

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Moderna Therapeutics, Inc.

Petitioner

v.

Protiva Biotherapeutics, Inc.

Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2019-00554
U.S. Patent No. 8,058,069

PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PROTIVA'S RESPONSE

Mail Stop: PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. PROTIVA’S EXPERT HAS MINIMAL EXPERIENCE WITH CATIONIC LIPIDS.....	2
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	3
IV. THE INSTITUTED GROUNDS.....	4
A. An Overlapping Phospholipid Range Is Disclosed.....	5
B. The Same Four Lipid-Component Carrier Particles Are Disclosed	6
C. Routine Optimization Of Lipid-Carrier Particles.....	7
(1) OPTIMIZATION OF THE CATIONIC LIPID.....	11
(2) OPTIMIZATION OF THE CONJUGATED LIPID	18
(3) OPTIMIZATION OF THE CHOLESTEROL.....	20
(4) OPTIMIZATION OF THE PHOSPHOLIPID.....	21
D. Dependent Claims	22
V. SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS CANNOT OVERCOME PETITIONER’S OBVIOUSNESS SHOWING.....	24
A. The Test Data Is Not Commensurate With Claim Scope	24
B. Test Data Does Not Show Unexpected Results	25
C. Other Secondary Considerations Lack The Required Nexus Or Are Attributable To The Prior Art.....	27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>In re Applied Materials, Inc.</i> , 692 F.3d 1289 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	7, 11, 12, 13
<i>In re Baxter-Travenol Labs.</i> , 952 F.2d 388 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	27
<i>Genentech, Inc. v. Hospira, Inc.</i> , 946 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	4, 5
<i>IXI IP, LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.</i> , 903 F.3d 1257 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	5
<i>In re Kulling</i> , 897 F.2d 1147 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	24
<i>Tokai Corp. v. Easton Enters., Inc.</i> , 632 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	24
<i>Wyers v. Master Lock Co.</i> , 616 F.3d 1231 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	24

LIST OF EXHIBITS RELIED UPON IN THE REPLY

Exhibit No.	References
1020	Declaration of Thomas J. Anchordoquy, Ph.D. iso Petitioner's Reply to Protiva's Response ("Anchordoquy")
1021	Curriculum Vitae of Thomas J. Anchordoquy
1022	Final Written Decision in IPR2018-00739, Paper 51, Entered September 11, 2019
1023	Onpattro Labeling, Application No. 210922Orig1s000
1024	Ian MacLachlin, Liposomal Formulations for Nucleic Acid Delivery (2007)
1025	Deposition of David H. Thompson, Ph.D. taken January 15, 2020
1026	Akinc <i>et. al.</i> , Onpattro story and clinical translation of nanomedicines containing nucleic acid-based drugs, Nature Nanotechnology, Vol. 14, Dec. 2019, pp. 1084-1087
1027	Zimmerman <i>et. al.</i> , RNAi-mediated gene silencing in non-human primates, 2006 Nature Publishing Group
1028	U.S. Patent No. 7,799,565 issued to MacLachlan, Sept. 21, 2010

I. INTRODUCTION

The Board ordered an IPR over the '069 patent with respect to grounds 1-3 for claims 1-22. In response, Patent Owner Protiva relies upon the mistaken premises that (1) the prior art references do not teach overlapping ranges for the phospholipid component (Response, 12-18) and (2) the disclosed ranges are too broad to support routine optimization (*id.*, 19-30). Both are demonstrably false. First, Protiva's expert admits that the cited references disclose an overlapping phospholipid range and actual prior art testing demonstrating phospholipid concentrations overlapping with the claimed range. Second, Protiva's own prior test data confirms the regular practice in the field of optimizing lipid concentrations and provides a starting point for such routine optimization.

Protiva relies heavily on its expert's belief that all the "cationic lipids should be minimized" because of toxicity concerns. Response, 29. This oversimplification evinces Protiva's expert's inexperience with lipid carrier particles. It was well known years before the '069 patent that ionizable cationic lipids can be used in high amounts to create particles that are substantially non-toxic. *See, e.g.*, EX1004, [0151].

Faced with prior disclosures of particle formulations with overlapping ranges for all claimed lipid components rendering the claims *prima facie* obvious, Protiva seeks to cloud the matter as much as possible. For example, Protiva points to 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.