

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FORMYCON AG,
Petitioner

v.

REGENERON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2025-00233
Patent No. 11,084,865

REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	ARGUMENT	2
A.	<i>Fintiv</i> factor 4: Petitioner’s <i>Sotera</i> stipulation weighs heavily against discretionary denial.	2
B.	<i>Fintiv</i> Factor 2: The lack of a scheduled trial date weighs heavily against discretionary denial.	3
C.	<i>Fintiv</i> Factors 3 & 5: Neither the <i>MDL</i> nor the <i>Mylan</i> matter counsel discretionary denial.	5
D.	<i>Fintiv</i> Factor 1: The circumstances of a stay are neutral.	9
E.	<i>Fintiv</i> Factor 6: Other circumstances strongly favor institution.	9
III.	CONCLUSION.....	10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Am. Honda Motor Co., v. Neo Wireless LLC</i> , IPR2023-00797, Paper 27, 3 (PTAB Mar. 22, 2024)	5
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 15, 12 (PTAB May 13, 2020)	9
<i>Aptiv Servs. US, LLC v. Microchip Tech.</i> , IPR2024-00646, Paper 11, 32 (PTAB Sept. 25, 2024)	4
<i>Duke Mfg. Co. v. Low Temp Indus., Inc.</i> , IPR2021-00415, Paper 13, 13-14 (PTAB July 20, 2021)	6
<i>E-One, Inc. v. Oskhosh Corp.</i> , IPR2019-00162, Paper 16, 8-9 (PTAB June 5, 2019)	7
<i>Genentech, Inc. v. Amgen Inc.</i> , 2020 WL 636439 (D. Del. Feb. 11, 2020)	3
<i>Geneva Pharms., Inc. v. GlaxoSmithKline PLC</i> , 349 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	8
<i>GoPro, Inc. v. 360Heros, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01754, Paper 38, 9 (PTAB Aug. 23, 2019)	2
<i>Hulu, LLC v. Piranha Media Dist., LLC</i> , IPR2024-01252, Paper 27 (Stewart Apr. 17, 2025)	6
<i>IBM Corp. v. Trusted Knight Corp.</i> , IPR2020-00323, Paper 15 (PTAB July 10, 2020)	7
<i>MDL. Motorola Solutions, Inc. v Stellar, LLC</i> , IPR2024-01205, Paper 19, 3-4 (Stewart March 28, 2025)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Smith v. Bayer Corp.</i> , 564 U.S. 299 (2011)	9

<i>Snap, Inc. v. SRK Tech. LLC,</i> IPR2020-00820, Paper 15, 16 (PTAB Oct. 21, 2020).....	9
--	---

Statutes

35 U.S.C. §315(b)	2
35 U.S.C. §316(a)(11).....	10

Other Authorities

Fed. R. Civ. P. 4	2
-------------------------	---

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description
1001	U.S. Patent No. 11,084,865 (“’865 Patent”)
1002	Forrest Declaration (“Forrest”)
1003	Forrest <i>Curriculum Vitae</i>
1004	File History of U.S. Application No. 16/739,559 (“865PH”)
1005	Lefkowitz Declaration (“Lefkowitz”)
1006	Lefkowitz <i>Curriculum Vitae</i>
1007	Zhou Declaration (“Zhou”)
1008	Napoleone Ferrara & Robert S. Kerbel, Angiogenesis as a Therapeutic Target, 438 NATURE 967-74 (Dec. 15, 2005) (“Ferrara 2005”)
1009	Hamish M. Fraser et al., Single Injections of Vascular Endothelial Growth Factor Trap Block Ovulation in the Macaque and Produce a Prolonged, Dose-Related Suppression of Ovarian Function, 90(2) J. CLIN. ENDOCRINOL. & METAB. 1114-1122 (Feb. 2005) (“Fraser”)
1010	Jocelyn Holash et al., VEGF-Trap: A VEGF Blocker with Potent Antitumor Effects, 99 (17) PNAS 11393-11398 (Aug. 20, 2002) (“Holash”)
1011	February 3, 2006 Angiogenesis Presentation (“February 3, 2006 Presentation”)
1012	February 8, 2006 Merrill Lynch Presentation (“February 8, 2006 Presentation”)
1013	March 8, 2006 Lehman Brothers Presentation (“March 8, 2006 Lehman Brothers Presentation”)
1014	Press Release, “VEGF trap oncology program with Sanofi-Aventis planned to expand rapidly, https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/872589/000095012305011496/y13089exv99w1.htm

