

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

SAMSUNG BIOEPIS CO., LTD. and BIOCON BIOLOGICS INC.,  
Petitioners,

v.

REGENERON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

U.S. Patent No. 10,888,601

---

*Inter Parts* Review No. IPR2023-00739<sup>1</sup>

---

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

---

<sup>1</sup> IPR2024-00201 has been joined with IPR2023-00739.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. BACKGROUND ..... 4

    A. Diabetic retinopathy and diabetic macular edema ..... 4

    B. Prior art therapies for angiogenic eye disorders..... 5

    C. Eylea® ..... 7

    D. The Challenged Claims of the '601 Patent ..... 10

III. PRIOR ART..... 12

    A. 2009 Press Release (Ex.1009)..... 12

    B. Shams (Ex.1010) ..... 12

    C. Elman 2010 (Ex.1006) ..... 13

IV. PRIORITY DATE ..... 14

V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ..... 16

    A. “[E]very 4 weeks for the first 5 injections followed by ... every 8 weeks” ..... 16

    B. “[M]ethod for treating”/“effective amount” ..... 21

        1. The challenged claims require effective treatment ..... 21

        2. The claims require intent to treat a specific angiogenic eye disorder ..... 22

VI. THE CLAIMED FIVE LOADING-DOSE REGIMEN IS NON-OBVIOUS..... 23

    A. Petitioner has not demonstrated obviousness over the 2009 Press Release alone or in view of Shams (all claims; Grounds 2 and 6)..... 24

        1. The 2009 Press Release and Shams do not teach toward the claimed five loading-dose regimen..... 24

- 2. Petitioner does not show that the POSA would arrive at the claimed regimen with “routine optimization” and “routine adjustments” .....31
- B. The recited dosing regimen is not obvious over the 2009 Press Release in view of Elman 2010 (all claims; Grounds 3 and 6).....39
  - 1. Elman 2010 does not teach toward five loading doses .....40
  - 2. There is no motivation to combine Elman 2010 with the 2009 Press Release.....44
- VII. THE PRIOR ART DOES NOT DISCLOSE THE REQUIRED EFFICACY (ALL CLAIMS AND GROUNDS) .....51
- VIII. PETITIONER FAILS TO SHOW INTENT TO TREAT DIABETIC RETINOPATHY (CLAIMS 18-19, 21, 25-28, 33; ALL GROUNDS) .....54
  - A. The record evidence distinguishes between DR and DME.....54
  - B. The 2009 Press Release does not disclose intent to treat DR .....56
  - C. Petitioner’s assertion that intent to treat DR is shown by intent to treat DME is unsupported and inconsistent with product labeling .....58
- IX. EYLEA’S COMMERCIAL SUCCESS IS AN OBJECTIVE INDICATOR OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS .....60
  - A. Eylea® Has a Nexus to the Challenged Claims.....60
  - B. Eylea® Is a Commercial Success.....61
- X. CONCLUSION.....62

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	38, 39
<i>Chemours Co. FC, LLC v. Daikin Indus., Ltd.</i> , 4 F.4th 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2021) .....	61
<i>Cont'l Can Co. USA v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991) .....	60
<i>Eli Lilly &amp; Co. v. Teva Pharms. Int'l GmbH</i> , IPR2018-01710, 2020 WL 1540364 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 31, 2020), <i>aff'd</i> 8 F.4th 1331 .....	23
<i>In re Fowler</i> , APPEAL 2018-003968, 2020 WL 289565 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 15, 2020) .....	25
<i>Genetics Inst., LLC v. Novartis Vaccines &amp; Diagnostics, Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	32, 33
<i>Merck &amp; Co., Inc. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	22
<i>Nidec Motor Corp. v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co.</i> , 868 F.3d 1013 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	16
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Lab'ys, Inc.</i> , 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	51
<i>Pacing Techs., LLC v. Garmin Int'l, Inc.</i> , 778 F.3d 1021 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	20
<i>Red Diamond, Inc. v. S. Visions, LLP</i> , No. PGR2019-00045, 2020 WL 2046054 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 28, 2020).....	33
<i>Roxane Lab'ys, Inc. v. Vanda Pharms. Inc.</i> , No. IPR2016-00690, 2016 WL 5226531 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 30, 2016).....	30, 50

*Sanofi-Aventis U.S. LLC v. Sandoz, Inc.*,  
No. 20-804-RGA, 2023 WL 4175334 (D. Del. Jun. 26, 2023) .....52

*In re Sebek*,  
465 F.2d 904 (CCPA 1972) .....33

*In re Stepan Co.*,  
868 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....34

*Unigene Lab’ys, Inc. v. Aptoex, Inc.*,  
655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....51

*Volvo Penta of the Ams., LLC v. Brunswick Corp.*,  
81 F.4th 1202 (Fed. Cir. 2023) .....60

**Other Authorities**

21 CFR § 201.57(c)(2) (2010) .....58

# 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.