

EXHIBIT M

From: [Tan, Nate](#)
To: [McLennan, Mark C.](#); [Sheh, Anthony](#)
Cc: [Afinogenova, Alina](#); [Brian Egan](#); [Blumenfeld, Jack](#); [Wacker, Jeanna](#); [#KEModernaSpikevaxService](#); [Carson, Patricia A.](#); [tmurray@morrisnichols.com](#); [Li, Yan-Xin](#); [Horstman, N. Kaye](#); [Genevant Team](#); [Meghan James](#); [Durie, Daralyn J.](#); [Davis, Kira A](#); [Brausa, Adam R.](#); [Dawson, Shaelyn K.](#); [Wiener, Eric C.](#); [Lee, Annie A.](#); [Arbutus MoFo](#); [Murray, Travis](#)
Subject: RE: C.A. No. 22-252-MSG Arbutus v. Moderna - Prior Litigation Materials
Date: Thursday, September 28, 2023 5:21:48 PM

This message is from an EXTERNAL SENDER

Be cautious, particularly with links and attachments.

Hi Mark,

Plaintiffs' investigation is ongoing, but we confirm that we have located at least some documents Arbutus produced in the Acuitas litigation (*Acuitas Therapeutics Inc. v. Arbutus Biopharma Corporation*, 2017 BCSC 199, Vancouver Registry No. S169829). Thus far, our search indicates that producing these documents requested by Moderna may require additional review in light of Arbutus's third-party confidentiality obligations.

NATE TAN

Associate | Morrison & Foerster LLP

2100 L Street, NW, Suite 900 | Washington, DC 20037

P: +1 (202) 887-6943

[mofo.com](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Twitter](#)

From: McLennan, Mark C. <mark.mclennan@kirkland.com>
Sent: Friday, September 22, 2023 6:25 PM
To: Tan, Nate <NTan@mofo.com>; Sheh, Anthony <ASheh@wc.com>
Cc: Afinogenova, Alina <alina.afinogenova@kirkland.com>; Brian Egan <began@morrisnichols.com>; Blumenfeld, Jack <JBlumenfeld@morrisnichols.com>; Wacker, Jeanna <jeanna.wacker@kirkland.com>; #KEModernaSpikevaxService <KEModernaSpikevaxService@kirkland.com>; Carson, Patricia A. <patricia.carson@kirkland.com>; tmurray@morrisnichols.com; Li, Yan-Xin <yanxin.li@kirkland.com>; Horstman, N. Kaye <kaye.horstman@kirkland.com>; Genevant Team <GenevantTeam@wc.com>; Meghan James <mjames@shawkeller.com>; Durie, Daralyn J. <DDurie@mofo.com>; Davis, Kira A <KiraDavis@mofo.com>; Brausa, Adam R. <ABrausa@mofo.com>; Dawson, Shaelyn K. <ShaelynDawson@mofo.com>; Wiener, Eric C. <EWiener@mofo.com>; Lee, Annie A. <AnnieLee@mofo.com>; Arbutus_MoFo <Arbutus_MoFo@mofo.com>; Murray, Travis <tmurray@morrisnichols.com>
Subject: RE: C.A. No. 22-252-MSG Arbutus v. Moderna - Prior Litigation Materials

External Email

Hi Nate,

Thanks for your email.

We'll consider your proposal but could you please let us know whether Plaintiffs have confirmed that they have the documents produced in the Acuitas suit?

