

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

ACUITAS THERAPEUTICS INC.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 1:22-cv-02229-MKV
)	
GENEVANT SCIENCES GMBH and)	
ARBUTUS BIOPHARMA CORP.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

**PLAINTIFF ACUITAS THERAPEUTICS INC.’S OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANTS’ MOTION TO DISMISS THE FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Nicholas Groombridge
Eric Alan Stone
Josephine Young
Allison C. Penfield
Chih-wei Wu
PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON
& GARRISON LLP
1285 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10019
(212) 373-3000

Saurabh Gupta (*pro hac vice* granted)
PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON
& GARRISON LLP
Washington, D.C. 20006-1047
(202) 223-7300

Attorneys for Plaintiff Acuitas Therapeutics Inc.

Dated: November 1, 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preliminary Statement.....	1
Statement of Facts.....	4
Argument	9
I. This Court Has Subject Matter Jurisdiction Because Acuitas’s Declaratory Judgment Action Presents “a Case of Actual Controversy” Between the Parties	10
A. The Risk of Having To Indemnify BioNTech Creates Subject Matter Jurisdiction Over Acuitas’s Declaratory Judgment Action	10
B. The Risk That Arbutus and Genevant Could Sue Acuitas for Indirect Infringement Creates Subject Matter Jurisdiction Over Acuitas’s Declaratory Judgment Action	14
C. Defendants’ “Four Reasons” Provide No Basis to Dismiss the Complaint.....	15
II. The Court Should Not Exercise Its Discretion To Dismiss the Complaint	18
III. While No Dismissal Is Warranted, Any Dismissal Would Be Without Prejudice	20
Conclusion	21

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>3M Co. v. Avery Denison Corp.</i> , 673 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	10, 12
<i>ABB Inc. v. Cooper Indus., Inc.</i> , 635 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	13, 14
<i>Allied Mineral Prods., Inc. v. OSMI, Inc.</i> , 870 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	17
<i>Arbutus Biopharma Corp. v. Moderna, Inc.</i> , 1:22-cv-00252-MSG (D. Del. Feb. 28, 2022).....	17
<i>Arris Grp., Inc. v. British Telecomms. PLC</i> , 639 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	15, 16
<i>BroadSign Int’l, LLC v. T-Rex Prop. AB</i> , No. 16 CV 04586-LTS, 2018 WL 357317 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 10, 2018).....	12
<i>Cedars-Sinai Med. Ctr. v. Watkins</i> , 11 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1993).....	10, 20
<i>Commn’s Test Design, Inc. v. Contec, LLC</i> , 952 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	19
<i>EMC Corp. v. Norand Corp.</i> , 89 F.3d 807 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	20
<i>Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Acceleron LLC</i> , 587 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Intel Corp. v. Future Link Sys., LLC</i> , No. CV 14-377-LPS, 2015 WL 649294 (D. Del. Feb. 12, 2015).....	12
<i>Lifeguard Licensing Corp. v. Kozak</i> , 371 F. Supp. 3d 114 (S.D.N.Y. 2019).....	21
<i>MedImmune, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , 549 U.S. 118 (2007).....	10
<i>Micron Tech., Inc. v. Mosaid Techs., Inc.</i> , 518 F.3d 897, 903 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	19
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. DataTern, Inc.</i> , 755 F.3d 899 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	11, 12, 15

Microsoft Corp. v. SynKloud Techs., LLC,
484 F. Supp. 3d 171 (D. Del. 2020).....12

Mitek Sys., Inc. v. United Servs. Auto. Ass’n,
34 F.4th 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2022) *passim*

Monolithic Power Sys., Inc. v. O2 Micro Int’l Ltd.,
No. C 07-2363 CW, 2008 WL 3266647 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 6, 2008)17

Organic Seed Growers & Trade Ass’n v. Monsanto Co.,
718 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cr. 2013).....16

Proofpoint, Inc. v. InNova Pat. Licensing, LLC,
No. 5:11-CV-02288-LHK, 2011 WL 4915847 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 17, 2011).....12, 21

SanDisk Corp. v. STMicroelectronics, Inc.,
480 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....19, 20

SRI Int’l Inc. v. Advanced Tech. Lab’ys, Inc.,
127 F.3d 1462 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....13

Tasini v. New York Times Co.,
184 F. Supp. 2d 350 (S.D.N.Y. 2002).....21

Univ. of Pittsburgh v. Varian Med. Sys., Inc.,
569 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....20

Warner-Lambert Co. v. Apotex Corp.,
316 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....15

Statutes

28 U.S.C. § 2201.....10

35 U.S.C. § 271.....14, 15

35 U.S.C. § 287..... *passim*

Other Authorities

Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).....20

Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1).....20, 21

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

This case presents a controversy over which federal courts have subject-matter jurisdiction: A declaratory judgment action by a product supplier against patent owners who have threatened to sue that supplier's customers, in circumstances that could implicate the supplier's own liability. The Federal Circuit reconfirmed the justiciability of such cases earlier this year, in an opinion that Defendants omit. *See Mitek Sys., Inc. v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 34 F.4th 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2022).

This case is about Comirnaty®, commonly known as the “Pfizer vaccine” against COVID-19. Despite the shorthand, Pfizer actually worked with a company called BioNTech to develop Comirnaty®. One of the critical components of Comirnaty®, a messenger RNA (“mRNA”) vaccine, is a lipid nanoparticle (“LNP”) made up of compounds called lipids that can protect the mRNA so that it can be safely delivered into the person's cells. Pursuant to a license agreement, Plaintiff Acuitas provided BioNTech with the lipids in Comirnaty®. Acuitas worked for over a decade to develop those lipids. Acuitas's hard work and insights were essential to Comirnaty®'s success.

Defendants Arbutus and Genevant, on the other hand, had nothing to do with the development of Comirnaty®, or of Acuitas's lipids used therein. None of Defendants' own lipids or mRNA-LNPs are used in any approved product. Yet they appear to have been writing patent claims to try to ensnare Comirnaty®, and they sent demand letters to Pfizer, copying Acuitas's licensee and partner BioNTech, preserving their right to seek damages for patent infringement under nine Arbutus patents they say Comirnaty® may infringe. All of those patents allegedly encompass compositions containing lipids and mRNA.

In response to Defendants' letters, BioNTech formally notified Acuitas of an indemnification claim under the Acuitas-BioNTech License Agreement. Acuitas then brought this

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.