

# EXHIBIT A



600 N. King Street • Suite 400  
P.O. Box 25130 • Wilmington, DE 19899  
Zip Code For Deliveries 19801

Writer's Direct Access:  
(302) 429-4232  
Email: sbrauerman@bayardlaw.com

March 2, 2023

**VIA CM/ECF (FILED UNDER SEAL)**

The Honorable Mitchell S. Goldberg  
United States District Court  
Eastern District of Pennsylvania  
United States Courthouse, Room 7614  
601 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19106

RE: *Arbutus Biopharma Corp., et al. v. Moderna, Inc., et al.*  
C.A. No. 22-252-MSG

Dear Judge Goldberg:

Below is a letter brief from *Amici curiae* Law Professors, Scholars, and Former Government Officials in response to the Statement of Interest filed by the United States of America (the "Government") (D.I. 49) and the Court's February 16, 2023 Order requesting briefing on the impact of the Government's Statement of Interest (D.I. 51).

**Interest of *Amicus Curiae***

*Amici curiae* are law professors, scholars, and former government officials who have researched and published in patent law, takings law, or both. They have an interest in ensuring the integrity of the patent system and the proper application of the federal government's eminent domain power to patented inventions. *Amici* have no stake in the parties or in the outcome of this case. A full list of signatories to this brief is set forth in Addendum A.<sup>1</sup>

**Summary of Argument**

This Court correctly decided that 28 U.S.C. § 1498(a) is inapplicable to a private company that enters into a purchase contract with the federal government for vaccine doses distributed in the healthcare market by other private companies for use by private individuals.

---

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 29(a)(4)(E), *amici* state that no counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part, and that no person other than *amici*, their members, or their counsel contributed money that was intended to fund preparing or submitting the brief.



*See Arbutus Biopharma Corp. v. Moderna, Inc.*, No. CV 22-252, 2022 WL 16635341 (D. Del. Nov. 2, 2022). *Amici* offer supporting legal analysis beyond that provided by the parties that is necessary for this Court to reissue its prior decision, if it decides that some action is necessary given the Statement of Interest by the U.S. Government: The express text, legislative history, and judicial interpretation of § 1498(a) establish that this is an eminent domain statute that has no applicability to the purchase contract between Moderna and the federal government.

The purchase contract between Moderna and the federal government does not meet the express statutory requirement that the patented invention is made or used “by or for the United States,” 28 U.S.C. § 1498(a), or that a contractor uses a patented invention “for the Government.” *Id.* Section 1498(a) is an eminent domain statute, authorizing the U.S. Court of Federal Claims to adjudicate a claim by a patent owner for “reasonable and entire compensation” when its patented invention is “used or manufactured *by or for the United States* without license of the owner.” *Id.* (emphasis added). This is confirmed by the express text and legislative history of § 1498(a) and the consistent interpretation of this statutory provision by courts. Thus, if this Court deems some action is necessary in response to the Statement of Interest of the United States, it should reissue its earlier decision that § 1498(a) is inapposite to the patent infringement claim by Arbutus Biopharma Corporation against Moderna, Inc.

## Argument

### I. Section 1498(a) is an Eminent Domain Statute

#### A. The Provenance of § 1498(a)

The provenance of § 1498(a) is found in nineteenth-century court decisions that patents are private property rights secured under the Takings Clause of the U.S. Constitution. In these decisions, the Supreme Court and lower federal courts consistently held that patents are private property secured under the Constitution. They include, for example:

- “[T]he government cannot, after the patent is issued, make use of the improvement any more than a private individual, without license of the inventor or making compensation to him.” *United States v. Burns*, 79 U.S. 246, 252 (1870).
- A patent owner can seek compensation for the unauthorized use of his patented invention by federal officials because “[p]rivate property . . . shall not be taken for public use without just compensation.” *Cammeyer v. Newton*, 94 U.S. 225, 234 (1876).
- “Inventions secured by letters-patent are property in the holder of the patent, and as such are as much entitled to protection as any other property. . . . Private property, the constitution provides, shall not be taken for public use without just compensation . . . .” *Brady v. Atlantic Works*, 3 F. Cas. 1190, 1192 (C.C.D. Mass. 1876) (Clifford, Circuit Justice), *rev’d on other grounds*, 107 U.S. 192 (1883).



- A patent is not a “grant” of special privilege; the text and structure of the Constitution, as well as court decisions, establish that patents are property rights secured under the Takings Clause). *McKeever v. United States*, 14 Ct. Cl. 396, 421 (1878).

Due to some unfortunate confusion at the turn of the twentieth century concerning the jurisdiction of a court to adjudicate a takings claim by a patent owner, Congress enacted in 1910 the predecessor statute to § 1498(a) to resolve this constitutional confusion. *See* Act of June 26, 1910, ch. 423, 36 Stat. 851, 851-52 (1910) (codified as amended in 28 U.S.C. § 1498(a)). The text and legislative history confirm that this is an eminent domain statute.