Exhibit	Description
1015	J.S. Rudge et al., VEGF Trap as a Novel Antiangiogenic Treatment Currently in Clinical Trials for Cancer and Eye Diseases, and VelociGene®-based Discovery of the Next Generation of Angiogenesis Targets, 70 COLD SPRING HARBOR SYMPOSIA ON QUANTITATIVE BIOLOGY 411-418 (2005) (“Rudge”)
1016	Christine Wulff et al., Prevention of Thecal Angiogenesis, Antral Follicular Growth, and Ovulation in the Primate by Treatment with Vascular Endothelial Growth Factor Trap R1R2, 143(7) ENDOCRINOLOGY 2797-2807 (Jul. 2002) (“Wulff”)
1017	Press Release, “Regeneron’s VEGF trap demonstrates positive preliminary results in patients with age-related macular degeneration” https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/872589/000095012306001068/y17152exv99w1.htm
1018	Chang et al., Practical Approaches to Protein Formulation Development, in Rational Design of Stable Protein Formulations 1 (J.F. Carpenter & M.C. Manning eds., 2002). (“Chang 2002”)
1019	U.S. Patent No. 7,374,758 to Papadopoulos et al. (“’758 Patent”)
1020	Nayar R, Manning MC. High throughput formulation: strategies for rapid development of stable protein products. Pharm Biotechnol. 2002;13:177-98. (“Nayar”)
1021	U.S. Patent No. 8,110,546 to Dix et al. (“Dix”)
1022	September 27, 2005 UBS Global Life Sciences Conference Presentation, https://web.archive.org/web/20051226175624/http://regeneron.com/investor/UBS_Sep05_FF.pdf
1023	[Reserved]
1024	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0113316 to Kaisheva et al. (“Kaisheva ’316”)
1025	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0138417 to Kaisheva et al. (“Kaisheva ’417”)
1026	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0197324 to Liu et al. (“Liu”)
1027	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0265309 to Kandel et al. (“’309 Publication”)

Exhibit	Description
1028	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0112061 to Holash et al. (“’061 Publication”)
1029	International Publication No. WO 00/75319 to Papadopoulos et al. (“’319 Publication”)
1030	International Publication No. WO 97/04801 to Andya et al. (“WO ’801”)
1031	Vial, Merriam-Webster.com, https://merriam-webster.com/dictionary/vial (last visited Jan. 16, 2023) (“Merriam Webster Vial Definition”)
1032	AVASTIN®, Approved Labeling, CENTER FOR DRUG EVALUATION AND RESEARCH (2004) (“AVASTIN Label”)
1033	RAPTIVA®, Physicians’ Desk Reference (59th ed. 2005) (“RAPTIVA Label”)
1034	REMICADE®, Physicians’ Desk Reference (59 th ed. 2005) (“REMICADE Label”)
1035	SIMULECT®, Physicians’ Desk Reference (59 th ed. 2005) (“SIMULECT Label”)
1036	HERCEPTIN®, Physicians’ Desk Reference (59 th ed. 2005) (“HERCEPTIN Label”)
1037	XOLAIR® label, Physicians’ Desk Reference (59th ed. 2005) (“XOLAIR Label”)
1038	Food & Drug Administration, Guidance for Industry, Container Closure Systems for Packaging Human Drugs and Biologics (May 1999), https://www.fda.gov/media/70788/download . (“FDA Container Closure Guidance”)
1039	US2006/0058234 (“Daly”)
1040	Zhou <i>Curriculum Vitae</i>
1041	Chirila, T.V., Hong, Y. (1998). The Vitreous Humor. In: Black, J., Hastings, G. (eds) Handbook of Biomaterial Properties. Springer, Boston, MA. (“Chirila”)

Exhibit	Description
1042	Silva Tavares Neto JED, Cyrino FVR, Lucena MM, Scott IU, Messias AMV, Jorge R. Intravitreal bevacizumab plus propranolol for neovascular age-related macular degeneration (the BEVALOL study): a phase I clinical trial. Int J Retina Vitreous. 2023. (“Neto”)
1043	[Reserved]
1044	Eldeeb M, Chan EW, Dedhia CJ, Mansour A, Chhablani J. One-year outcomes of ziv-aflibercept for macular edema in central retinal vein occlusion. Am J Ophthalmol Case Rep. 2017 Oct 6;8:58-61. (“Eldeeb”)
1045	Macugen Label, https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2006/021756s006,s007lbl.pdf (“Macugen Label”)
1046	Vitravene Label, https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/nda/98/20961_Vitravene_prntlbl.pdf (“Vitravene Label”)
1047	[Reserved]
1048	Vernon SA. Intravitreal triamcinolone therapy for diabetic macular oedema. Br J Ophthalmol. 2005 Aug;89(8):931-3. (“Vernon”)
1049	Jaffe, G.J., Ashton, P., & Pearson, P.A. (Eds.). (2006). Intraocular Drug Delivery (1st ed.). (“Jaffe”)
1050	Rosenfeld PJ, Heier JS, Hantsbarger G, Shams N. Tolerability and efficacy of multiple escalating doses of ranibizumab (Lucentis) for neovascular age-related macular degeneration. Ophthalmology. 2006 Apr;113(4):623.e1. (“Rosenfeld 2006”)
1051	Rosenfeld PJ, Heier JS, Chung CY, McCluskey ER. RhuFab V2 Dose-Escalation Trial: Safety and Tolerability of 3 Escalating Dosing Regimens in Subjects with Age-Related Macular Degeneration (AMD). ASRS Annual Meeting, August 16-20, 2003. (“Rosenfeld 2003”)
1052	Costa RA, Jorge R, Calucci D, Cardillo JA, Melo LA Jr, Scott IU. Intravitreal bevacizumab for choroidal neovascularization caused by AMD (IBeNA Study): results of a phase 1 dose-escalation study. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2006 Oct;47(10):4569-78. (“Costa”)

