

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,
Petitioner

v.

REGENERON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2022-01225
Patent No. 10,130,681 B2

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §314(A)	4
A. Institution Should Be Denied under <i>General Plastic</i>	4
1. Petitioner Previously Challenged Substantially Similar Claims of a Related Patent Using the Same References (<i>General Plastic</i> Factors One and Two)	6
2. Petitioner Uses the Prior Proceeding to Roadmap Its Arguments (<i>General Plastic</i> Factor Three)	8
3. Petitioner Fails to Explain Its Delay in Filing (<i>General Plastic</i> Factors Four and Five).....	10
4. Petitioner’s Strategically Delayed Filing Taxes the Finite Resources of the Board (<i>General Plastic</i> Factors Six and Seven).....	11
B. Institution Should Be Denied under <i>Fintiv</i>	12
1. The Court Has Not Granted a Stay, Nor Has One Been Requested (<i>Fintiv</i> Factor One).....	13
3. The Parties Have Invested in Extensive Pre-Litigation Activity (<i>Fintiv</i> Factor Three).....	15
4. The Validity of the ’681 Patent Is Central to Both Proceedings (<i>Fintiv</i> Factor Four).....	16
5. PO and Petitioner Are Parties in Both Proceedings (<i>Fintiv Factor</i> Five).....	17
6. Other Circumstances Warrant Discretionary Denial of Institution (<i>Fintiv</i> Factor Six)	17

C.	Petitioner’s Attempt to Pass Off a Suspect Exhibit, with No Evidence of Public Accessibility, Requires Rejection of at Least Ground 5	18
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	20
A.	The Challenged Claims Require Efficacy	20
1.	The Preamble Is Limiting and Requires “[T]reating”	21
2.	“[M]ethod for [T]reating” Requires a High Level of Efficacy	24
a.	Treatments for Angiogenic Eye Disorders Were Expected to Achieve a High Level of Efficacy by 2011	24
b.	The Intrinsic Record Supports a High Level of Efficacy	25
3.	The “Initial,” “Secondary,” and “Tertiary Dose” Limitations Require Achieving and Maintaining a High Level of Efficacy	30
4.	Petitioner’s Arguments That the Claims Do Not Require Efficacy Are Unavailing	33
a.	“High Level of Efficacy” Does Not Generate §112 Problems	33
b.	PO’s Construction Does Not Eliminate the Notice Function	36
B.	The Challenged Claims Require an Intent to Treat.....	36
C.	The Recited Exclusion Criteria Are Entitled to Patentable Weight....	38
1.	The Printed Matter Doctrine Does Not Apply to the Exclusion Criteria	39
a.	The Exclusion Criteria Do Not “Claim the Content of Information”	41

b.	The Exclusion Criteria Are Functionally Related to the Rest of the Claim	43
IV.	PETITIONER FAILS TO MAKE ITS THRESHOLD SHOWING THAT AT LEAST ONE CHALLENGED CLAIM IS UNPATENTABLE	44
A.	Grounds 1-3 (§102 Anticipation): Petitioner Fails to Establish That Dixon, Adis, or Regeneron (8-May-2008) Disclose the Recited Exclusion Criteria.....	44
1.	None of Petitioner’s References Expressly Discloses the Exclusion Criteria	44
2.	None of Petitioner’s References Inherently Discloses the Exclusion Criteria	45
a.	Neither the VIEW Studies Nor the VIEW Clinical Trial Protocol Is Prior Art.....	45
b.	The Exclusion Criteria Are Not Necessarily Present in the Disclosures of Dixon, Adis, or Regeneron (8-May-2008).....	47
c.	The Exclusion Criteria Are Not Inherent in the Practice of the ’681 Claimed Method.....	51
B.	Grounds 4–6 (§103 Obviousness): Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate That Any Challenged Claim Is Obvious	52
1.	Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate Obviousness of All of the Recited Exclusion Criteria	53
2.	Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate Obviousness of the Claimed Dosing Regimen.....	56
a.	Dixon’s Disclosure of CLEAR-IT-2 Would Not Have Provided a Reasonable Expectation of Success	58
b.	Petitioner Fails to Show Reasonable Expectation of Success with Respect to the Intent to Treat Limitation of the Challenged Claims	62
c.	Objective Evidence Confirms Non-Obviousness.....	64

V. CONCLUSION.....67

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.