Thanks,
Mark

Mark C. McLennan

KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP

601 Lexington Avenue, New York, NY 10022

T +1 212 909 3451

mark.mclennan@kirkland.com

From: Tan, Nate <NTan@mofo.com>

Sent: Friday, September 22, 2023 4:05 PM

To: McLennan, Mark C. <mark.mclennan@kirkland.com>; Sheh, Anthony <ASheh@wc.com>

Cc: Afinogenova, Alina <alina.afinogenova@kirkland.com>; Brian Egan <began@morrisnichols.com>;

Blumenfeld, Jack <JBlumenfeld@morrisnichols.com>; Wacker, Jeanna

<jeanna.wacker@kirkland.com>; #KEModernaSpikevaxService

<KEModernaSpikevaxService@kirkland.com>; Carson, Patricia A. <patricia.carson@kirkland.com>;

tmurray@morrisnichols.com; Li, Yan-Xin <yanxin.li@kirkland.com>; Horstman, N. Kaye

<kaye.horstman@kirkland.com>; Genevant Team <GenevantTeam@wc.com>; Meghan James

<mjames@shawkeller.com>; Durie, Daralyn J. <DDurie@mofo.com>; Davis, Kira A

<KiraDavis@mofo.com>; Brausa, Adam R. <ABrausa@mofo.com>; Dawson, Shaelyn K.

<ShaelynDawson@mofo.com>; Wiener, Eric C. <EWiener@mofo.com>; Lee, Annie A.

<AnnieLee@mofo.com>; Arbutus_MoFo <Arbutus_MoFo@mofo.com>; Murray, Travis

<tmurray@morrisnichols.com>

Subject: RE: C.A. No. 22-252-MSG Arbutus v. Moderna - Prior Litigation Materials

Mark,

Plaintiffs have been diligently investigating the prior litigations referenced in your email. In light of your July 3, 2023 compromise offer regarding prior litigations, Plaintiffs understood that Moderna was narrowing its request for information from prior litigations to those listed in that letter. Since then, Moderna has declined a compromise regarding prior litigations.

Regarding your request for documents from the other prior litigations, Plaintiffs are willing to collect, review, and produce documents it has produced, to the extent available, from *Acuitas v. Arbutus*, filed October 2016 in the Supreme Court of British Columbia, if Moderna agrees to produce all documents and communications responsive to RFP 133 ("All documents and communications related to licensing negotiations regarding LNP technology between Moderna and Acuitas Therapeutics Inc. ('Acuitas') or any of Acuitas's affiliates."). To be clear, this would include Moderna collecting producing email communications between Moderna and Acuitas relating to those licenses, and relating to the *Acuitas v. Arbutus* action and the resulting settlement agreement, regardless of

whether the ESI custodians Moderna disclosed participated in those conversations.

-
Regarding the other litigations Moderna is requesting, which were not listed in Moderna's July 3 letter, those litigations do not appear to be relevant to the claims and defenses in this action (including for the reasons articulated below) and thus Plaintiffs do not believe their collection and production would be proportional to the needs of the case.

Alnylam Pharmaceuticals Inc. and Isis Pharmaceuticals Inc. v. Tekmira Pharmaceuticals Corp., No. 1:12-cv-10087 (D. Mass.)

This litigation from over ten years ago concerned allegations of patent infringement against Tekmira. These patents are not related to any claim at issue in this case. For example, no inventor of a patent asserted in the *Alnylam v. Tekmira* case is a named inventor of any patent asserted here. The accused act of infringement is the provision of siRNA molecules. Compl. at ¶ 23. Accordingly, nothing in the *Alnylam* litigation is relevant to the claims at issue here. Further, this litigation was from a decade ago, and the burden of producing any information is high.

Tekmira Pharmaceuticals Corp. v. Michael Hope, et al., No. S117660 in the Supreme Court of British Columbia

-
This litigation, from over ten years ago, concerned claims of breach of common law and contractual duties by M. Hope, T. Madden, and B. Mui, in their individual capacities, against Tekmira. This was not a patent case. Accordingly, there is no relevance to any issue in this case. Further, this litigation was from a decade ago in a foreign jurisdiction, and the burden of producing any information is high.

2014 Demand for Arbitration by University of British Columbia, BCICAC File No.: DCA-1623

-
This arbitration, from almost ten years ago, concerned licensing disputes between UBC and Tekmira regarding UBC's, not Tekmira's patents, and thus did not involve the patents asserted in this action. Further, this litigation was from almost a decade ago in a foreign jurisdiction, and the burden of producing any information is high.

