

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
CLARKSBURG DIVISION**

REGENERON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:22-cv-00061-TSK

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

REGENERON'S OPENING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

Table of Contents

Table of Authorities ii

I. Legal Principles 1

II. The Formulation Patent..... 4

 A. “Organic Co-Solvent” 5

 B. “Present in Native Conformation . . . as Measured by Size Exclusion Chromatography” 8

III. The Treatment Patents 12

 A. “Best Corrected Visual Acuity” 13

 B. Patients Excluded from Treatment..... 17

 C. “Formulated as an Isotonic Solution” 20

IV. The Manufacturing Patents 22

 A. “Anti-oxidants” 22

 B. “Chemically Defined Medium (CDM)” 24

 C. “Cell(s) Cultured in a Chemically Defined Medium (CDM)” 26

V. Conclusion 30

Table of Authorities**CASES**

<i>Acumed LLC v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 483 F.3d 800 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	2
<i>Avid Tech., Inc. v. Harmonic, Inc.</i> , 812 F.3d 1040 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	8
<i>Cadence Pharmaceuticals Inc. v. Exela Pharmsci Inc.</i> , 780 F. 3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	21
<i>Cias, Inc. v. Alliance Gaming Corp.</i> , 504 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	28
<i>CR Bard Inc. v. AngioDynamics, Inc.</i> , 979 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	19
<i>CUPP Comput. AS v. Trend Micro Inc.</i> , -- F.4th --, 2022 WL 16954357 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 16, 2022).....	7
<i>Curtiss-Wright Flow Control Corp. v. Velan, Inc.</i> , 438 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	5
<i>dunnhumby USA, LLC v. emnos USA Corp.</i> , 2015 WL 1542365 (N.D. Ill. Apr. 1, 2015).....	25
<i>Epistar Corp. v. ITC</i> , 566 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	2
<i>Game & Tech. Co., Ltd. v. Activision Blizzard Inc.</i> , 926 F. 3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	28
<i>Gillette Co. v. Energizer Holdings, Inc.</i> , 405 F. 3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	28
<i>Hill-Rom Servs., Inc. v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	23
<i>In re Chatfield</i> , 545 F.2d 152 (CCPA 1976).....	18
<i>In re Distefano</i> , 808 F.3d 845 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	18
<i>Intamin Ltd. v. Magnetar Techs., Corp.</i> , 483 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	23

Intel Corp. v. Qualcomm Inc.,
21 F.4th 801 (Fed. Cir. 2021)23

Interactive Gift Exp., Inc. v. Compuserve, Inc.,
256 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....9

Invitrogen Corp v. Biocrest Mfg., LP,
327 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....28, 29

Laitram Corp. v. NEC Corp.,
62 F.3d 1388 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....5

Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.,
358 F.3d 898 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....3

Littelfuse, Inc. v. Mersen USA EP Corp.,
29 F.4th 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2022)23

Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.,
517 U.S. 370 (1996).....1

Martek Biosciences Corp. v. Nutrinova, Inc.,
579 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....24

Mformation Techs., Inc. v. Rsch. in Motion Ltd.,
764 F.3d 1392 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....2, 19

MPHJ Tech. Investments, LLC v. Richo Ams. Corp.,
847 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....26

Nidec Motor Corp. v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co.,
868 F.3d 1013 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....6

O2 Micro Int’l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.,
521 F. 3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....20, 23

Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Lab’ys, Inc.,
520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....14

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)..... *passim*

Praxair Distribution, Inc. v. Mallinckrodt Hosp. Prods. IP Ltd.,
890 F.3d 1024 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....18, 19, 20

Rapoport v. Dement,
254 F.3d 1053 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....19

Teva Pharm. USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc., 574 U.S. 318 (2015)1, 4

Thorner v. Sony Comput. Ent. Am. LLC,
669 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....3, 24

Toshiba Corp. v. Imation Corp.,
681 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....3, 21

Tr. of Columbia Univ. v. Symantec Corp.,
811 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....7

Trebro Mfg., Inc. v. FireFly Equip., LLC,
748 F.3d 1159 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....24

U.S. Surgical Corp. v. Ethicon, Inc.,
103 F.3d 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....1, 8, 12

Vanda Pharm. Inc. v. West-Ward Pharm. Int’l Ltd.,
887 F.3d 1117 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....19

Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptoronic, Inc.,
90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....25

Vivid Techs., Inc. v. Am. Sci. & Eng’g,
200 F.3d 795 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....1, 6

STATUTES & REGULATIONS

35 U.S.C. § 111.....26

35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 4.....5

35 U.S.C. § 112(d).....5

35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(1).....14

37 C.F.R. § 1.75.....2

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Manual for Patent Examining and Procedure.....28

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.