

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MODERNA THERAPEUTICS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

PROTIVA BIOTHERAPEUTICS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00739
Patent No. 9,364,435

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.120**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED 1

II.INTRODUCTION 1

III.DR. JANOFF’S DECLARATION IS ENTITLED NO WEIGHT.....4

IV.STATE OF THE ART8

V.PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.....9

VI.CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....11

VII.RESPONSE TO GROUND 1.....14

 A. The petition fails to address the claims as a whole14

 B. The prior art does not teach each and every claim element15

 1. The petition fails to identify a range for conjugated lipid15

 2. The petition’s reliance on broad ranges and non-grounds
 references is misplaced.....17

 C. The petition fails to articulate a reason to combine the prior art
 disclosures18

 D. The petition fails to show any reasonable expectation of success20

 E. The petition mischaracterizes and fails to address the full scope
 of unexpected results21

 F. The petition fails to address prior art teachings contrary to the
 proffered obviousness theory28

 G. Dependent Claims 2-2029

 1. Claim 530

 2. Claim 631

 3. Claim 731

 4. Claim 831

 5. Claim 1332

 6. Claim 1432

 7. Claims 16-2032

VIII.RESPONSE TO GROUND 233

 A. The petition fails to assess the full scope and content of Lin and

;

Ahmad	33
B. The petition fails to demonstrate motivation to combine	36
C. The petition fails to show any reasonable expectation of success	37
IX.RESPONSE TO GROUND 3	39
A. The prior art does not disclose each and every element of the challenged claims	39
1.L054 is not a nucleic acid-lipid particle	39
2.The prior art ranges are not sufficiently specific	44
B. The challenged claims are not obvious over the '554 publication	46
C. Dependent Claims 2-20	48
1. Claim 5	48
2. Claim 6	49
3. Claim 7	49
4. Claim 8	49
5. Claim 11	50
6. Claim 13	51
7. Claims 14, 16-20	52
X.OBJECTIVE INDICIA OF NONOBVIOUSNESS	53
A. Long-felt need	55
B. Failure of Others.....	57
C. Skepticism	58
D. Unexpected Results	59
E. Commercial Success.....	61
XI.THE PETITION DOES NOT COMPORT WITH STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	62
XII.CONCLUSION	63
XIII.APPENDIX	65

I. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED

Moderna Therapeutics, Inc. (“Petitioner”) filed a petition for *inter partes* review of claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent No. 9,364,435 (the “’435 patent,” EX1001). The Board issued its decision instituting trial (Paper 15) on all grounds set forth in the petition. Protiva Biotherapeutics, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) hereby requests that the Board now issue a final written decision confirming that claims 1-20 are not unpatentable.

II. INTRODUCTION

The nucleic acid-lipid particles claimed by the ’435 patent have achieved tremendous recognition in the field of genetic therapy. The ’435 patent is now listed in FDA’s Orange Book as protecting the patisiran—tradename “Onpattro”—commercial product. EX2027. Patisiran received regulatory approval in the U.S. and Europe and has been designated by the FDA as a “first-in-class” drug. EX2024.

The therapeutic potential of genetic therapy has been appreciated for over 25 years, but effectively delivering nucleic acids to target cells without eliciting vehicle-related toxicity has prevented realization of this potential. *See e.g.*, EX2011 at 38, 42; EX2014 at 11. By 2008, the industry-wide failure to identify a solution to the delivery problem resulted in waning confidence. EX2015 at 2, 10. Dr. Phillip Sharp, Nobel Laureate and co-founder of Alnylam Pharmaceuticals, was asked about the challenges that lie ahead for RNAi drugs he answered “Delivery, delivery,

delivery.” EX2014 at 11; *see also* EX2016, Title of Article (“Merck’s Alan Sachs, on RNAi’s Big Challenge: Delivery, Delivery, Delivery”); EX2011 at 42 (“Delivery, delivery, delivery.”).

The nucleic acid-lipid particle formulations of the ’435 patent solved a long-felt need for compositions that could safely and effectively deliver nucleic acids to target cells of patients. Skilled artisans were skeptical that compositions having high levels of cationic lipid (i.e., 50 mol % to 85 mol %) and low levels of conjugated lipid (i.e., 0.5 mol % to 2 mol %) would be effective, let alone well-tolerated when administered *in vivo*. The combination of effectiveness and low toxicity that characterizes the claimed compositions surprised many in the field, and finally solved the delivery problem that hindered the field for decades.

Given the innovation protected by the ’435 patent, the petition is a poorly conceived challenge. It seeks troubling shortcuts rather than providing any *bona fide* obviousness analysis addressing motivation to combine and reasonable expectation of success in view of the state of the art at the time. In numerous instances, the petition fails to coherently identify the specific invalidity theories on which its challenge is based.

The obviousness challenges of Grounds 1 and 3 argue for a *prima facie* case of obviousness on a per-limitation basis for what it contends are overlapping ranges of individual claim elements. Petitioner then rests on its putative “*prima facie*” case

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.