

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG BIOEPIS CO., LTD., CELLTRION INC,
and BIOCON BIOLOGICS INC.
Petitioner,

v.

REGENERON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.
Patent Owner.

U.S. Patent No. 11,253,572

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2023-00884¹

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

¹ IPR2024-00260 and IPR2024-00298 have been joined with IPR2023-00884.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction..... 1

II. Background..... 3

 A. EYLEA® 3

 1. Development of Eylea® for AMD 3

 2. Development of Eylea® for DME..... 8

 3. Eylea®’s Commercial Success 12

 B. ’572 Patent..... 12

III. Priority Date..... 13

IV. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art 14

V. Claim Construction..... 15

 A. The *Results Limitations* Have Patentable Weight (all claims)..... 15

 B. “A method of treating” (all claims)..... 17

 C. “approximately 4 weeks following the immediately preceding dose . . . approximately 8 weeks following the immediately preceding dose” (claims 1, 15 26, 29)..... 18

VI. Petitioner Has Not Proven the Challenged Claims Unpatentable 20

 A. Ground II: The December 2010 PR Is Not Prior Art..... 20

 1. Dr. Yancopoulos Reduced to Practice the Claimed Inventions Before December 20, 2010 21

 2. The December 2010 PR Discloses Dr. Yancopoulos’s Work 27

 B. Ground III: The November 2010 PR Is Not Prior Art 31

 1. Dr. Yancopoulos Reduced to Practice Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-14, and 26-30 Before November 22, 2010..... 31

2.	The November 2010 PR Discloses Dr. Yancopoulos’s Own Work.....	37
C.	Ground IV.....	38
1.	The Claimed Results Were Not Obvious.....	39
2.	Ground IV Is a Disguised Inherency Argument That Fails.....	47
D.	Ground V.....	53
1.	Samsung Has Not Shown Obviousness Over the 2009 PR, Dixon, and 2007 ARVO	54
2.	2010 ARVO Is Not Prior Art.....	55
E.	Ground VI.....	58
1.	Samsung’s Ground VI Arguments Fail for the Same Reasons as for Grounds II and IV	59
2.	Neither Dixon Nor Hecht Shows the Claimed Formulations Were Obvious	59
F.	Ground VII	63
G.	Ground VIII.....	64
1.	Dixon Does Not Disclose the Claimed Results	64
2.	The December 2010 PR Is Not Prior Art.....	64
H.	Ground IX: The 2009 PR, Shams, and Elman 2010 Do Not Disclose Four Secondary Doses.....	64
1.	2009 PR.....	65
2.	Shams	66
3.	Elman	67
4.	The <i>Mylan</i> Order.....	69
I.	Grounds X & XI: The <i>Results Limitations</i> Have Patentable Weight	70
VII.	Eylea®’s Commercial Success Objectively Demonstrates Non-Obviousness.....	70

A. Eylea® has as nexus to the challenged claims.....70

B. Eylea® is a commercial success71

VIII. Conclusion73

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Ariad Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Eli Lilly and Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	13
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Boehringer Ingelheim Corp.</i> , 86 F. Supp. 2d 433 (D.N.J. 2000)	16
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Labs. Inc.</i> , 246 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	16
<i>Barry v. Medtronic, Inc.</i> , 914 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	25
<i>Chemours Co. FC, LLC v. Daikin Indus., Ltd.</i> , 4 F.4th 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	71
<i>Comark Comm 'ns, Inc. v. Harris Corp.</i> , 156 F.3d 1182 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	16
<i>Cont'l Can Co. USA v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	70
<i>Duncan Parking Techs., Inc. v. IPS Grp., Inc.</i> , 914 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	56
<i>E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Unifrax I LLC</i> , 921 F.3d 1060 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	21
<i>Foundation Medicine, Inc. v. Guardant Health, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00636, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 20, 2019).....	49-50
<i>Foundation Medicine, Inc. v. Guardant Health, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00636, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 20, 2019)	50
<i>Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. United States</i> , 2020 WL 582217 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 5, 2020)	51
<i>Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Mustek, Systems, Inc</i> , 340 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	47-48

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.