

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

MERCK SHARP & DOHME LLC,  
Petitioner

v.

HALOZYME INC.,  
Patent Owner

---

Case PGR2025-00030  
U.S. Patent No. 12,054,758

---

**PATENT OWNER'S MOTION FOR ADDITIONAL DISCOVERY**

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION: DISCOVERY IS WARRANTED..... 1

II. BACKGROUND: PETITIONER HAS REFUSED TO PROVIDE UNREDACTED VERSIONS OF RELEVANT DOCUMENTS ..... 3

III. ARGUMENT: PETITIONER SHOULD PROVIDE UNREDACTED VERSIONS OF ALL DOCUMENTS..... 4

A. HALOZYME’S DISCOVERY REQUESTS SATISFY THE *GARMIN* FACTORS AND GOOD CAUSE EXISTS FOR THE REQUESTED DISCOVERY .....8

1. *Garmin* Factor 1: More Than a Possibility And Mere Allegation that Useful Information Will Be Found..... 8

2. *Garmin* Factor 2: No Request for Litigation Positions and Underlying Basis..... 10

3. *Garmin* Factor 3: No Ability To Generate Equivalent Information By Other Means ..... 10

4. *Garmin* Factors 4 and 5: Requests Are Easily Understandable and Not Overly Burdensome To Answer ..... 10

IV. CONCLUSION..... 10

**PATENT OWNER’S UPDATED EXHIBIT LIST**

<b>Ex. No.</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>2001</b>	Declaration of Barbara Triggs-Raine, Ph.D. in support of Patent Owner Discretionary Denial Brief (WITHDRAWN)
<b>2002</b>	<i>Curriculum Vitae</i> of Barbara Triggs-Raine, Ph.D.
<b>2003</b>	Disclaimer in a Patent under 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(a), filed in U.S. Patent Application No. 18/066,960, June 13, 2025
<b>2004</b>	“Halozyme Therapeutics to Present Data on PEGPH20 at the Upcoming 2011 EORTC-NCIASCO Annual Meeting,” Halozyme Therapeutics, Inc. Press Release, October 24, 2011
<b>2005</b>	LinkedIn profiles of Michael Shepard, Robert Connor, Ge (Gina) Wei, and Qiping Zhao
<b>2006</b>	Sequence listing of U.S. Patent Application No. 18/066,960
<b>2007</b>	Gifre, L., et al., “Trends in recombinant protein use in animal production,” <i>Microb Cell Fact</i> 16:40 (2017)
<b>2008</b>	“Recombinant Drugs,” Smithsonian Institution, accessible at <a href="https://www.si.edu/spotlight/birth-of-biotech/recombinant-drugs">https://www.si.edu/spotlight/birth-of-biotech/recombinant-drugs</a> (last accessed February 27, 2025)
<b>2009</b>	Naz, R., “Antisperm Contraceptive Vaccines: Where We Are and Where We Are Going?,” <i>American Journal of Reproductive Immunology</i> 66:5-12 (2011)
<b>2010</b>	Primakoff, P., et al., “Fully effective contraception in male and female guinea pigs immunized with the sperm protein PH-20,” <i>Nature</i> 335:543-546 (October 6, 1988)
<b>2011</b>	Definition of “guinea pig,” Merriam-Webster OnLine, archived by the Internet Archive on February 21, 2010, accessible at <a href="https://web.archive.org/web/20100221175034/http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/guinea%20pig">https://web.archive.org/web/20100221175034/http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/guinea%20pig</a> (last accessed February 27, 2025)
<b>2012</b>	“A decade in numbers,” <i>Nature Materials</i> 11:743-744 (September 2012)
<b>2013</b>	Lin, Y., et al., “Molecular cloning of the human and monkey sperm surface protein PH-20,” <i>Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci USA</i> 90:10071-10075 (November 1993)