Exhibit	Description
1053	C.A. Cordeiro, R.A. Costa, R. Jorge, D. Calucci, J. Cardillo, I.U. Scott; Intravitreal Bevacizumab for Macular Edema Associated with Hemiretinal and Central Retinal Vein Occlusion . <i>Invest. Ophthalmol. Vis. Sci.</i> 2006;47(13):4257. (“Cordeiro”)
1054	Rosenfeld, Philip J., Andrew A. Moshfeghi, and Carmen A. Puliafito. "Optical coherence tomography findings after an intravitreal injection of bevacizumab (Avastin®) for neovascular age-related macular degeneration." <i>Ophthalmic Surgery, Lasers and Imaging Retina</i> 36.4 (2005): 331-335. (“Rosenfeld 2005”)
1055	Bonini-Filho MA, Jorge R, Barbosa JC, Calucci D, Cardillo JA, Costa RA. Intravitreal injection versus sub-Tenon's infusion of triamcinolone acetate for refractory diabetic macular edema: a randomized clinical trial. <i>Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.</i> 2005 Oct;46(10):3845-9. (“Bonni-Filho”)
1056	Gillies MC, Simpson JM, Luo W, Penfold P, Hunyor AB, Chua W, Mitchell P, Billson F. A randomized clinical trial of a single dose of intravitreal triamcinolone acetate for neovascular age-related macular degeneration: one-year results. <i>Arch Ophthalmol.</i> 2003 May;121(5):667-73. (“Gillies”)
1057	Eyetechnology Study Group. Anti-vascular endothelial growth factor therapy for subfoveal choroidal neovascularization secondary to age-related macular degeneration: phase II study results. <i>Ophthalmology.</i> 2003 May;110(5):979-86. (“Eyetechnology Study”)
1058	Hida T, Chandler D, Arena JE, Machemer R. Experimental and clinical observations of the intraocular toxicity of commercial corticosteroid preparations. <i>Am J Ophthalmol.</i> 1986 Feb 15;101(2):190-5. (“Hida”)
1059	Jonas JB, Kreissig I, Degenring R. Intraocular pressure after intravitreal injection of triamcinolone acetate. <i>Br J Ophthalmol.</i> 2003 Jan;87(1):24-7. (“Jonas 2003”)
1060	Danis RP, Ciulla TA, Pratt LM, Anliker W. Intravitreal triamcinolone acetate in exudative age-related macular degeneration. <i>Retina.</i> 2000. (“Danis”)
1061	Young S, Larkin G, Branley M, Lightman S. Safety and efficacy of intravitreal triamcinolone for cystoid macular oedema in uveitis. <i>Clin Exp Ophthalmol.</i> 2001 Feb;29(1):2-6. (“Young”)

Exhibit	Description
1062	Kenalog Label, https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2006/014901s034lbl.pdf (“Kenalog Label”)
1063	Jonas JB, Kreissig I, Degenring R. Intravitreal triamcinolone acetonide for treatment of intraocular proliferative, exudative, and neovascular diseases. Prog Retin Eye Res. 2005 Sep;24(5):587-611. (“Jonas 2005”)
1064	Gallemore RP, and Boyer DS. Intravitreal Kenalog Injections, https://www.aao.org/eyenet/article/intravitreal-kenalog-injections (“Gallemore”)
1065	Kuppermann BD, Thomas EL, de Smet MD, Grillone LR; Vitrase for Vitreous Hemorrhage Study Groups. Safety results of two phase III trials of an intravitreal injection of highly purified ovine hyaluronidase (Vitrax) for the management of vitreous hemorrhage. Am J Ophthalmol. 2005 Oct;140(4):585-97. (“Kupperman I”)
1066	Kuppermann BD, Thomas EL, de Smet MD, Grillone LR; Vitrase for Vitreous Hemorrhage Study Groups. Pooled efficacy results from two multinational randomized controlled clinical trials of a single intravitreal injection of highly purified ovine hyaluronidase (Vitrax) for the management of vitreous hemorrhage. Am J Ophthalmol. 2005 Oct;140(4):573-84. (“Kuppermann II”)
1067	Vitrax Label, https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2004/21640s002,003lbl.pdf (“Vitrax Label”)
1068	Gaudreault J, Fei D, Rusit J, Suboc P, Shiu V. Preclinical pharmacokinetics of Ranibizumab (rhuFabV2) after a single intravitreal administration. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2005 Feb;46(2):726-33. (“Gaudreault”)
1069	Lucentis Label, https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2006/125156lbl.pdf (“Lucentis Label”)
1070	Macugen Drug Approval Letter, https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/nda/2004/21-756_Macugen_approv.pdf (“Macugen Approval Letter”)

