

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG BIOEPIS CO., LTD.
Petitioner,

v.

REGENERON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.
Patent Owner.

Patent No. 11,253,572

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2023-00884

DECLARATION OF MICHAEL W. STEWART, M.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. SUMMARY OF OPINIONS.....	1
III. QUALIFICATIONS	3
IV. MATERIALS CONSIDERED	5
V. LEGAL STANDARDS	5
VI. TECHNICAL BACKGROUND	8
A. Angiogenic eye disorders	8
B. Prior art therapies for angiogenic eye disorders.....	11
C. Eylea.....	17
VII. THE '572 PATENT.....	19
VIII. PETITIONER'S PRIOR ART REFERENCES	20
A. 2009 Press Release (Ex.1005).....	21
B. Dixon (Ex.1009).....	21
C. Hecht (Ex.1016)	24
D. Shams (Ex.1017)	25
E. Elman 2010 (Ex. 1018)	26
F. 2006 Press Release (Ex.1027).....	27
G. 2007 ARVO Abstract (Ex.1030).....	28
H. Randolph (Ex. 1032)	28
I. Fraser (Ex. 1033).....	29
IX. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	29
X. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	30
A. results limitations	30
B. "approximately 4 weeks following the immediately preceding dose . . . approximately 8 weeks following the immediately preceding dose"	30
XI. ANALYSIS OF PRIOR ART.....	36

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
A. The prior art does not disclose or suggest the required benefits to visual acuity for angiogenic eye disorders, in general, or for AMD, specifically	36
1. In general, partial results from Phase I and II clinical trials do not predict a Phase III clinical trial's outcome	37
2. No POSA would have reasonably expected the 2q8 regimen to succeed based on Dixon and the 2006 Press Release	38
a. Claim 1	39
b. Claims 2, 3, 8, and 10	42
c. Claims 4 and 9	42
d. Claims 5 and 11	43
e. Claims 26-28.....	43
f. Claims 29 and 30	46
B. The prior art does not disclose or suggest the required benefits to visual acuity in the context of DME	47
C. It was not obvious to formulate aflibercept as an isotonic solution or with a non-ionic surfactant.....	49
1. Neither Dixon nor Hecht renders obvious an isotonic solution.....	49
2. Neither Dixon nor Hecht renders obvious a non-ionic surfactant.....	50
D. Using exactly four secondary doses was not obvious from the 2009 Press Release, Shams, and Elman 2010	53
1. The 2009 Press Release does not teach or suggest the dosing regimen of claim 25.....	54
2. The 2009 Press Release in combination with Shams does not teach or suggest the dosing regimen of claim 25.....	56
a. Shams does not teach or suggest more loading doses.....	56

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
b. Shams and the 2009 Press Release do not narrow down the numerous ways to modify the DA VINCI 2q8 dosing regimen	59
c. A POSA would not arrive at the claimed regimen with “routine optimization” or “routine adjustments”	60
d. A POSA would not have a reasonable expectation of success in using a fixed extended dosing regimen in order to treat effectively while minimizing the number of loading doses	63
3. The 2009 Press Release in combination with Elman 2010 does not teach or suggest the dosing regimen of claim 25	66
a. Elman teaches monthly doses based on individual patient assessments	66
b. Elman does not teach using exactly five loading doses.....	68
c. Elman’s results do not show any benefit of five loading doses	72
d. There is no motivation to combine Elman 2010 with the 2009 Press Release	75
XII. COMMERCIAL SUCCESS.....	85
A. Nexus to Eylea.....	85
B. Commercial success of Eylea.....	91
XIII. EXHIBITS 2109 & 2112-2114.....	91

I, Michael W. Stewart, M.D., make this declaration in connection with the proceeding identified above.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I have been retained by counsel for Patent Owner, Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc., (“Regeneron”) as a technical expert in connection with the proceeding identified above. I submit this declaration in support of Patent Owner’s Response in connection with the *Inter Partes* Review of United States Patent No. 11,253,572 (“the ’572 Patent”).

2. I am being paid at my usual hourly rate for my work on this matter. I have no personal or financial stake or interest in the outcome of the present proceeding.

II. SUMMARY OF OPINIONS

3. It is my opinion that the challenged claims of the ’572 Patent are nonobvious and patentable. The following is a summary of my opinions:

- The results of the recited dosing regimens for angiogenic eye disorders, in general, and for age related macular degeneration, specifically, were not obvious over Dixon, either alone or in view of the 2006 Press Release.

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.