

[BoxInterferences@uspto.gov](mailto:BoxInterferences@uspto.gov)  
Tel: 571-272-9797

Filed: February 28, 2022

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

**THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, UNIVERSITY  
OF VIENNA, AND EMMANUELLE CHARPENTIER**  
Junior Party

(Applications 15/947,680; 15/947,700; 15/947,718; 15/981,807;  
15/981,808; 15/981,809; 16/136,159; 16/136,165; 16/136,168; 16/136,175;  
16/276,361; 16/276,365; 16/276,368; and 16/276,374),

v.

**THE BROAD INSTITUTE, INC., MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF  
TECHNOLOGY, and PRESIDENT AND FELLOWS OF HARVARD  
COLLEGE,**  
Senior Party

(Patents 8,697,359; 8,771,945; 8,795,965; 8,865,406; 8,871,445; 8,889,356;  
8,895,308; 8,906,616; 8,932,814; 8,945,839; 8,993,233; 8,999,641,  
9,840,713, and Application 14/704,551).

---

Patent Interference No. 106,115 (DK)

---

**Judgment**  
**37 C.F.R. § 41.127(a)**

Before, SALLY GARDNER LANE, JAMES T. MOORE, and DEBORAH KATZ,  
*Administrative Patent Judges.*

KATZ, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

Interference 106,115

1           In the Decision on Priority issued concurrently, we deny Motion 2 filed by  
2 The Regents of the University of California, University of Vienna, and  
3 Emmanuelle Charpentier (“CVC”) (Paper 1579) and grant Motion 5 filed by The  
4 Broad Institute, Inc., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and President and  
5 Fellows of Harvard College (“Broad”) (Paper 2118), both seeking judgment  
6 based on priority under 35 U.S.C. § 102(g).<sup>1</sup> (*See* Paper 2863.) We also deny  
7 Motion 3 filed by CVC (Paper 1558), seeking judgment based on improper  
8 inventorship named on Broad’s involved patents and application. (*See id.*)

9           According, it is

10           ORDERED that judgment on priority is entered against CVC as to Count 1,  
11 the sole count of the interference (*see* Redeclaration, Paper 23, 11:30–13:12);

12           FURTHER ORDERED that the following claims of CVC are finally  
13 refused:

14           Application 15/947,680 – Claims 156–185;

15           Application 15/947,700 – Claims 156–185;

16           Application 15/947,718 – Claims 156–185;

17           Application 15/981,807 – Claims 156–185;

18           Application 15/981,808 – Claims 156–170 and 172–185;

19           Application 15/981,809 – Claims 156–170 and 172–185;

20           Application 16/136,159 – Claims 156–184;

21           Application 16/136,165 – Claims 156–184;

---

<sup>1</sup> Patent interferences continue under the relevant statutes in effect on 15 March 2013. *See* Pub. L. 112-29, § 3(n), 125 Stat. 284, 293 (2011).

Interference 106,115

1 Application 16/136,168 – Claims 156–184;

2 Application 16/136,175 – Claims 156–184;

3 Application 16/276,361 – Claims 3–31;

4 Application 16/276,365 – Claims 3–32;

5 Application 16/276,368 – Claims 3–31;

6 Application 16/276,374 – Claims 3–32.

7 (*See* 35 U.S.C. § 135(a); *see* Redecoration, Paper 23, 13:16–14:9.)

8 FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are directed to 35 USC § 135(c) and  
9 37 C.F.R. § 41.205 regarding the filing of settlement agreements;

10 FURTHER ORDERED that a party seeking judicial review timely serve  
11 notice on the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office; 37 C.F.R.  
12 §§ 90.1 and 104.2. *See* also 37 C.F.R. § 41.8(b);<sup>2</sup> and

13 FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this judgment be entered into the  
14 administrative records of CVC applications 15/947,680; 15/947,700; 15/947,718;  
15 15/981,807; 15/981,808; 15/981,809; 16/136,159; 16/136,165; 16/136,168;  
16 16/136,175; 16/276,361; 16/276,365; 16/276,368; and 16/276,374; and Broad  
17 patents 8,697,359; 8,771,945; 8,795,965; 8,865,406; 8,871,445; 8,889,356;  
18 8,895,308; 8,906,616; 8,932,814; 8,945,839; 8,993,233; 8,999,641;  
19 9,840,713, and application 14/704,551.

---

<sup>2</sup> Attention is directed to *Biogen Idec MA, Inc., v. Japanese Foundation for Cancer Research*, 785 F.3d 648, 654–57 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (determining that pre-AIA § 146 review was eliminated for interference proceedings declared after 5 September 2012).

Interference 106,115

cc (via e-mail):

Attorney for Junior Party

Eldora L. Ellison  
Eric K. Steffe  
David H. Holman  
Byron L. Pickard  
John Christopher Rozendaal  
Paul A. Ainsworth  
Michael E. Joffre  
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.  
eellison-PTAB@sternekessler.com  
esteffe-PTAB@sternekessler.com  
dholman-PTAB@sternekessler.com  
bpickard-PTAB@sternekessler.com  
jcrozendaal-PTAB@sternekessler.com  
painsworth-PTAB@sternekessler.com  
mjoffre-PTAB@sternekessler.com

Li-Hsien Rin-Laures  
RINLAURES LLC  
lily@rinlauresip.com

Sandip H. Patel  
Greta E. Noland  
MARSHALL GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP  
spatel@marshallip.com  
gnoland@marshallip.com

Attorney for Senior Party

Raymond N. Nimrod  
Matthew D. Robson  
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP

Interference 106,115

raynimrod@quinnemanuel.com  
matthewrobson@quinnemanuel.com  
Steven R. Trybus  
LOCKE LORD LLP  
Steven.Trybus@lockelord.com  
patent@lockelord.com