

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SAMSUNG BIOEPIS CO., LTD.,  
Petitioner,

v.

REGENERON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2023-00566  
Patent 10,888,601 B2

---

Before JOHN G. NEW, SUSAN L.C. MITCHELL, and  
ROBERT A. POLLOCK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

NEW, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Granting Institution of *Inter Partes* Review

35 U.S.C. § 314

Granting Motion for Joinder

35 U.S.C. § 315(c); 37 C.F.R. § 42.122

## I. INTRODUCTION

Samsung Bioepis Co., Ltd. (“Petitioner”) has timely filed a Petition (“Samsung Petition”) requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 1–9, 34–39, 41–43, and 45 of U.S. Patent No. 10,888,601 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’601 patent”). Paper 3 (“Pet.”). Petitioner also timely filed a Motion for Joinder (the “Motion” or “Mot.,” Paper 2) to join this proceeding with *Mylan Pharms. Inc. v. Regeneron Pharms., Inc.*, IPR2022-01226, filed May 5, 2021, and instituted on November 10, 2021 (the “*Mylan* IPR”). See *Mylan* IPR, Paper 21.

For the reasons set forth below, we (1) institute *inter partes* review based on the same grounds as instituted in the *Mylan* IPR, and (2) GRANT Petitioner’s Motion for Joinder, subject to the conditions detailed herein.

## II. INSTITUTION OF INTER PARTES REVIEW

In the *Mylan* IPR, we instituted trial on the following grounds:

Ground	Claim(s) Challenged	35 U.S.C. §	Reference(s)/Basis
1	1–9, 34–39, 41– 43, 45	102 <sup>1</sup>	Dixon <sup>2</sup>
2	1–9, 34–39, 41– 43, 45	102	Adis <sup>3</sup>
3	1–9, 34–39, 41– 43, 45	102	Regeneron 2008 <sup>4</sup>
4	1–9, 34–39, 41– 43, 45	102	NCT-795 <sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (“AIA”), Pub. L. No. 112–29, 125 Stat. 284 (2011), amended 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103, effective March 16, 2013. Because the application from which the ’601 patent issued has an effective filing date after that date, the AIA versions of §§ 102 and 103 apply.

<sup>2</sup> J.A. Dixon et al., *VEGF Trap-Eye for the Treatment of Neovascular Age-Related Macular Degeneration*, 18(10) EXPERT OPIN. INVESTIG. DRUGS 1573–80 (2009) (“Dixon”) Ex. 1006.

<sup>3</sup> Adis R&D Profile, *Aflibercept: AVE 0005, AVE 005, AVE0005, VEGF Trap – Regeneron, VEGF Trap (R1R2), VEGF Trap-Eye*, 9(4) DRUGS R D 261–269 (2008) (“Adis”) Ex. 1007.

<sup>4</sup> Press Release, *Regeneron and Bayer HealthCare Announce Encouraging 32-Week Follow-Up Results from a Phase 2 Study of VEGF Trap-Eye in Age-Related Macular Degeneration*, April 28, 2008 (“Regeneron 2008”) Ex. 1012.

<sup>5</sup> ClinicalTrials.gov (archive), *Vascular Endothelial Growth Factor (VEGF) Trap-Eye: Investigation of Efficacy and Safety in Wet Age-Related Macular Degeneration (AMD) (VIEW1)*, available at: <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/history/NCT00509795?A=8&B=9&C=merged#StudyPageTop> (last visited December 21, 2022) Ex. 1014.

Ground	Claim(s) Challenged	35 U.S.C. §	Reference(s)/Basis
5	1–9, 34–39, 41– 43, 45	103	Dixon alone or in view of Papadopoulos <sup>6</sup> and/or Wiegand <sup>7</sup>
6	1–9, 34–39, 41– 43, 45	103	Dixon in combination with Rosenfeld-2006 <sup>8</sup> , and if necessary, Papadopoulos patent and/or Wiegand
7	1–9, 34–39, 41– 43, 45	103	Dixon in combination with Heimann-2007, and if necessary, Papadopoulos and/or Wiegand

*Mylan* IPR, Paper 21, 4–5, 29–30.

Samsung’s Petition is substantially identical to Mylan’s Petition, challenging the same patent and claims, based on the same grounds of unpatentability, and relying upon the same evidence (including the same prior art combinations supported by the same expert declaration) as the *Mylan* IPR. *See* Mot. 1. Petitioner seeks only institution of the same claims and grounds for which the Board instituted in the *Mylan* IPR. *Id.*

---

<sup>6</sup> Papadopoulos et al. (US 7,374,758 B2, May 20, 2008) (“Papadopoulos”) Ex. 1010.

<sup>7</sup> Wiegand et al. (US 7,531,173 B2, May 12, 2009) (“Wiegand”) Ex. 1008.

<sup>8</sup> P.J. Rosenfeld et al., *Ranibizumab for Neovascular Age-Related Macular Degeneration*, 355 (14) N. ENGL. J. MED. 1419–31; Suppl. App’x 1–17 (2006) (“Rosenfeld”) Ex. 1058.

At this stage, and in this proceeding, Patent Owner has not raised any arguments in response to the substantive grounds of the Mylan Petition. Petitioner undertakes, if the Petition and Motion are granted, to assume a limited “understudy” role, and will not take an active role in the *inter partes* review proceeding unless the *Mylan* Petitioner ceases to participate in the instituted IPR. Mot. 1. Petitioner contends that the proposed joinder will neither unduly complicate the *Mylan* IPR nor delay its schedule. *Id.* As such, Petitioner asserts, the joinder will promote judicial efficiency in determining patentability of the ’601 patent in the *Mylan* IPR without prejudice to Patent Owner. *Id.*

In view of these representations by Petitioner, and having reviewed the Samsung Petition, we determine that, under the current circumstances, it is appropriate to exercise our discretion to institute *inter partes* review of the challenged claims based upon the same grounds authorized and for the same reasons discussed in our Institution Decision in the *Mylan* IPR. *See Mylan* IPR, Paper 21.

