

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BIOCON BIOLOGICS INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

REGENERON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Inter Partes Review No.: IPR2024-00298

U.S. Patent No. 11,253,572
Filed: June 21, 2021
Issued: February 22, 2022
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. 11,253,572**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	vi
EXHIBIT LIST	ix
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8).....	7
A. Real Parties-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)).....	7
B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	8
C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)-(4)).....	12
D. Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4))	13
E. Payment of Fees (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.103 and 42.15(a)).....	13
III. GROUNDS FOR STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a); 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.101(a)-(c)).....	13
IV. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE AND RELIEF REQUESTED	14
A. Identification of Challenge (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)).....	14
B. Grounds of Challenge (37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)(2)).....	14
V. THE '572 PATENT	16
A. Overview	16
B. Priority Date	16
C. The Challenged Claims	17
D. Prosecution History	19
E. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	19
VI. CONSTRUCTION OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS	20
A. “A method for treating...”	20
B. Exclusion Criteria.....	21

VII.	SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART	22
A.	The 2009 Press Release.....	23
B.	The November 2010 Press Release.....	24
C.	The December 2010 Press Release	24
D.	Dixon.....	25
E.	Hecht	26
F.	Shams	26
G.	Elman 2010	27
H.	CATT and PIER Studies	28
I.	Prior Art Regarding Aflibercept Efficacy	29
VIII.	DETAILED GROUNDS FOR INVALIDITY.....	31
A.	Ground I: Claims 15 and 24 Are Anticipated by Each of the 2009 Press Release and December 2010 Press Release.....	31
B.	Ground II: Claims 1-5, 8-11, 16-17, and 20-21 (Generic/DME Results Claims) Are Anticipated by the December 2010 Press Release	34
1.	Claims 1 and 16	35
2.	Claim 2.....	36
3.	Claims 3, 8, 10, 17, and 21 and Claims 4, 9, and 20	36
4.	Claims 5 and 11	37
C.	Ground III: Claims 26-30 (AMD Results Claims) Are Anticipated by the November 2010 Press Release	38
1.	Claims 26-28.....	38
2.	Claims 29-30.....	40
D.	Ground IV: Claims 1-5, 8-11, and 26-30 (Generic/AMD Results Claims) Are Rendered Obvious by Dixon Alone or In View of the	

2006 Press Release.....	42
1. Claim 1.....	43
2. Claim 2.....	44
3. Claims 3-4 and 8-10.....	45
4. Claims 5 and 11.....	46
5. Claims 26-28.....	46
6. Claims 29-30.....	48
E. Ground V: Claims 16-17, and 20-21 Are Rendered Obvious by the 2009 Press Release Alone or in View of the 2007 ARVO Abstract, Dixon and/or the 2010 ARVO Abstract (collectively “Ground V References”).....	49
F. Ground VI: Claims 6-7 and 12-13 Are Rendered Obvious by Each of Dixon in View of Hecht, Dixon in View of the 2006 Press Release and Hecht, and the December 2010 Press Release in View of Hecht	52
G. Ground VII: Claims 18-19 and 22-23 Are Rendered Obvious by Each of the December 2010 Press Release in View of Hecht, and the 2009 Press Release in View of the Ground V References and Hecht	54
H. Ground VIII: Claim 14 Is Rendered Obvious by Each of Dixon and the December 2010 Press Release Alone or In View of the CATT Study and/or PIER Study	54
I. Ground IX: Claim 25 is Rendered Obvious by the 2009 Press Release Alone or in View of Shams or Elman 2010.....	55
J. Grounds X and XI.....	59
1. The “Results Limitations” in the Results Claims Are Not Entitled to Patentable Weight.....	59
2. Ground X: Claims 1-5, 8-11, and 26-30 are Anticipated by Dixon Because the “Results Limitations” Lack Patentable Weight.....	63
3. Ground XI: Claims 1-5, 8-11, 16-17, and 20-21 are Anticipated by the 2009 Press Release Because the “Results	

Limitations” Lack Patentable Weight.....	64
K. There Are No Secondary Considerations.....	64
IX. DISCRETIONARY DENIAL IS UNWARRANTED.....	65
A. The <i>Advanced Bionics</i> and <i>Becton Dickinson</i> Factors Do Not Favor Denial Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	65
B. The <i>General Plastic</i> Factors Do Not Support Denial Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).....	67
C. The <i>Fintiv</i> Factors Do Not Support Denial Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).....	68
X. CONCLUSION	70

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.