UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Northern District of West Virginia

Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc.					
Plaintiff(s)					
V.			Civil Action No.	1:22-cv-61	
Mylan Ph	armaceuticals,	Inc., et al.			
Defendant(s)					
JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL ACTION					
The court has ordered that:					
☐ Jud	gment award	☐ Judgment costs	Other		
		_ 0	_		
		The Court concludes that Regeneron has demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that the			
other:	Defendants have infringed claims 4, 7, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16, and 17 of the '865 Patent; Regeneron has demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that the Defendants will induce infringement of claims 6				
and 25 of the '572 Patent and claims 11 and 19 of the '601 Patent; (continued below)				<u> </u>	
This action	on was:				
☐ tried by jury ☐ tried by judge ☐		⊠ decided by judge			

decided by Judge Thomas S. Kleeh

Mylan has not demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that claims 4, 7, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16, and 17 of the '865 Patent are anticipated or obvious in light of the prior art or invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for lack of written description, lack of enablement, or indefiniteness. Mylan has not demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that claim 6 of the '572 Patent is invalid as anticipated; Mylan has demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that claim 6 of the '572 Patent is invalid as obvious; Mylan has not demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that claim 25 of the '572 patent is invalid as anticipated; Mylan has demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that claim 25 of the '572 patent is invalid as obvious; Mylan has not demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that Claim 11 of the '601 Patent is invalid as anticipated; Mylan has demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that Claim 11 of the '601 patent is invalid as obvious; Mylan has demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that Claim 19 of the '601 Patent is invalid as obvious.

CLERK OF COURT December 27, 2023 Cheryl Dean Riley Date:

/s/ D. Kinsey