University of British Columbia v. Tekmira, Superior Court of NJ (MER-L-2296-09)

-
This litigation, from over ten years ago, concerned licensing disputes between UBC and Tekmira relating to UBC's, not Tekmira's patents, and thus did not involve the patents asserted in this action. The technology at issue related to the cancer drug Marqibo, which is comprised of vincristine encapsulated in sphingomyelin/cholesterol liposomes. This technology is unrelated to any claim or defense in this case. Further, this litigation was from almost a decade ago in a foreign jurisdiction, and the burden of producing any information is high.

NATE TAN

Associate | Morrison & Foerster LLP

2100 L Street, NW, Suite 900 | Washington, DC 20037

P: +1 (202) 887-6943

[mofo.com](https://www.mofo.com) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Twitter](#)

From: McLennan, Mark C. <mark.mclennan@kirkland.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:39 AM

To: Sheh, Anthony <ASheh@wc.com>

Cc: Afinogenova, Alina <alina.afinogenova@kirkland.com>; Brian Egan <began@morrisonichols.com>;

Blumenfeld, Jack <JBlumenfeld@morrisnichols.com>; Wacker, Jeanna <jeanna.wacker@kirkland.com>; #KEModernaSpikevaxService <KEModernaSpikevaxService@kirkland.com>; Carson, Patricia A. <patricia.carson@kirkland.com>; tmurray@morrisnichols.com; Li, Yan-Xin <yanxin.li@kirkland.com>; Horstman, N. Kaye <kaye.horstman@kirkland.com>; Genevant Team <GenevantTeam@wc.com>; Meghan James <mjames@shawkeller.com>; Durie, Daralyn J. <DDurie@mofo.com>; Davis, Kira A <KiraDavis@mofo.com>; Brausa, Adam R. <ABrausa@mofo.com>; Dawson, Shaelyn K. <ShaelynDawson@mofo.com>; Wiener, Eric C. <EWiener@mofo.com>; Tan, Nate <NTan@mofo.com>; Lee, Annie A. <AnnieLee@mofo.com>; Arbutus_MoFo <Arbutus_MoFo@mofo.com>; Murray, Travis <tmurray@morrisnichols.com>
Subject: RE: C.A. No. 22-252-MSG Arbutus v. Moderna - Prior Litigation Materials

External Email

Tony,

We did not receive a response to our email from August 23 below. When do Plaintiffs expect to get back to Moderna about these materials from prior litigations and the queries below? As you know, these RFPs have been pending for more than 9 months now.

Regards,
Mark

Mark C. McLennan

KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
601 Lexington Avenue, New York, NY 10022
T +1 212 909 3451

mark.mclennan@kirkland.com

From: McLennan, Mark C.
Sent: Wednesday, August 23, 2023 9:31 PM
To: 'Sheh, Anthony' <ASheh@wc.com>
Cc: Afinogenova, Alina <alina.afinogenova@kirkland.com>; Brian Egan <began@morrisnichols.com>; Blumenfeld, Jack <JBlumenfeld@morrisnichols.com>; Hurst, James F. <james.hurst@kirkland.com>; Wacker, Jeanna <jeanna.wacker@kirkland.com>; #KEModernaSpikevaxService <KEModernaSpikevaxService@kirkland.com>; Carson, Patricia A. <patricia.carson@kirkland.com>; tmurray@morrisnichols.com; Li, Yan-Xin <yanxin.li@kirkland.com>; Horstman, N. Kaye <kaye.horstman@kirkland.com>; Genevant Team <GenevantTeam@wc.com>; Meghan James <mjames@shawkeller.com>; Daralyn Durie (ddurie@mofo.com) <ddurie@mofo.com>; Kira Davis (kiradavis@mofo.com) <kiradavis@mofo.com>; Adam Brausa (abrausa@mofo.com) <abrausa@mofo.com>; Shaelyn Dawson (shaelyndawson@mofo.com)

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.