Inc. v. Cytonome/ST, LLC</i> , IPR2021-00306, Paper 13 (Jun. 7, 2021)	16
<i>Adaptics Ltd. v. Perfect Co.</i> , IPR2018-01596, Paper 20 (Mar. 6, 2019)	5, 6
<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Gerate GmbH</i> , IPR2019-01469, 2020 WL 740292 (Feb. 13, 2020)	11, 16
<i>Amgen, Inc. v. Alexion Pharms., Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00739, Paper 15 (Aug. 30, 2019)	28
<i>Apple, Inc. v. ITC</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	57
<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 935 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2019), cert. denied, 141 S. Ct. 236 (2020)	47
<i>Baldwin Graphic Sys., Inc. v. Siebert, Inc.</i> , 512 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	35
<i>Baxalta Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , 972 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	42
<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (Dec. 15, 2017)	11
<i>Bettcher Indus., Inc. v. Bunzl USA, Inc.</i> , 661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	47
<i>Boehringer Ingelheim Vetmedica, Inc. v. Schering-Plough Corp.</i> , 320 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	34
<i>Boragen, Inc. v. Syngenta Participations AG</i> , IPR2020-00124, 2020 WL 2206972 (May 5, 2020)	15
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Lab'ys, Inc.</i> , 246 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	43, 44

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.