

NOTE: This disposition is nonprecedential.

**United States Court of Appeals  
for the Federal Circuit**

---

**SANOFI-AVENTIS DEUTSCHLAND GMBH,**  
*Appellant*

v.

**MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,**  
*Appellee*

**ANDREW HIRSHFELD, PERFORMING THE  
FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES OF THE UNDER  
SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND DIRECTOR OF  
THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK  
OFFICE,**  
*Intervenor*

---

2020-1871

---

Appeal from the United States Patent and Trademark  
Office, Patent Trial and Appeal Board in No. IPR2018-  
01670.

-----  
**SANOFI-AVENTIS DEUTSCHLAND GMBH,**  
*Appellant*

v.

2

SANOFI-AVENTIS DEUTSCHLAND v.  
MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.

**MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,**  
*Appellee*

**ANDREW HIRSHFELD, PERFORMING THE  
FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES OF THE UNDER  
SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND DIRECTOR OF  
THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK  
OFFICE,**  
*Intervenor*

---

2020-2029, 2020-2032, 2020-2033, 2020-2034

---

Appeals from the United States Patent and Trademark  
Office, Patent Trial and Appeal Board in Nos. IPR2018-  
01675, IPR2018-01676, IPR2018-01678, IPR2019-00122.

-----  
**SANOFI-AVENTIS DEUTSCHLAND GMBH,**  
*Appellant*

v.

**ANDREW HIRSHFELD, PERFORMING THE  
FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES OF THE UNDER  
SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND DIRECTOR OF  
THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK  
OFFICE,**  
*Intervenor*

---

2020-2159

---

SANOFI-AVENTIS DEUTSCHLAND v.  
MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.

3

Appeal from the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Patent Trial and Appeal Board in No. IPR2019-00979.

---

Decided: December 29, 2021

---

WILLIAM SUTTON ANSLEY, Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP, Washington, DC, argued for appellant. Also represented by ADAM BANKS, ANISH R. DESAI, SARAH M. STERNLIEB, ELIZABETH WEISWASSER, New York, NY; LAUREN ANN DEGNAN, Fish & Richardson P.C., Washington, DC; SCOTT MICHAEL FLANZ, JOHN STEPHEN GOETZ, New York, NY.

DOUGLAS H. CARSTEN, McDermott Will & Emery, Irvine, CA, argued for appellee. Also represented by ADAM WILLIAM BURROWBRIDGE, Washington, DC; WESLEY EUGENE DERRYBERRY, STEFFEN NATHANAEL JOHNSON, TASHA THOMAS, RICHARD TORCZON, Wilson, Sonsini, Goodrich & Rosati, PC, Washington, DC; ELHAM FIROUZI STEINER, San Diego, CA.

KAKOLI CAPRIHAN, Office of the Solicitor, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Alexandria, VA, for intervenor. Also represented by DANIEL KAZHDAN, THOMAS W. KRAUSE, BRIAN RACILLA, FARHEENA YASMEEN RASHEED.

---

Before DYK, CLEVINGER, and TARANTO, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM.

These consolidated appeals are from the final written decisions in six inter partes reviews by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board—IPR2018-01670, IPR2018-01675, IPR2018-01676, IPR2018-01678, IPR2019-00122, and IPR2019-00979. The reviews involved claims of three patents owned

by Sanofi-Aventis Deutschland GmbH—claims 1–3 of U.S. Patent No. 8,679,069, claims 11, 14, 15, 18, and 19 of U.S. Patent No. 8,603,044, and claims 1–6, 12–18, 20, 23, 26–30, 32, 33, 36, and 38–40 of U.S. Patent No. 8,992,486. The Board held all challenged claims unpatentable for obviousness. Sanofi appeals. We affirm.

The three patents, which share a specification, address a pen-type injection device that allows a user to set and administer a dose of medication. *See, e.g.*, '069 patent, col. 1, lines 13–17. The challenged independent claims of the three patents (claim 1 of the '069 patent, claim 1 of the '486 patent, and claim 11 of the '044 patent) are relevantly similar, detailing components of a “housing part for a medication dispensing apparatus.” '069 patent, col. 6, lines 36–60 (claim 1). The Board determined that all challenged claims are unpatentable on two independent grounds—obviousness over Burroughs and obviousness over Steinfeldt-Jensen. We limit our discussion to the latter ground, addressed in IPR2018-01670, IPR2018-01676, IPR2018-01678, and IPR2019-00979.

Steenfeldt-Jensen (U.S. Patent No. 6,235,004) describes an injection syringe used to dispense medicine and depicts five embodiments. Steinfeldt-Jensen, col. 1, lines 11–15; *id.*, figs. 1–17. The Board determined that a relevant artisan would have modified Steinfeldt-Jensen’s fifth embodiment with a teaching from its first embodiment to meet the threaded-sleeve limitation of the asserted independent claims, such as claim 1 of the '069 patent. *Mylan Pharms. Inc. v. Sanofi-Aventis Deutschland GmbH*, IPR2018-01670, at 61–68 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 2, 2020) (*1670 Final Written Decision*).<sup>1</sup> The Board also determined that a relevant artisan would have modified Steinfeldt-Jensen’s

---

<sup>1</sup> The Board’s *1670 Final Written Decision* is representative of the Board’s discussion of the same limitation in the other IPRs discussing Steinfeldt-Jensen.

SANOFI-AVENTIS DEUTSCHLAND v.  
MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.

5

fifth embodiment with a component from its third embodiment to meet the radial-stop limitation of claims 30 and 32 of the '486 patent. *Mylan Pharms. Inc. v. Sanofi-Aventis Deutschland GmbH*, IPR2018-01678, at 67–69 (P.T.A.B. May 29, 2020) (*1678 Final Written Decision*). Sanofi challenges the Board's findings.

The Board had substantial evidence to support its determination that, based on the express teaching of a nut member on the first embodiment of Steinfeldt-Jensen (at col. 7, lines 41–47), a relevant artisan would have modified the fifth embodiment with an internally threaded driver tube to engage the piston rod. In light of the expert testimony, the Board reasonably found that the first and fifth embodiments have substantially similar components and arrangements of components, that the driver tubes and piston rods of the two embodiments perform the same functions, that the modified parts would be expected to operate in substantially the same manner, that the nut member of the first embodiment teaches an internally threaded driver tube, and that a relevant artisan would have understood Steinfeldt-Jensen as actually suggesting consideration of using the internally threaded driver tube taught by the first embodiment in other, similar-structure embodiments, such as the fifth. And the Board reasonably found that any increase in friction from the modification would not have deterred a relevant artisan from pursuing the suggestion.

The Board also reasonably found that a relevant artisan had a motivation to modify Steinfeldt-Jensen to meet the radial-stop limitation of claims 30 and 32 of the '486 patent. *1678 Final Written Decision* at 67–69. The Board determined that a relevant artisan would have modified the fifth embodiment, which had outer hooks and longitudinal slots acting as a radial stop, by replacing it with protruding teeth from the third embodiment. The Board found that these two elements were interchangeable, crediting Mylan's testimony that using either component as a radial stop would have been a routine and predictable

# 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.