Paper No. 38
Filed: September 19, 2024

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BAYER CROPSCIENCE LP, MONSANTO COMPANY, AND
INARI AGRICULTURE, INC.,

Petitioners,

v.

CORTEVA AGRISCIENCE LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2023-01037[1]
Patent 11,149,283

PATENT OWNER'S FOURTH UNOPPOSED MOTION TO SEAL

[1] The Board joined Inari Agriculture, Inc. as a party (Petitioner) to this proceeding via a Motion for Joinder in IPR2024-00180.

I. Introduction

Patent Owner Corteva Agriscience LLC requests that the confidential version Petitioners' Demonstrative Exhibits be sealed under 37 C.F.R. § 42.54. Good cause to seal exists because (i) a public, redacted version of the Demonstrative Exhibits is also being filed by Petitioners, and (ii) the redacted portions of the Demonstrative Exhibits quote, discuss, and/or refer to confidential information in previously sealed Exhibits 2002 and 2004, which reflect Patent Owner's proprietary protein research information that is not publicly available.

The Board previously entered the parties' agreed-upon Protective Order and granted Patent Owner's motion to seal such confidential information in Exhibits 2002 and 2004. *See* Paper 16; Paper 7. Here, the same reasons support granting Patent Owner's fourth motion to seal. In response to Patent Owner's inquiry, counsel for Petitioner confirmed that Petitioner does not oppose this motion.

II. Governing Rules and PTAB Guidance

Under 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(1), the default rule is that all papers filed in an *inter partes* review are open and available for access by the public, but a party may file a concurrent motion to seal and the information at issue shall be sealed pending the outcome of the motion.

Similarly, 37 C.F.R. § 42.14 provides:

> The record of a proceeding, including documents and things, shall be made available to the public, except as otherwise ordered. A party intending a document or thing to be sealed shall file a motion to seal concurrent with the filing of the document or thing to be sealed. The document or thing shall be provisionally sealed on receipt of the motion and remain so pending the outcome of the decision on the motion.

It is, however, only "confidential information" that is protected from disclosure. 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(7) ("The Director shall prescribe regulations -- . . . providing for protective orders governing the exchange and submission of confidential information"). In that regard, the *Office Trial Practice Guide*, 77 *Fed. Reg.* 48756, 48760 (Aug. 14, 2012) provides:

> The rules aim to strike a balance between the public's interest in maintaining a complete and understandable file history and the parties' interest in protecting truly sensitive information.
>
> * * *
>
> *Confidential Information*: The rules identify confidential information in a manner consistent with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c)(1)(G), which provides for protective orders for trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information. § 42.54.

III. Identification of Confidential Information

The confidential information in Petitioners' Demonstrative Exhibits consists of Patent Owner's proprietary protein research information that is not publicly available. This information is contained in the following document:

- Petitioners' Demonstrative Exhibits at pages 34 and 35.

IV. Good Cause Exists for Sealing the Confidential Information

The Board's rules identify confidential information in a manner consistent with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c)(1)(G), which provides for protective orders for trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information. Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,760 (Aug. 14, 2012) ("The rules identify confidential information in a manner consistent with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c)(1)(G), which provides for protective orders for trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information."). Here, the confidential information that Patent Owner seeks to seal pertains to proprietary protein research information that is not publicly available.

The Board has found good cause to seal proprietary scientific research information under similar circumstances and should find the same here. For example, in *Inari Agriculture, Inc. v. Corteva Agriscience LLC*, the Board found good cause to grant motions to seal documents regarding "proprietary protein research information." PGR2023-00022, Paper 22 at 3-4 (PTAB February 5, 2024);

see also PGR2023-00022, Paper 29 at 2-3 (PTAB May 9, 2024). Similarly, in *Illumina, Inc. v. Cornell Research Foundation, Inc.*, the Board found good cause to grant a patent owner's motion to seal a document containing non-public research data. IPR2016-00549, Paper 20 at 4-6 (PTAB May 26, 2017); *see also* IPR2016-00553, Paper 21 at 4-6 (PTAB May 26, 2017); IPR2016-00557, Paper 52 at 4-6 (PTAB May 26, 2017); IPR2016-00559, Paper 21 at 4-6 (PTAB May 26, 2017). The Board also found good cause to seal portions of a declaration and the Patent Owner's Response that cited such non-public data. IPR2016-00549, Paper 20 at 4-6 (PTAB May 26, 2017). In *Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.*, the Board similarly found good cause to grant a patent owner's motion to seal copies of documents that contained "proprietary technical and product development information," as well as declarations and papers discussing that confidential information. IPR2013-00517, Paper 83 at 4-5 (PTAB Jan. 29, 2015).

Here, the confidential information quoted, discussed, and/or referred to in the Petitioner's Demonstrative Exhibits is the content from the already sealed Exhibits 2002 and 2004, which is confidential information reflecting Patent Owner's non-public research. Patent Owner has maintained these Exhibits and the information they contain as confidential and proprietary. If such non-public research data is made public, it would create a competitive disadvantage for Patent Owner.

Accordingly, there is good cause to grant this fourth motion to seal.

V. Proposed Protective Order

On January 8, 2024, the Board entered the parties' agreed-upon Protective Order that was attached as Appendix A to the first unopposed Motion to Seal (Paper 7). *See* Paper 16. This previously entered Protective Order will also govern the treatment of the Petitioner's Demonstrative Exhibits and the confidential information therein.

VI. Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, Patent Owner respectfully requests that the Board grant this fourth unopposed motion to seal.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 19, 2024

/Pier D. DeRoo/
Pier D. DeRoo
Reg. No. 69,340

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the foregoing **Patent Owner's Fourth Unopposed Motion to Seal** was served electronically via email on September 19, 2024, in its entirety on the following:

Dov P. Grossman
Ben Picozzi
Williams & Connolly LLP
680 Maine Avenue SW
Washington, DC 20024
dgrossman@wc.com
bpicozzi@wc.com

Scott A. McKeown
Jonathan B. Roses
Charles T. Steenburg
Eric J. Rutt
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, MA 02210-2206
SMcKeown-PTAB@WolfGreenfield.com
JRoses-PTAB@WolfGreenfield.com
Charles.Steenburg@WolfGreenfield.com
Eric.Rutt@WolfGreenfield.com

Petitioners have consented to service by email.

Dated: September 19, 2024

/William Esper/
William Esper
Legal Assistant and PTAB Coordinator
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,
Garrett & Dunner, LLP