The modern Supreme Court has confirmed the long-standing rule that patents are property rights secured under the Takings Clause and Due Process Clauses. Roughly twenty years ago, the Supreme Court held that patents are “property” under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. *See Florida Prepaid Postsecondary Educ. Expense Bd. v. Coll. Sav. Bank*, 527 U.S. 627, 642-43 (1999). In 2015, the Court approvingly quoted an 1882 decision stating that “[a patent] confers upon the patentee an exclusive property in the patented invention which cannot be appropriated or used by the government itself, without just compensation, any more than it can appropriate or use without compensation land which has been patented to a private purchaser.” *Horne v. U.S. Dept. of Agriculture*, 135 S. Ct. 2419, 2427 (2015) (quoting *James v. Campbell*, 104 U.S. 356, 358 (1882)).

### **B. The Legislative History of § 1498(a) Confirms it is an Eminent Domain Statute**

The House committee report for the bill that became § 1498(a) expressly stated that the federal government was using patents without authorization “in flat violation of [the Takings Clause] and the decisions of the Supreme Court.” H.R. Rep. No. 61-1288, at 3 (1910). During the congressional debates leading up to the enactment of § 1498(a), the bill’s sponsor, Representative Currier, emphasized that the legislation “does not create any liability; it simply gives a remedy upon an existing liability.” 45 Cong. Rec. 8755, 8756 (1910). Throughout the congressional debates, legislators repeatedly referenced the earlier-cited court decisions that had already secured to patent owners their constitutional remedy under the Takings Clause. *See* H.R. Rep. No. 61-1288, at 1-4.

### **C. The Text of § 1498(a) Confirms it is an Eminent Domain Statute**

The court precedents and legislative history explain the text of § 1498(a), which provides for claims of compensation arising from exercises of the government’s eminent domain power. Section 1498(a) states that a patent owner can sue the federal government in the Court of Federal Claims (originally the Court of Claims) for “recovery of his reasonable and entire compensation” when a patented invention is “used or manufactured by or for the United States without license of the owner.”



March 2, 2023

Page 4

In 1918, after extensive federal procurement efforts with contractors during World War One, Congress amended § 1498(a) for patent owners to sue the government for reasonable compensation when federal contractors infringe their patents. *See* Act of July 1, 1918, ch. 114, 40 Stat. 704, 705 (1918) (codified as amended in 28 U.S.C. § 1498(a)). This amendment added the “used or manufactured by or for the United States” that currently exists in § 1498(a). *Id.* Consistent with its function as an eminent domain statute, the statute was amended again shortly after the U.S. entered World War Two, requiring suits against the government for compensation for patent infringement by federal contractors, but again this amendment is limited to only when contractors make or use a patented invention “for the Government.” Act of October 31, 1942, Pub. L. 768, § 6, 77th Cong. 2d Sess., 56 Stat. 1013, 1014 (1942) (codified as amended in 28 U.S.C. § 1498(a)).

As this Court recognized, Moderna’s contract is not an example of a contractor making and using a patented invention “for the United States,” as Moderna vaccine doses were distributed by private companies for use by private healthcare patients. The “by and for the United States” text in § 1498(a) limits its applicability to manufacture or use of patent inventions by the federal government, or by federal contractors acting “for the Government,” such as the unauthorized use of patented inventions for the U.S. military in the nineteenth century. *See Burns*, 79 U.S. at 251-54 (1870) (unauthorized use of patented tent by U.S. military); *McKeever*, 14 Ct. Cl. At 417 (unauthorized use of a patented cartridge by U.S. military).

The twentieth-century lawsuits brought by patent owners under § 1498(a) are no different. *See, e.g.,* *Hughes Aircraft Co. v. Messerschmitt-Boelkow-Blohm*, 625 F.2d 580 (5th Cir. 1980); *Hughes Aircraft Co. v. United States*, 534 F.2d 889 (Ct. Cl. 1976); *Croll-Reynolds Co. v. Perini-Leavell-Jones-Vinell*, 399 F.2d 913 (5th Cir. 1968), *cert. denied*, 393 U.S. 1050 (1969). One famous § 1498(a) case arose from the U.S. military’s unauthorized use of a patented battery during World War Two. *See United States v. Adams*, 383 U.S. 39 (1966).

In sum, the plain text of § 1498(a) and its legislative history makes clear that it does not apply to products and services, which may be paid for by the public fisc, but are ultimately made for private companies to distribute for use by private parties. Although the government emphasizes in its Statement of Interest its “authorization or consent of the Government,” 23 U.S.C. § 1498(a), in its purchase agreement with Moderna to manufacture its vaccine doses, such consent triggers this statute only when such manufacture or use is “for the Government.” *Id.* For example, this authorization and consent clearly applies to the use of the vaccine doses for U.S. military personnel and federal employees. Beyond this, § 1498(a) is inapplicable to Moderna’s manufacture of its vaccine doses pursuant to its purchase agreement with the federal government *for use by private patients* in the U.S. healthcare market.

This Court correctly denied Moderna’s motion to dismiss by recognizing that § 1498(a) applies only when a contractor makes or uses a patented invention “for the Government.” *Arbutus Biopharma Corp.*, 2022 WL 16635341, at \*7. The federal government may have derived an incidental benefit from resolution of the COVID-19 public health emergency through the

# 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.