Exhibit	Description
1071	CATT Research Group; Martin DF, Maguire MG, Ying GS, Grunwald JE, Fine SL, Jaffe GJ. Ranibizumab and bevacizumab for neovascular age-related macular degeneration. N Engl J Med. 2011 May 19;364(20):1897-908. (“CATT Study”)
1072	Oliveira LB, Tatebayashi M, Mahmoud TH, Blackmon SM, Wong F, McCuen BW 2nd. Dispace facilitates posterior vitreous detachment during vitrectomy in young pigs. Retina. 2001;21(4):324-31. (“Oliveira”)
1073	Wang F, Wang Z, Sun X, Wang F, Xu X, Zhang X. Safety and efficacy of dispace and plasmin in pharmacologic vitreolysis. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2004 Sep;45(9):3286-90. doi: 10.1167/iops.04-0026. (“Wang”)
1074	Tezel TH, Del Priore LV, Kaplan HJ. Posterior vitreous detachment with dispace. Retina. 1998;18(1):7-15. (“Tezel”)
1075	Tsui I, Pan CK, Rahimy E, Schwartz SD. Ocriplasmin for vitreoretinal diseases. J Biomed Biotechnol. 2012;2012:354979. (“Tsui”)
1076	Sakuma T, Tanaka M, Mizota A, Inoue J, Pakola S. Safety of in vivo pharmacologic vitreolysis with recombinant microplasmin in rabbit eyes. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2005 Sep;46(9):3295-9. (“Sakuma”)
1077	Gandorfer A, Rohleder M, Sethi C, Eckle D, Welge-Lüssen U, Kampik A, Luthert P, Charteris D. Posterior vitreous detachment induced by microplasmin. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2004 Feb;45(2):641-7. (“Gandorfer”)
1078	Malik D, Tarek M, Caceres del Carpio J, Ramirez C, Boyer D, Kenney MC, Kuppermann BD. Safety profiles of anti-VEGF drugs: bevacizumab, ranibizumab, aflibercept and ziv-aflibercept on human retinal pigment epithelium cells in culture. Br J Ophthalmol. 2014 Jun;98 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):i11-16. (“Malik”)
1079	Application for Extension of Patent Term to U.S. Patent No. 7,374,758. (“The ’758 PTE”)
1080	US2004/0014667 (“’667 Publication”)
1081	US20050175610 (“Wiegand”)
1082	Drickamer K, Taylor ME. Evolving views of protein glycosylation. Trends Biochem Sci. 1998 Sep;23(9):321-4. (“Drickamer”)

Exhibit	Description
1083	Kimura R, Miller WM. Glycosylation of CHO-derived recombinant tPA produced under elevated pCO ₂ . Biotechnol Prog. 1997 May-Jun;13(3):311-7. (“Kimura”)
1084	Baker KN, Rendall MH, Hills AE, Hoare M, Freedman RB, James DC. Metabolic control of recombinant protein N-glycan processing in NS0 and CHO cells. Biotechnol Bioeng. 2001 May 5;73(3):188-202. (“Baker”)
1085	Kobata A. A journey to the world of glycobiology. Glycoconj J. 2000 Jul-Sep;17(7-9):443-64. (“Kobata”)
1086	Dwek RA. Glycobiology: “towards understanding the function of sugars”. Biochem Soc Trans. 1995 Feb;23(1):1-25. (“Dwek”)
1087	L. Liu, Antibody Glycosylation and Its Impact on the Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacodynamics of Monoclonal Antibodies and Fc-Fusion Proteins, 104 Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences 1866–1884 (2015). (“Liu 2015”)
1088	R. Jefferis, Glycosylation of Recombinant Antibody Therapeutics, 21 Biotechnology Progress 11-16 (2005). (“Jefferis”)
1089	Patent Owner Response filed in Celltrion, Inc. v. Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc., PTAB-IPR2023-00462 (“’992 IPR POR”)
1090	Ronin C, Granier C, Caseti C, Bouchilloux S, Van Rietschoten J. Synthetic substrates for thyroid oligosaccharide transferase. Effects of peptide chain length and modifications in the Asn-Xaa-Thr-region. Eur J Biochem. 1981 Aug;118(1):159-64. doi: 10.1111/j.1432-1033.1981.tb05499.x. PMID: 6793364. (“Ronin”)
1091	Imperiali B, Hendrickson TL. Asparagine-linked glycosylation: specificity and function of oligosaccharyl transferase. Bioorg Med Chem. 1995 Dec;3(12):1565-78. doi: 10.1016/0968-0896(95)00142-5. PMID: 8770382. (“Imperiali”)
1092	Anguita R, Tasiopoulou A, Shahid S, Roth J, Sim SY, Patel PJ. A Review of Aflibercept Treatment for Macular Disease. Ophthalmol Ther. 2021 Sep;10(3):413-428. doi: 10.1007/s40123-021-00354-1. Epub 2021 Jun 13. Erratum in: Ophthalmol Ther. 2021 Sep;10(3):429. (“Anguita”)

Exhibit	Description
1093	Hart GW. Glycosylation. Curr Opin Cell Biol. 1992 Dec;4(6):1017-23. (“Hart”)
1094	Jager RD, Aiello LP, Patel SC, Cunningham ET Jr. Risks of intravitreal injection: a comprehensive review. Retina. 2004 Oct;24(5):676-98. (“Jager”)
1095	Garcia-Valdecabres M, López-Alemán A, Refojo MF. pH stability of ophthalmic solutions. Optometry. 2004 Mar;75(3):161-8. (“Garcia-Valdecabres”)
1096	Andya JD, Hsu CC, Shire SJ. Mechanisms of aggregate formation and carbohydrate excipient stabilization of lyophilized humanized monoclonal antibody formulations. AAPS PharmSci. 2003;5(2):E10. (“Andya”)
1097	Dave A. Parkins & Ulla T. Lashmar, The Formulation of Biopharmaceutical Products, 3(4) PHARM. SCI. & TECH. TODAY 129- 137 (Apr. 4, 2000) (“Parkins”)
1098	Response to Office Action of July 13, 2011 in U.S. Application No. 12/835,065 (“Nov 22 OA Response”)
1099	US20050281822 (“’822 Publication”)
1100	García-Carmona, J. & Gómez-Morales, Jaime & Sainz, Julio & Rodríguez Clemente, Rafael. (2003). Morphological characteristics and aggregation of calcite crystals obtained by bubbling CO ₂ through a Ca(OH) ₂ suspension in the presence of additives. Powder Technology. 130. 307-315. (“Garcia-Carmona”)
1101	Expert Declaration of Richard Manning submitted in IPR2021-00881 (“Manning Declaration”)
1102	Sigma Polyoxyethylenesorbitan Monolaurate (Tween 20) Product Information, https://www.sigmaaldrich.com/deepweb/assets/sigmaaldrich/product/documents/189/818/p6585pis.pdf?srsId=AfmBOorZBp4Jza0NG_Jn1Jt_MYg0rFShdd7KRyjrE8PM4nmrl_kub_kky (“Sigma Polysorbate 20 Product Information”)
1103	Fuhrman LC Jr. Ansel’s Pharmaceutical Dosage Forms and Drug Delivery Systems. 8th ed. Chapter 15: Parenterals. Am J Pharm Educ. 2006;70(3):71. (“Ansel”)