### III. JOINDER OF *INTER PARTES* REVIEWS

An *inter partes* review may be joined with another *inter partes* review, subject to the provisions 35 U.S.C. § 315(c), which governs joinder of *inter partes* review proceedings:

(c) JOINDER. — If the Director institutes an *inter partes* review, the Director, in his or her discretion, may join as a party to that *inter partes* review any person who properly files a petition under section 311 that the Director, after receiving a preliminary response under section 313 or the expiration of the time for filing such a response, determines warrants the institution of an *inter partes* review under section 314.

As the moving party, Petitioner bears the burden of proving that it is entitled to the requested relief. 37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c). A motion for joinder should: Set forth the reasons joinder is appropriate; identify any new grounds of unpatentability asserted in the petition; and explain what impact (if any) joinder would have on the trial schedule for the existing review. *See Kyocera Corp. v. Softview, LLC*, IPR2013-00004, Paper 15 at 4 (PTAB Apr. 24, 2013); *see also*, USPTO, *America Invents Act (AIA) Frequently Asked Questions*,” available at: [uspto.gov/patents/laws/america-invents-act-aia/america-invents-act-aia-frequently-asked#type-inter-partes-review\\_3244](https://uspto.gov/patents/laws/america-invents-act-aia/america-invents-act-aia-frequently-asked#type-inter-partes-review_3244) (last visited February 2, 2022).

Petitioner timely filed its Joinder Motion within one month of the institution of the *Mylan* IPR, as required by 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b). In the motion, Petitioner explains that:

Samsung Bioepis further stipulates herein that if joinder is granted, it will take a limited “understudy” role in the same manner previously found to support joinder so long as Mylan remains an active party. Joinder thus creates no additional burden for the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (the “Board”), Mylan, or Patent Owner. Nor will it impact the schedule of the *Mylan* IPR.

Mot. 1. As discussed in the Institution Decision, Section II *supra*, the instituted grounds in this proceeding are the same as that instituted in the *Mylan* IPR.

Having considered the unopposed motion for joinder, and our decision to institute the same grounds in the *Mylan* IPR, we determine that Petitioner Samsung has established persuasively that joinder is appropriate and will have little to no impact on the timing, cost, or presentation of the trial on the

instituted ground. Thus, in consideration of the foregoing, and in the manner set forth in the following Order, the Motion for Joinder is GRANTED.

#### IV. ORDER

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby:

ORDERED that trial is instituted in IPR2022-00257 on the following grounds:

- Ground 1: Claims 1–9, 34–39, 41–43, and 45 of the '601 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Dixon.
- Ground 2: Claims 1–9, 34–39, 41–43, and 45 of the '601 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Adis.
- Ground 3: Claims 1–9, 34–39, 41–43, and 45 of the '601 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Regeneron 2008.
- Ground 4: Claims 1–9, 34–39, 41–43, and 45 of the '601 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by NCT-795.
- Ground 5: Claims 1–9, 34–39, 41–43, and 45 of the '601 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Dixon alone or in view of Papadopoulos and/or Wiegand.
- Ground 6: Claims 1–9, 34–39, 41–43, and 45 of the '601 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Dixon in combination with Rosenfeld-2006, and if necessary, Papadopoulos and/or Wiegand.
- Ground 7: Claims 1–9, 34–39, 41–43, and 45 of the '601 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Dixon in combination with Heimann-2007, and if necessary, Papadopoulos and/or Wiegand.

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner's Unopposed Motion for Joinder with IPR20221-01226 is GRANTED;

FURTHER ORDERED that IPR2023-00532 is terminated and joined with IPR2022-01226, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.72, 42.122, wherein Samsung will maintain a secondary role in the proceeding, unless and until Mylan ceases to participate as a petitioner in the *inter partes* review;

FURTHER ORDERED that the Scheduling Order in place for IPR2022-01226, along with modifications appropriately stipulated to by the parties, shall govern the joined proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that all future filings in the joined proceeding are to be made only in IPR2022-01226;

FURTHER ORDERED that the case caption in IPR2022-01226 for all further submissions shall be changed to add Samsung Bioepis Co., Ltd. as a named Petitioner after the *Mylan* Petitioner, and a footnote shall be added to indicate the joinder of IPR2023-00532 to that proceeding, as shown in the attached sample case caption;<sup>9</sup> and

FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this Decision shall be entered into the record of IPR2022-01226.

---

<sup>9</sup> The attached sample caption includes Petitioner Celltrion, Inc., based on our concurrently decided decision granting institution and granting the motion for joinder in IPR2023-00533.



IPR2023-00533  
Patent 10,888,601 B2

FOR PETITIONER:

Raymond N. Nimrod  
Matthew A. Traupman  
Landon Andrew Smith  
QUINN MANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP  
raymimrod@quinnmanuel.com  
matthewtraupman@quinnmanuel.com  
landonsmith@quinnmanuel.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Deborah E. Fishman  
David A. Caine  
David S. Denuyl  
Alice S. Ho  
ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP  
deboarh.fishman@arnoldporter.com  
david.caine@arnoldporter.com  
david.denuyl@arnoldporter.com  
alice.ho@arnoldporter.com

Joined Case Caption

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., CELLTRION, INC., and  
SAMSUNG BIOEPIS CO., LTD.,  
Petitioners,

v.

REGENERON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2022-01226<sup>1</sup>  
Patent 10,888,601 B2

---

---

<sup>1</sup> IPR2023-00533 and IPR 2023-00566 have been joined with this proceeding.