

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

REGENERON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.
and BIOCON BIOLOGICS INC.,

Defendants.

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

**DEFENDANTS' REPLY POST TRIAL BRIEF – ISSUES
WHERE DEFENDANTS BEAR THE BURDEN OF PROOF**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. THE DOSING PATENTS..... 1

 A. Claim 6 – the isotonic solution is anticipated by Dixon (DTX 204). 1

 B. Claim 6 – using an isotonic solution would have been obvious. 2

 C. The DME/DR claims are anticipated..... 3

 D. The DME/DR claims would have been obvious..... 5

 E. Regeneron continues to blur lines on secondary considerations. 5

 F. The claims are invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 112. 6

II. THE ‘865 FORMULATION PATENT..... 8

 A. Dix ‘226 anticipates and renders the claims obvious..... 8

 B. The combinations: Fraser + Lucentis or Fraser + Liu. 9

 C. Other secondary considerations. 10

 D. The claims fail to comply with § 112. 10

III. CONCLUSION..... 10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Abbott Lab’ys v. Baxter Pharm. Prods., Inc.,
471 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2006) 1

Allergan, Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.,
796 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2015) 7

Amazon.com, Inc. v. Barnesandnoble.com, Inc.,
239 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2001) 5

Andrew Corp. v. Gabriel Elecs., Inc.,
847 F.2d 819 (Fed. Cir. 1988) 7

Bayer Healthcare Pharms., Inc. v. Watson Pharms., Inc.,
713 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 6

Crown Ops. Int’l, Ltd. v. Solutia Inc.,
289 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2002) 6

Estee Lauder Inc. v. L’Oreal, S.A.,
129 F.3d 588 (Fed. Cir. 1997) 8

Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kan. City,
383 U.S. 1 (1966)..... 2

Hoffmann-La Roche Inc. v. Apotex Inc.,
748 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014) 2

Immersion Corp. v. Motorola Mobility LLC,
2018 WL 5294508 (D. Del. Oct. 25, 2018) 8

In re Copaxone Consol. Cases,
906 F.3d 1013 (Fed. Cir. 2018) 2

In re Kubin,
2007 WL 2070495 (P.T.A.B. May 31, 2007)..... 5

In re Kubin,
561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009) 5

In re Petering,
301 F.2d 676 (C.C.P.A. 1962) 9

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007)..... 2, 3

Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.,
545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008) 4

Oka v. Youssefyeh,
849 F.2d 581 (Fed. Cir. 1988) 8

PAR Pharm., Inc. v. TWI Pharms., Inc.,
773 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2014) 3

Parker Compound Bows, Inc. v. Hunter’s Mfg. Co., Inc.,
2016 WL 617464 (W.D. Va. Feb. 12, 2016) 8

Rasmusson v. SmithKline Beecham Corp.,
413 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2005) 7

UCB, Inc. v. Actavis Lab’ys UT, Inc.,
65 F.4th 679 (Fed. Cir. 2023) 5

Warner Chilcott Co., LLC v. Teva Pharms. U.S.A, Inc.,
642 Fed. App’x 996 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 2

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102(a) 8

35 U.S.C. § 103(c) 8

35 U.S.C. § 112..... 1, 10

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
'572 patent	U.S. Patent No. 11,253,572 B2 (PTX 3)
'601 patent	U.S. Patent No. 10,888,601 B2 (PTX 1)
'747 patent	U.S. Patent No. 7,303,474 B2 (DTX 2730)
'865 patent	U.S. Patent No. 11,084,865 B2 (PTX 2)
'959 patent	U.S. Patent No. 7,070,959 B1 (DTX 7)
7-20-23 PTAB	<i>Celltrion, Inc. v. Regeneron Pharms., Inc.</i> , IPR2023-00462, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. July 20, 2023)
AMD	Age-related macular degeneration
Asserted Patents	The '601 patent (PTX 1), '865 patent (PTX 2), and '572 patent (PTX 3)
Asserted Claims	Claims 11 and 19 of the '601 patent, claims 6 and 25 of the '572 patent, and claims 4, 7, 9, 11, and 14-17 of the '865 patent
BCVA	Best corrected visual acuity
DA VINCI	Phase II Regeneron clinical trial for the use of aflibercept to treat DME
Defendants' FOF, Defendants' Proposed Findings	Defendants' Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law (Dkt. 587)
Defendants	Biocon Biologics Inc. and Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc.
Dix '226	U.S. Patent No. 10,406,226 B2 (DTX 13)
Dixon	James A. Dixon et al., <i>VEGF Trap-Eye for the Treatment of Neovascular Age-Related Macular Degeneration</i> , 18 EXPERT OPINION INVESTIGATIONAL DRUGS 1573 (2009) (DTX 204)
DME	Diabetic macular edema
Dosing Patents	The '572 patent and the '601 patent
DR	Diabetic retinopathy
FDA	United States Food and Drug Administration

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.