Exhibit	Description
1104	K.L. Cheng, et al., On Calibration of pH Meters, 5 Sensors 209-219 (2005)) (“Cheng”)
1105	John A. Illingworth, A Common Source of Error in pH Measurements, 195 Biochemical Journal 259-262 (1981) (“Illingworth”)
1106	Chun-Man Chan et al., Evaluation of a Luminescent Ruthenium Complex Immobilized Inside Nafion as an Optical pH Sensor, 123 Analyst 1843-1847 (1998) (“Chan”)
1107	Hanna Instruments, Checker® HI 98103: pH Tester with Replaceable Electrode, User Manual, Hanna Instruments (December 2004) (“Hanna”)
1108	Oakton Instruments, Waterproof pHTestr 2: Microprocessor-Based Pocket pH Tester, Instruction Sheet, Oakton Instruments (February 2005) (“Oakton”)
1109	August 26, 2024 Regeneron’s Nonconfidential Response Brief filed in Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc., Case No. 24-1965, Federal Circuit (Dkt. 36) (“Regeneron Appeal Responsive Brief”)
1110	[Reserved]
1111	[Reserved]
1112	[Reserved]
1113	[Reserved]
1114	[Reserved]
1115	Eugene J. McNally, Protein Formulation and Delivery, Drugs and the Pharmaceutical Sciences (2000) (“McNally”)
1116	Executed Summons Returned in <i>Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Formycon AG</i> , Civil Action No., 1:23-CV-97
1117	Minute entry for proceedings held before Chief District Judge Kleeh, scheduling conference held on 5/17/2024, <i>In Re: Aflibercept Patent Litigation</i> , 1:24-md-03103-TSK, D110

Exhibit	Description
1118	Defendants' Motion For Status Conference, <i>In Re: Aflibercept Patent Litigation</i> , 1:24-md-03103-TSK, D334
1119	Defendant Samsung Bioepis Co., Ltd.'s Motion for Entry of Scheduling Order Pursuant to Rule 16 or, in the Alternative, a Status Conference, <i>In Re: Aflibercept Patent Litigation</i> , 1:24-md-03103-TSK, D478
1120	Defendant Formycon AG's Motion to Partially Adopt and Join Samsung Bioepis, Co., Ltd.'s Motion for Entry of Scheduling Order Pursuant to Rule 16 or, in the Alternative, a Status Conference, <i>In Re: Aflibercept Patent Litigation</i> , 1:24-md-03103-TSK, D484
1121	Celltrion, Inc.'s Motion for a Status Conference, and Notice of Partial Adoption and Joinder of Samsung Bioepis, Co., Ltd.'s Scheduling Motion [ECF No. 478], <i>In Re: Aflibercept Patent Litigation</i> , 1:24-md-03103-TSK, D490
1122	Email from Arthur Argall to Louis Fogel, copying counsel from other existing and planned MDL parties, Re: In re Aflibercept Patent Litigation (23-md-3103) -- status conference request
1123	Lex Machina, Timing metrics for Federal District Court Cases for Judge Thomas Shawn Kleeh
1124	Lex Machina, Timing metrics for Federal District Court Cases in N.D.W.Va.
1125	Stipulation and Order Vacating Permanent Injunction Previously Issued by the Court in this Matter and Dismissing All Claims and Counterclaims with Prejudice, <i>In Re: Aflibercept Patent Litigation</i> , 1:24-md-03103-TSK, 519
1126	Transcript from Oral Argument in <i>Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc.</i> , Appeal No. 24-2002 (Feb. 7, 2025)
1127	<i>Celltrion, Inc. v. Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</i> , IPR2023-00462, Decision Granting Institution of <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, Paper 11 (PTAB July 20, 2023)

I. INTRODUCTION

A straightforward application of the *Fintiv* factors¹ weighs strongly against exercising discretion to deny institution in this case: (1) Petitioner has filed a *Sotera* stipulation, ensuring no duplication of efforts between the PTAB and the district court in the *MDL*,² (2) the district court has not scheduled a trial date nor given any indication that it will do so soon, (3) the parties to the preliminary injunction (“PI”) proceedings did not argue the obviousness grounds presented here, and (4) the ’865 patent should have never issued.

