

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MODERNA THERAPEUTICS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

ARBUTUS BIOPHARMA CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2019-00554
Patent 8,058,069 B2

Before CHRISTOPHER G. PAULRAJ, JACQUELINE T. HARLOW and
TIMOTHY G. MAJORS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

HARLOW, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Institution of *Inter Partes* Review
35 U.S.C. § 314

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner, Moderna Therapeutics, Inc., filed a Petition (Paper 1, “Pet.”), requesting *inter partes* review of claims 1–22 of U.S. Patent No. 8,058,069 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’069 patent”). Patent Owner, Arbutus Biopharma Corporation, timely filed a Preliminary Response (Paper 7, “Prelim. Resp.”).

Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a), an *inter partes* review may not be instituted unless the information presented in the petition “shows that there is a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition.” For the reasons stated below, we determine that there is a reasonable likelihood that Petitioner would prevail with respect to at least one challenged claim. We hereby institute *inter partes* review of the challenged claims on all the grounds of unpatentability asserted in the Petition.

A. Related Matters

Petitioner filed petitions seeking *inter partes* review of two additional patents held by Patent Owner in IPR2018-00680, challenging U.S. Patent No. 9,404,127 B2, and IPR2018-00739 (“the ’739 IPR”), challenging U.S. Patent No. 9,364,435 B2 (“the ’435 patent”).¹ Pet. 4; Paper 4, 2–3. The Board instituted review in each proceeding on September 11, 2018.

¹ Patent Owner explains that Protiva Biotherapeutics, Inc., identified as the patent owner in IPR2018-00680 and IPR2018-00739, previously “existed as a wholly-owned subsidiary of Arbutus Biopharma Corporation,” and was “amalgamated into Arbutus Biopharma Corporation in January 2018.” Paper 4, 2.

See IPR2018-00680 (Paper 13); IPR2018-00739 (Paper 15). The '435 patent at issue in the '739 IPR is a continuation of the '069 patent challenged here. Ex. 1002, (63).

B. The '069 Patent

The '069 patent relates to “stable nucleic acid-lipid particles (SNALP) comprising a nucleic acid (such as one or more interfering RNA), methods of making the SNALP, and methods of delivering and/or administering the SNALP.” Ex. 1001, Abstract. The '069 patent states that

[t]he present invention is based, in part, upon the surprising discovery that lipid particles comprising from about 50 mol % to about 85 mol % of a cationic lipid, from about 13 mol % to about 49.5 mol % of a non-cationic lipid, and from about 0.5 mol % to about 2 mol % of a lipid conjugate provide advantages when used for the in vitro or in vivo delivery of an active agent, such as a therapeutic nucleic acid (e.g., an interfering RNA).

Id. at 5:44–51. The '069 patent further states that

the present invention provides stable nucleic acid-lipid particles (SNALP) that advantageously impart increased activity of the encapsulated nucleic acid (e.g., an interfering RNA such as siRNA) and improved tolerability of the formulations in vivo, resulting in a significant increase in the therapeutic index as compared to nucleic acid-lipid particle compositions previously described. Additionally, the SNALP of the invention are stable in circulation, e.g., resistant to degradation by nucleases in serum and are substantially non-toxic to mammals such as humans.

Id. at 5:51–61.

The '069 patent identifies specific SNALP formulations that encapsulate siRNA as the nucleic acid, such as the “1:57 SNALP” and the “1:62 SNALP,” and states that “the Examples herein illustrate that the improved lipid particle formulations of the invention are highly effective in

downregulating the mRNA and/or protein levels of target genes.” Ex. 1001, 5:61–6:3. In characterizing the 1:57 SNALP and 1:62 SNALP formulations, the ’069 patent explains that these are “target formulations, and [] the amount of lipid (both cationic and non-cationic) present and the amount of lipid conjugate present in the formulation may vary.” *Id.* at 68:35–39. In this regard, the ’069 patent explains that the 1:57 SNALP formulation usually includes 57 mol % \pm 5 mol % cationic lipid and 1.5 mol % \pm 0.5 mol % lipid conjugate, with non-cationic lipid making up the balance of the formulation. *Id.* at 68:39–44. Similarly, the 1:62 SNALP formulation typically includes 62 mol % \pm 5 mol % cationic lipid and 1.5 mol % \pm 0.5 mol % lipid conjugate, with non-cationic lipid making up the remainder. *Id.* at 68:44–48.

The ’069 patent describes several studies comparing the efficacy of siRNA encapsulated in different SNALP formulations. For example, in a study examining siRNA SNALP formulations directed at silencing Eg5, a kinesin-related protein critical for mitosis in mammalian cells (Ex. 1001, 68:55–62), the ’069 patent reports that the 1:57 SNALP formulation “was among the most potent inhibitors of tumor cell growth at all siRNA concentrations tested” (*id.* at 70:19–22). Similarly, in a test of SNALP formulations targeting apolipoprotein B (“ApoB”), a protein associated with hypercholesterolemia (*id.* at 70:55–59), the ’069 patent explains that the 1:57 SNALP formulation “was the most potent at reducing ApoB expression in vivo” (*Id.* at 72:21–23). The ’069 patent also reports experimental results indicating that the ApoB 1:57 SNALP formulation “was more than 10 times as efficacious as the 2:30 SNALP [a prior art SNALP composition] in

mediating ApoB gene silencing in mouse liver at a 10-fold lower dose” (*id.* at 73:64–67), and that the “1:57 and 1:62 SNALP formulations had comparable ApoB silencing activity in vivo” (*id.* at 74:51–53).

C. Challenged Claims

Petitioner challenges claims 1–22 of the ’069 patent. Claim 1, the sole independent claim of the ’069 patent, is illustrative, and is reproduced below:

1. A nucleic acid-lipid particle comprising:
 - (a) a nucleic acid;
 - (b) a cationic lipid comprising from 50 mol % to 65 mol % of the total lipid present in the particle;
 - (c) a non-cationic lipid comprising a mixture of a phospholipid and cholesterol or a derivative thereof, wherein the phospholipid comprises from 4 mol % to 10 mol % of the total lipid present in the particle and the cholesterol or derivative thereof comprises from 30 mol % to 40 mol % of the total lipid present in the particle; and
 - (d) a conjugated lipid that inhibits aggregation of particles comprising from 0.5 mol % to 2 mol % of the total lipid present in the particle.

Ex. 1001, 91:23–35.

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.