Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

Paper 96
Entered: February 27, 2026

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MERCK SHARP & DOHME LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

HALOZYME, INC.,
Patent Owner.

PGR2025-00003 (11,952,600 B2)	PGR2025-00046 (12,091,692 B2)
PGR2025-00004 (12,018,298 B2)	PGR2025-00024 (12,060,590 B2)
PGR2025-00006 (12,152,262 B2)	PGR2025-00030 (12,054,758 B2)
PGR2025-00009 (12,123,035 B2)	PGR2025-00052 (12,264,345 B1)
PGR2025-00017 (12,110,520 B2)	PGR2025-00042 (12,037,618 B2)
PGR2025-00033 (12,049,652 B2)	PGR2025-00050 (12,077,791 B2)
PGR2025-00039 (12,104,185 B2)	PGR2025-00053 (12,195,773 B2)

Before JEFFREY N. FREDMAN, SUSAN L. C. MITCHELL, CYNTHIA M. HARDMAN, and MICHAEL A. VALEK, *Administrative Patent Judges.*[1]

PER CURIAM

ORDER
Granting Petitioner's Motion to Seal
37 C.F.R. §§ 42.14, 42.54

---

[1] This Order addresses issues in each of the identified proceedings. We exercise our discretion to issue one Order to be filed in each proceeding. The parties are not authorized to use this style heading in subsequent papers. This is not a decision by an expanded panel of the Board. Rather, the listed judges are paneled on various of the listed cases.

Petitioner Merck Sharp & Dohme LLC ("Petitioner") filed a motion to seal the confidential version of its Opposition to Patent Owner's Motion to Terminate (Paper 93) and Exhibits 1236, 1242, and 1244. *See* Paper 92[2] ("Mot.") 1–3.

The standard for granting a motion to seal is "for good cause." 37 C.F.R. § 42.54(a). That standard includes a showing that (1) the information sought to be sealed is truly confidential, (2) a concrete harm would result upon public disclosure, (3) there exists a genuine need to rely in the trial on the specific information sought to be sealed, and (4) on balance, an interest in maintaining confidentiality outweighs the strong public interest in having an open record. *Argentum Pharms. LLC v. Alcon Research, Ltd.*, IPR2017-01053, Paper 27 (PTAB Jan. 19, 2018) (informative), 3–4.

Petitioner represents that the portions of its Opposition to Patent Owner's Motion to Terminate it seeks to seal discuss "Petitioner's confidential information and documents that Petitioner has marked as 'PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL.'" Mot. 2. Petitioner further states that "[t]he documents and information contained therein are indeed confidential, [and] the information sought to be sealed has not been published or otherwise made public." *Id.* Moreover, Petitioner states that "to the best of its ability" it has "limited the material in its Opposition to Patent Owner's Motion to Terminate to non-confidential information" and filed a public, redacted version of its Opposition (Paper 94). *Id.* Regarding the exhibits, Petitioner represents they contain "confidential and highly sensitive

[2] We cite Papers and Exhibits in PGR2025-00003. Similar papers and exhibits were filed in all other captioned proceedings.

information relating to" Petitioner's employee records and tax filings "that have not been published or otherwise made public." *Id.* at 3.

We find that the information Petitioner seeks to seal is limited and is the type of information typically kept confidential as commercially sensitive information. Moreover, the redactions to Petitioner's Opposition appear to be reasonably limited to protecting this information, and therefore strike an appropriate balance with the public's interest in an open record. Accordingly, we grant Petitioner's Motion. 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.14, 42.54.

We remind the parties that confidential information that is subject to a protective order ordinarily becomes public 45 days after final judgment in a trial.[3] *See* Consolidated Office Trial Practice Guide[4] 21–22. There is an expectation that information will be made public where the existence of the information is referred to in a decision to grant or deny a request to institute a review. *Id.* at 22. A party seeking to maintain the confidentiality of information, however, may file a motion to expunge the information from the record prior to the information becoming public. *Id.*; 37 C.F.R. § 42.56.

[3] For purposes of this order, final judgment includes conclusion of any appeal.

[4] *Available at* https://www.uspto.gov/TrialPracticeGuideConsolidated.

ORDER

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby:

ORDERED that, Petitioner's Motion to Seal (Paper 92) is *granted*.

FOR PETITIONER:

Jeffrey Kushan
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
jkushan@sidley.com

Mark Stewart
MERCK SHARP & DOHME LLC
mark.stewart@merck.com

Blaine Hackman
DECHERT LLP
blaine.hackman@dechert.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Eldora Ellison
Trey Powers
Jennifer Chagnon
Tyler Liu
David Holman
Louis Panzica
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC
eellison-ptab@sternekessler.com
tpowers-ptab@sternekessler.com
jchagnon-ptab@sternekessler.com
tliu-ptab@sternekessler.com
dholman-ptab@sternekessler.com
lpanzica@sternekessler.com

Aubrey Haddach
Joshua Mack
HALOZYME, INC.
ahaddach@halozyme.com
jmack@halozyme.com

David Kappos
CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE
dkappos@cravath.com

Lauren Martin
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
laurenmartin@quinnemanuel.com