

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

SAMSUNG BIOEPIS CO., LTD.,  
Petitioner,

v.

REGENERON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2023-00739

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

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW  
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 10,888,601**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. MANDATORY NOTICES PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(A)(1).....	6
A. Real Party-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)) .....	6
B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	6
C. Lead and Backup Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)-(4) .....	8
D. Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4)) .....	9
E. Payment of Fees (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.103 and 42.15(a)).....	9
III. GROUNDS FOR STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(A); 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.101(A)-(C)).....	9
IV. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE AND RELIEF REQUESTED .....	9
A. Identification of Challenge (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)).....	9
B. Grounds of Challenge (37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)(2)).....	10
V. THE '601 PATENT.....	11
A. Overview .....	11
B. The Challenged Claims .....	12
C. Prosecution History .....	13
D. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	14
VI. PRIORITY DATE .....	15
A. Claims 10-33 Are Not Entitled to a Priority Date Earlier Than July 12, 2013 .....	15
VII. CONSTRUCTION OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS .....	16
A. “A method for treating...”.....	16
B. “Wherein the patient [loses less than/gains at least] 15 letters of Best Corrected Visual Acuity (BCVA) score” (Claims 13, 15, 22, 23, 29, and 31) / “The method of [claims 15/23/32] wherein Best Corrected Visual Acuity (BCVA) is according to Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Study (ETDRS) letter score” (Claims 14, 16, 20, 24, 30, and 32).....	17
C. Exclusion Criteria (Claims 17, 25, and 33).....	21

VIII. OVERVIEW OF THE PRIMARY PRIOR ART REFERENCES.....	22
A. The 2009 Press Release.....	22
B. Shams .....	23
C. Elman 2010.....	24
D. Do 2011 .....	26
E. 2016 Eylea Label.....	27
F. CATT and PIER Studies .....	28
G. Prior Art Knowledge Regarding the Relationship Between DR/DME .....	30
IX. DETAILED GROUNDS FOR INVALIDITY .....	31
A. Ground I: Claims 46-47 are Anticipated and/or Rendered Obvious by the 2009 Press Release .....	31
B. Ground II: Claims 10-12, 18-19, 21, 26-28 Are Rendered Obvious by the 2009 Press Release Either Alone or in View of Shams .....	34
1. Claims 11/19/27: “The method of [claims 10/18/26] wherein approximately every 4 weeks comprises approximately every 28 days or approximately monthly.” .....	40
2. Claims 12/21/28: “The method of [claims 10/18/26] further comprising, after 20 weeks, administering, via intravitreal injection, 2 mg of aflibercept once every 4 weeks.” .....	40
C. Ground III: Claims 10-12, 18-19, 21, 26-28 Are Rendered Obvious by the 2009 Press Release in Combination with Elman 2010 .....	41
1. A POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Combine the 2009 Press Release with Elman 2010’s Dosing Regimen .....	42
2. A POSA Would Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Combining the 2009 Press Release with Elman 2010’s Dosing Regimen.....	44
D. Ground IV: Claims 13-16, 20, 22-24, and 29-32 Are Rendered Obvious by the 2009 Press Release Alone, or in Combination with Elman 2010, and/or Further in View of Do 2011 .....	46

1.	Alternatively, the Requirements of Claims 13-16, 20, 22-24, and 29-32 Are Inherent in Practicing the Method .....	49
E.	Ground V: Claims 13-16, 20, 22-24, and 29-32 Are Anticipated by the 2016 Eylea Label.....	50
1.	If the Recited Results Are Given Patentable Weight, Claims 13-16, 20, 22-24, and 29-32 Are Not Entitled to a Priority Date Earlier Than April 29, 2019 .....	51
2.	The 2016 Eylea Label Anticipates Claims 13-16, 20, 22-24, and 29-32 If They Are Not Entitled to a Priority Date Earlier Than 2019.....	53
F.	Ground VI: Claims 17, 25, and 33 Are Rendered Obvious by the 2009 Press Release Alone or in View of Elman 2010 and Further in View of the CATT and PIER Studies .....	54
G.	There Are No Secondary Considerations.....	55
X.	DISCRETIONARY DENIAL IS UNWARRANTED .....	56
A.	The <i>Becton Dickinson</i> Factors Do Not Favor Denial Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	56
1.	<i>Becton Dickinson</i> Factors (a), (b), and (d).....	57
2.	<i>Becton Dickinson</i> Factors (c), (e), and (f).....	58
B.	The <i>General Plastic</i> Factors Do Not Support Denial Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).....	59
1.	<i>General Plastic</i> Factors 2-5 .....	61
2.	<i>General Plastic</i> Factors 6-7 .....	62
3.	Additional Factors.....	62
C.	The <i>Fintiv</i> Factors Do Not Support Denial Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).....	63
1.	<i>Fintiv</i> Factors 1 and 2 .....	65
2.	<i>Fintiv</i> Factor 3 .....	65
3.	<i>Fintiv</i> Factor 4 .....	66
4.	<i>Fintiv</i> Factor 5 .....	66
5.	<i>Fintiv</i> Factor 6 .....	67
XI.	CONCLUSION.....	67

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Page

### Cases

<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH,</i> IPR2019-01469, <i>Paper 6</i> (PTAB Feb. 13, 2020) .....	56
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Alexion Pharms., Inc.,</i> IPR2019-00739, <i>Paper 15</i> (Aug. 30, 2019).....	58
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.,</i> IPR2022-00976, <i>Paper 9. 11</i> (PTAB Nov. 15, 2022) .....	67
<i>Becton, Dickinson &amp; Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG,</i> IPR2017-01586, <i>Paper 8</i> (Dec. 15, 2017).....	56, 57
<i>Biogen Int’l GMBH v. Mylan Pharms. Inc.,</i> 18 F.4th 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2021) .....	52
<i>Biomarin Pharm. Inc. v. Genzyme Therapeutic Prods. Ltd. P’ship,</i> IPR2013-00534, <i>Paper 81</i> .....	36
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Boehringer Ingelheim Corp.,</i> 86 F. Supp. 2d 433 (D.N.J.) .....	18
<i>General Plastic,</i> IPR2016-01357, <i>Paper 19</i> (PTAB Sept. 6, 2017).....	59
<i>Indivior UK Ltd. v. Dr. Reddy’s Lab’ys S.A.,</i> 18 F.4th 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2021) .....	50
<i>In re Kao,</i> 639 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	55, 56
<i>In re Kubin,</i> 561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	20
<i>In re O’Farrell,</i> 853 F.2d 894 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	39
<i>In re Peterson,</i> 315 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	39
<i>Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Space Systems/Loral, Inc.,</i> 324 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	20

# 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.