

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APOTEX INC.,
Petitioner

v.

REGENERON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,
Patent Owner

Inter Partes Review No.: IPR2022-00298

U.S. Patent No. 9,254,338 B2
Filed: July 12, 2013
Issued: February 9, 2016
Inventor: George D. Yancopoulos

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

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 9,254,338 B2**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXHIBIT LIST	viii
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 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. § 42.104(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 of 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 (Ex.1006)	27
	2. Adis (Ex.1007)	30
	3. Regeneron (8-May-2008) (Ex.1013).	31
	4. NCT-795 (Ex.1014).	32
	5. NCT-377 (Ex.1015).	35
	6. The ‘758 patent (Ex.1010).	36
	7. Dix (Ex.1033)	37
XI.	GROUND 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.....	44
4.	Ground 3: Regeneron (8-May-2008) anticipates the Challenged Claims.....	49
5.	Grounds 4 and 5: NCT-795 and NCT-377 each anticipate the Challenged Claims.....	54
B.	Obviousness.....	60
1.	Legal standard.....	61
2.	Ground 6: The Challenged Claims are obvious over Dixon (either alone or in combination with the '758 patent or Dix).....	62
3.	No secondary considerations.....	65
XII.	CONCLUSION.....	69
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	70
	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....	71

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Advanced Display Sys., Inc. v. Kent State Univ.</i> , 212 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	28
<i>In re Antor Media Corp.</i> , 689 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	59
<i>Arctic Cat Inc. v. GEP Power Prods., Inc.</i> , 919 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	17
<i>Ariosa Diagnostics v. Verinata Health, Inc.</i> , 805 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	23
<i>In re Baxter Travenol Labs</i> , 952 F.2d 388 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	41
<i>Bayer Healthcare Pharm., Inc. v. Watson Pharm., Inc.</i> , 713 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	64
<i>Bayer Schering Pharma AG v. Barr Lab 'ys, Inc.</i> , 575 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	64
<i>Bio-Rad Lab 'ys, Inc. v. 10X Genomics Inc.</i> , 967 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	17, 18
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Lab 'ys, Inc.</i> , 246 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	17, 20, 38, 59
<i>Chengdu Kanghong Biotechnology Co. v. Regeneron Pharms., Inc.</i> , No. PGR2021-00035, 9 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 15, 2021)	<i>passim</i>
<i>In Re: Copaxone Consol. Cases</i> , 906 F.3d 1013 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	18, 20
<i>In re Cruciferous Sprout Litig.</i> , 301 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	38
<i>Cubist Pharms., Inc. v. Hospira, Inc.</i> , 75 F. Supp. 3d 641 (D. Del. 2014).....	59
<i>GlaxoSmithKline LLC v. Glenmark Pharms., Inc.</i> , No. 14-877-LPS-CJB, 2016 WL 3186657 (D. Del. June 3, 2016).....	20

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.