The ’865 patent is part of an expansive thicket of over 50 patents directed to various aspects of EYLEA®—an intravitreal formulation of aflibercept. Every patent claim challenged at the PTAB in this thicket has ultimately been either disclaimed by PO or found unpatentable by the Board. *See* IPR2023-00462 (adverse judgment on parent patent U.S. 10,464,992); IPR2023-00884 (adverse judgment on U.S. 11,253,572); IPR2023-00739 (adverse judgment on U.S. 10,888,601); IPR2022-01226 (all challenged claims of U.S. 10,888,601 unpatentable); PGR2021-00117 (disclaiming all claims of U.S. 10,857,231); IPR2023-00099 (disclaiming all claims of U.S. 10,857,205); IPR2023-00620 (disclaiming challenged claims of U.S. 10,406,226); IPR2023-00442 and IPR2022-01225 (all challenged claims of U.S.

¹ *Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.*, IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020).

² “*MDL*” refers to PO’s multidistrict litigation against Formycon, Samsung Bioepis (“SB”), Sandoz, and Celltrion in N.D.W.Va. Pet. 6-8.

10,130,681 unpatentable); IPR2022-00257 and IPR2021-00880 (all challenged claims of U.S. 9,669,069 unpatentable); IPR2021-00881 (all challenged claims of U.S. 9,254,338 unpatentable). The Board should review the merits of the '865 patent's claims because PO's own prior-art presentations—with Fraser and Wulff—provide strong evidence that these claims are equally unpatentable. Pet. 1-2.

PO's arguments misdirect the Board away from this straightforward application of *Fintiv*. As just one example, PO claims Petitioner delayed filing until "365 days after it was *sued*." POPR, 6. But 35 U.S.C. §315(b) considers only the date that a petitioner was properly served under Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 4. *GoPro, Inc. v. 360Heros, Inc.*, IPR2018-01754, Paper 38, 9 (PTAB Aug. 23, 2019) (precedential). Petitioner filed promptly after it was formally served on October 16, 2024. Ex.1116. There was thus no undue delay. This and many other examples of misdirection in the POPR do not withstand scrutiny. For the reasons described below, the Board should decline to exercise its discretion to deny institution.

II. ARGUMENT

A. *Fintiv* factor 4: Petitioner's *Sotera* stipulation weighs heavily against discretionary denial.

Petitioner stipulated that it "will not pursue in the parallel district court proceeding the same grounds as in the Petition or any grounds that could have reasonably been raised in the petition." Pet. 70-71. CJ Boalick's memo makes clear that a timely filed *Sotera* stipulation remains "highly relevant." However, the POPR

did not address Petitioner’s *Sotera* stipulation at all.

Petitioner’s *Sotera* stipulation obviates any overlap with the district court and ensures that this IPR will be a “true alternative” to the *MDL*. *Motorola Solutions, Inc. v Stellar, LLC*, IPR2024-01205, Paper 19, 3-4 (Stewart March 28, 2025). For example, as a biosimilar, no “system prior art” exists in this field that would call Petitioner’s stipulation into question. *Cf. id.* (discounting *Sotera* stipulation where petitioner’s invalidity arguments included combinations with “unpublished system art”). Thus, if Petitioner ultimately serves invalidity contentions in the *MDL*, Petitioner’s arguments will be tailored to grounds not available by statute here.³

Under these circumstances, the Board should find that the *Sotera* stipulation weighs heavily against exercising discretion to deny. *See Sotera*, Paper 12, 19 (holding that stipulation “mitigates any concerns of duplicative efforts” and “concerns of potentially conflicting decisions,” and “weighs strongly in favor of not exercising discretion to deny institution”).

B. *Fintiv* Factor 2: The lack of a scheduled trial date weighs heavily against discretionary denial.

The *MDL* is still in its early stages. There is *no* trial date nor do the parties have any indication the district court will set a trial date any time soon. The parties

³ In compliance with certain BPCIA pre-suit requirements, Petitioner served invalidity contentions (“3(B) statements”) during the “Patent Dance.” But these contentions were merely preliminary and are not binding on the parties. *See, e.g., Genentech, Inc. v. Amgen Inc.*, 2020 WL 636439, at *5 (D. Del. Feb. 11, 2020).

were last before the district court in May 2024. Ex.1117. Since then, the district court has not responded to the four status conference requests made by *MDL* parties over the past seven months. Ex.1118, Ex.1119, Ex.1120, Ex.1121. Nor is there a case schedule in place yet at the district court. And most recently, PO proposed that trial should occur after the district court entertains a PI against yet another (new) potential defendant, which—based on the completed PI proceedings—would result in further delay of no less than 8 months.⁴ Ex.1122. This lack of a trial date weighs heavily against discretionary denial. *See, e.g., Aptiv Servs. US, LLC v. Microchip Tech.*, IPR2024-00646, Paper 11, 32 (PTAB Sept. 25, 2024) (other *Fintiv* factors do not outweigh lack of trial date).

Even using median times-to-trial as a guide, the expected statutory deadline for a FWD here (June 17, 2026) is well before any trial could occur in the *MDL*. The median time-to-trial in civil cases for Judge Kleeh is 627 days (~1.72 years) (Ex.1123) and for N.D.W.Va. is 676 days (~1.85 years) (Ex.1124). Thus, even if the court set a trial date tomorrow, based on these statistics (discounting Judge Kleeh's median 3 months for the PI proceedings), trial would not be expected until September 2026 at the earliest—three months after an expected FWD. An institution

⁴ Petitioner and PO are continuing to discuss raising a status conference with the district court. Although the parties require further guidance from the district court before proposing any schedule, if institution is granted Petitioner will not seek a trial date on the '865 patent before the expected FWD.

decision on the merits is especially important here given the June 2027 expiration date of the '865 patent coupled with the slow pace of the district court proceeding.

