

Filed on behalf of: Celltrion, Inc.  
By: Lora M. Green (lgreen@wsgr.com)  
Yahn-Lin Chu (ychu@wsgr.com)

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

CELLTRION, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

REGENERON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case No. IPR2022-00258  
Patent No. 9,254,338

---

**PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW OF  
U.S. PATENT NO. 9,254,338**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Mandatory Notices (37 C.F.R. § 42.8) .....	3
A. Real-Parties-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)).....	3
B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	3
C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel and Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3), (4)).....	4
III. Payment of Fees Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.15(a) and § 42.103 .....	5
IV. Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)).....	5
V. Threshold Requirement for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review .....	5
VI. Overview of Challenge and Precise Relief Requested .....	6
A. Challenged Claims .....	6
B. Statutory Grounds of Challenge.....	6
VII. Overview of the '338 Patent.....	7
A. The '338 Patent .....	7
B. European Equivalent, EP-325 .....	10
VIII. Claim Construction (37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)(3)).....	11
A. “Initial Dose,” “Secondary Dose,” and “Tertiary Dose” .....	12
1. Regeneron’s contradictory construction for “tertiary dose,” if presented here, must be rejected. ....	13
B. “4 Weeks” and “8 Weeks” After the Immediately Preceding Dose.....	16

C.	“VEGFR1 Component,” “VEGFR2 Component,” and the “Multimerization Component.”	17
D.	“Treating”	17
	1. The “method for treating” element of the preamble is not a limitation on the Challenged Claims, and therefore, does not require construction	17
	2. Regeneron’s anticipated argument that the “method for treating” preamble is a positive limitation should be rejected	19
	3. If construed to be a limitation, the preamble’s plain and ordinary meaning—which does not provide any specific efficacy requirement—must govern	21
IX.	Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	22
X.	The Scope and Content of the Prior Art	23
	A. VEGF Trap-Eye/aflibercept Background	23
	B. Petitioner’s Prior Art References	26
	1. Dixon (EX1006)	27
	2. Adis (EX1007)	30
	3. Regeneron (8-May-2008) (EX1013)	31
	4. NCT-795 (EX1014)	32
	5. NCT-377 (EX1015)	35
	6. The ’758 Patent (EX1010)	36
	7. Dix (EX1033)	37
XI.	Grounds for Unpatentability – Detailed Analysis	37
	A. Anticipation	37
	1. Legal Standards	38

2.	Ground 1: Dixon Anticipates the Challenged Claims .....	39
3.	Ground 2: Adis Anticipates the Challenged Claims.....	45
4.	Ground 3: Regeneron (8-May-2008) anticipates the Challenged Claims .....	50
5.	Grounds 4 and 5: NCT-795 and NCT-377 each anticipate the Challenged Claims .....	55
B.	Obviousness.....	62
1.	Legal Standard .....	62
2.	Ground 6: The Challenged Claims are obvious over Dixon (either alone or in combination with the '758 patent or Dix) .....	63
3.	No Secondary Considerations.....	67
XII.	Conclusion .....	70
XIII.	Certificate of Compliance.....	71
XIV.	Payment of Fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.15(a) and 42.103 .....	72
XV.	Appendix – List of Exhibits.....	73

...

Celltrion, Inc. (“Petitioner”) petitions for *inter partes* review (“IPR”) under 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 and 37 C.F.R. §§ 42 *et seq.*, seeking cancellation of claims 1, 3-11, 13-14, 16-24, and 26 (the “Challenged Claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 9,254,338 (“’338 patent”) (EX1001), currently assigned to Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (“Regeneron” or “Patent Owner”).

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Challenged Claims should have never issued. They are drawn to “VEGF Trap-Eye” dosing regimens known to persons of ordinary skill in the art (hereafter, “skilled artisans”) long before the patent’s alleged 2011 priority date. Regeneron’s age-related macular degeneration (“AMD”) clinical trials (VIEW1/VIEW2) with EYLEA® (a/k/a VEGF Trap-Eye or aflibercept) were designed to use the precise dosing regimens now covered by the Challenged Claims. The problem: Regeneron publicly disclosed these exact dosing regimens to skilled artisans as early as 2008, three years prior to filing its patent application. Regeneron then withheld those publications from the Examiner, allowing the ’338 patent to issue. For at least these reasons, the Challenged Claims are unpatentable.

Petitioner thus files this Petition, supported by expert declarations from Dr. Thomas Albini—a renowned ophthalmologist (EX1002), and Dr. Mary Gerritsen—a pharmacologist with over thirty years’ experience (EX1003).

# 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.