PO argues this factor weighs for discretionary denial because **SB** proposed a scheduling order with a trial set for March 2026. POPR, 16. Not so. First, the district court has not yet responded to any parties' schedule-related motions, underscoring the glacial pace of the *MDL*. Ex.2008. Second, Formycon joined SB *only* to request a status conference—not a trial date. Ex.1120, 1. Lacking any significant relationship, SB's actions cannot be imputed to Formycon. *Am. Honda Motor Co., v. Neo Wireless LLC*, IPR2023-00797, Paper 27, 3 (PTAB Mar. 22, 2024). Third, Petitioner was diligent in filing because it was not served until October 16, 2024, (Ex.1116), and the accorded filing date for this IPR is December 2, 2024. Paper 4.

Further, the timing of this Petition is proportional to PO's thicket. Before PO filed the complaint, it accused Petitioner of infringing *fifty-five* patents during the Patent Dance preceding litigation. And even when PO filed its complaint, Petitioner could not know which patents PO would ultimately move forward on from its "narrower" group of *thirty-nine* asserted patents. *See Fintiv*, 11 (recognizing that it is reasonable for a petitioner to wait to file its petition until it learns which claims are being asserted against it in a parallel proceeding).

C. *Fintiv* Factors 3 & 5: Neither the *MDL* nor the *Mylan* matter counsel discretionary denial.

Almost all of PO's discretionary-denial arguments focus on "investment" in

the wrong proceeding, *i.e.*, the *Mylan* matter,⁵ in which Formycon was not involved and that ended over five months *before* PO filed its complaint against Petitioner. POPR, 7. But the *Fintiv* “framework generally addresses the impact of an *ongoing* proceeding in another tribunal that is progressing in parallel with the Board proceeding.” *Hulu, LLC v. Piranha Media Dist., LLC*, IPR2024-01252, Paper 27 (Stewart Apr. 17, 2025). Here, the only ongoing proceeding involving Petitioner is the *MDL*, not the *Mylan* matter.

In the *MDL*, the “investment” PO touts is simply not there. Outside of the early PI phase (discussed more below), the case involving Formycon has hardly begun. The parties have not exchanged infringement or invalidity contentions, claim construction has not started, discovery outside of the jurisdictional and PI phase has not begun, no case schedule is in place, and there is no trial date. Because neither the parties nor the district court have expended significant time, effort, or resources beyond the PI phase, *Fintiv* factor 3 weighs against the Board exercising its discretion to deny institution. *Sotera*, 16-17. Indeed, the Board has declined to exercise its discretion to deny under similar facts. *See Duke Mfg. Co. v. Low Temp Indus., Inc.*, IPR2021-00415, Paper 13, 13-14 (PTAB July 20, 2021) (“Although we appreciate that the court and the parties have invested effort and time in the

⁵ “*Mylan* matter” refers to PO’s action against Mylan in N.D.W.Va. Pet. 8. PO and Mylan jointly requested that the court vacate its permanent injunction against Mylan and dismiss all claims with prejudice, which was so ordered. Ex.1125.

preliminary injunction proceedings, it remains that much work lies ahead despite the district court having granted the preliminary injunction.”).

PO argues that the PI constitutes substantial investment. POPR, 7-8. But neither the parties nor the district court invested substantial resources *related to the arguments raised in the Petition*. Formycon argued different invalidity grounds for the '865 patent in the PI proceedings: obviousness-type double patenting (“OTDP”) and lack of written description.⁶ Ex.2006, 8. Thus, this is not a case where the PI favors denial, and PO’s cited cases do not counsel otherwise. *See E-One, Inc. v. Oshkosh Corp.*, IPR2019-00162, Paper 16, 8-9 (PTAB June 5, 2019) (discretionarily denying institution due to “*extensive overlap* of the asserted prior art, expert testimony, and the disputed claim terms” following “claim construction order and preliminary injunction order”).⁷

Moreover, the Federal Circuit has not decided the obviousness issues raised in the Petition. POPR, 6. Rather, the court addressed only OTDP and written description. As to OTDP, the court analyzed whether claim 4 of the '865 patent was invalid for OTDP over claim 5 of PO’s own reference patent. *See, e.g.*, Ex.2006, 12; Ex.2005, 18. The court did so under a different analysis than the obviousness

⁶ SB also argued invalidity for OTDP and lack of written description (Ex.2005, 9), while Celltrion argued OTDP only (Ex.2007, 5).

⁷ PO also cites to *IBM Corp. v. Trusted Knight Corp.*, IPR2020-00323, but the panel in that case declined to exercise discretionary denial under *Fintiv*.

standard applicable here, as OTDP requires comparison between *claims*, not disclosures. *See Geneva Pharms., Inc. v. GlaxoSmithKline PLC*, 349 F.3d 1373, 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (“Because [OTDP] compares earlier and later claims, an earlier patent’s disclosure is not available to show [OTDP].”).

The *Mylan* matter also does not counsel for discretionary denial. First, those parties settled following oral argument at the Federal Circuit, and the district court has now *vacated* final judgment and *dismissed* all claims with prejudice, on the request of PO and Mylan. Ex.1125.⁸ Second, the claims at issue in that proceeding were just a subset of the claims at issue here, with Mylan challenging the validity of only claims 4, 7, 9, 11, and 14-17. Ex.2001, 1. But here, Petitioner challenges almost every claim of the ’865 patent: 1-12, 14-17, 19-20, 22-36, 39-42, 44-45, and 47-55. Pet. 1. And claim 1 is *substantially broader* in scope than claim 4. Unlike claim 4, claim 1 encompasses *any concentration* of VEGF antagonist fusion protein, *any* organic co-solvent, and *any amount* of organic co-solvent. The district court’s findings on validity in *Mylan* focused on a concentration requirement—“40 mg/ml” VEGF antagonist fusion protein—not recited in claim 1. For example, the district court found that disclosure of “10-50 mg/ml” in primary reference Dix did not teach

⁸ At oral argument, the Federal Circuit panel cast serious doubt on whether the law supported the district court’s ’865 patent validity findings. *See, e.g.*, Ex.1126, 22:19-25 (Judge Prost, concerning invalidity: “[B]ack to criticality . . . and I’ll discuss with [PO’s counsel] why I think the District Court’s findings may have put the [] wrong burden and asked the wrong question.”).

“40 mg/ml” for anticipation. Ex.2001, 154-64.⁹

Finally, even if the Board considers the *Mylan* matter, then *Fintiv* factor 5 still weighs against exercising discretion.¹⁰ *Fintiv*, 13-14. The district court’s findings in *Mylan* were made on a different record with different parties and a narrower set of claims. *See Smith v. Bayer Corp.*, 564 U.S. 299, 312 (2011) (“A court’s judgment binds only the parties to a suit, subject to a handful of discrete and limited exceptions.”). And because *Mylan* has no preclusive effect to Formycon, the district court must still conduct a trial on the ’865 patent in the Formycon case. PO’s argument that the Board must defer to the court’s previous judgment (that the district court has vacated, no less) is not correct.

D. *Fintiv* Factor 1: The circumstances of a stay are neutral.

The Board routinely considers this factor neutral where, as here, neither party has requested a stay. *Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.*, IPR2020-00019, Paper 15, 12 (PTAB May 13, 2020) (informative).

E. *Fintiv* Factor 6: Other circumstances strongly favor institution.

Finally, the merits of the Petition here favor institution. *Supra* §I. In IPR2023-

⁹ The district court also found that claim 4 was not obvious because other prior art taught away from a 40 mg/ml formulation. Ex.2001, 165.

¹⁰ *Fintiv* factor 5 is neutral even considering just the *MDL*. Although the parties are the same, Petitioner’s *Sotera* stipulation ensures lack of overlap with the district court. *Snap, Inc. v. SRK Tech. LLC*, IPR2020-00820, Paper 15, 16 (PTAB Oct. 21, 2020) (precedential as to §II.A).

00462, for example, the Board found a reasonable likelihood that claims substantially similar to claim 1 were unpatentable over Fraser and instituted trial. Ex.1127. In particular, the Board found that “[o]n the current record, Petitioner sufficiently demonstrates that Fraser’s VEGF Trap_{R1R2} formulation includes an organic co-solvent, i.e., Tween 20 (polysorbate 20); buffer, i.e., phosphate, citrate, and NaCl (pH 6.0); and a stabilizing agent, i.e., glycerol or sucrose” and that the claimed 98% native conformation limitation “is necessarily a natural result of the formulation ingredients,” all elements claimed by the ’865 patent. *Id.*, 29-30, 31-32.

Efficient use of Board resources also favors institution. Formycon’s Petition is a copycat of SB’s Petition in IPR2025-00176; Formycon has requested conditional joinder and has agreed to act as an understudy. Mot. (Paper 1), 2, 4-5. Considering these Petitions together (with, if necessary, an extended deadline available under 35 U.S.C. §316(a)(11)) would efficiently resolve the patentability of the ’865 patent consistent with the goals of the AIA.

III. CONCLUSION

A comprehensive assessment of the *Fintiv* factors indicates that they weigh against discretionary denial or are neutral. Formycon respectfully requests that its Petition for *inter partes* review be instituted.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 23, 2025

/Kristi L. R. Sawert/
Louis E. Fogel (Reg. No. 54,731)
Grace Kim (Reg. No. 71,977)
Kristi L. R. Sawert (Reg. No. 45,702)
Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street, Suite 3200
Minneapolis, MN 55402
T: 202-783-5070
F: 877-769-7945

(Control No. IPR2025-00233)

Attorneys for Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 37 CFR § 42.6(e), the undersigned certifies that on April 23, 2025, a complete and entire copy of this Petitioner's Reply to Patent Owner's Preliminary Response to Address Discretionary Denial and corresponding exhibits were provided via email to the Patent Owner by serving the correspondence email addresses of record as follows:

David I. Berl
Andrew V. Trask
Arthur J. Argall III
Elizabeth S. Weiswasser
WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP
680 Maine Avenue SW
Washington, DC 20024

Priyata Y. Patel
PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON &
GARRISON LLP
2001 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006

Email: Eylea@wc.com
GRP-PW-EYLEA-Biosimilars@paulweiss.com

/Anastasia Renard/
Anastasia Renard
Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street, Suite 3200
Minneapolis, MN 55402
renard@fr.com