<b>Ex. No.</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>2014</b>	<i>Intentionally Left Blank</i>
<b>2015</b>	File History of U.S. Patent No. 7,872,107
<b>2016</b>	Pils, B., <i>et al.</i> , “Variation in structural location and amino acid conservation of functional sites in protein domain families,” <i>BMC Bioinformatics</i> 6 (August 25, 2005)
<b>2017</b>	European Patent Application Publication No. 0953574 A1, published November 3, 1999
<b>2018</b>	Duterme, C., <i>et al.</i> , “Two Novel Functions of Hyaluronidase-2 (Hyal2) Are Formation of the Glycocalyx and Control of CD44-ERM Interactions,” <i>The Journal of Biological Chemistry</i> , 284(48):33495-33508 (November 27, 2009)
<b>2019</b>	Atmuri, V., <i>et al.</i> , “Hyaluronidase 3 ( <i>HYAL3</i> ) knockout mice do not display evidence of hyaluronan accumulation,” <i>Matrix Biology</i> 27:653-660 (2008)
<b>2020</b>	Hemming, R., <i>et al.</i> , “Mouse Hyal3 encodes a 45- to 56-kDa glycoprotein whose overexpression increases hyaluronidase 1 activity in cultured cells,” <i>Glycobiology</i> 18(4):280-289 (2008)
<b>2021</b>	Miller, A., “Hyaluronidase 2 and its intriguing role as a cell-entry receptor for oncogenic sheep retroviruses,” <i>Seminars in Cancer Biology</i> 18:296-301 (2008)
<b>2022</b>	Kaneiwa, T. <i>et al.</i> , “Identification of human hyaluronidase-4 as a novel chondroitin sulfate hydrolase that preferentially cleaves the galactosaminidic linkage in the trisulfated tetrasaccharide sequence,” <i>Glycobiology</i> 20(3):300-309 (March 2010)
<b>2023</b>	Petition for Post-Grant Review, <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00004 (P.T.A.B.), November 26, 2024
<b>2024</b>	Petition for Post-Grant Review, <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00003 (P.T.A.B.), November 12, 2024
<b>2025</b>	Petition for Post-Grant Review, <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00009 (P.T.A.B.), December 27, 2024
<b>2026</b>	Petition for Post-Grant Review, <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00006 (P.T.A.B.), December 10, 2024

<b>Ex. No.</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>2027</b>	Petition for Post-Grant Review, <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00017 (P.T.A.B.), January 17, 2025
<b>2028</b>	Petition for Post-Grant Review, <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00024 (P.T.A.B.), February 21, 2025
<b>2029</b>	Declaration of Michael Hecht, Ph.D. (Exhibit 1003), <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00004 (P.T.A.B.), November 26, 2024
<b>2030</b>	Declaration of Michael Hecht, Ph.D. (Exhibit 1003), <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00003 (P.T.A.B.), November 12, 2024
<b>2031</b>	Declaration of Michael Hecht, Ph.D. (Exhibit 1003), <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00009 (P.T.A.B.), December 27, 2024
<b>2032</b>	Declaration of Michael Hecht, Ph.D. (Exhibit 1003), <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00006 (P.T.A.B.), December 10, 2024
<b>2033</b>	Declaration of Michael Hecht, Ph.D. (Exhibit 1003), <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00017 (P.T.A.B.), January 17, 2025
<b>2034</b>	Declaration of Michael Hecht, Ph.D. (Exhibit 1003), <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00024 (P.T.A.B.), February 21, 2025
<b>2035</b>	Lokeshwar, V., <i>et al.</i> , "Regulation of Hyaluronidase Activity by Alternative mRNA Splicing," <i>The Journal of Biological Chemistry</i> 277(37):33654-33663 (2002)
<b>2036</b>	Declaration of Michael Hecht, Ph.D. (Exhibit 1003), <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00033 (P.T.A.B.), March 7, 2025
<b>2037</b>	Petition for Post-Grant Review, <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00033 (P.T.A.B.), March 7, 2025
<b>2038</b>	Declaration of Michael Hecht, Ph.D. (Exhibit 1003), <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00039 (P.T.A.B.), March 28, 2025

<b>Ex. No.</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>2039</b>	Petition for Post-Grant Review, <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00039 (P.T.A.B.), March 28, 2025
<b>2040-2044</b>	<i>Intentionally Left Blank</i>
<b>2046</b>	“2023 Pharma 50: The 50 largest pharma companies in the world,” drugdiscoverytrends.com, accessible at <a href="https://www.drugdiscoverytrends.com/2023-pharma-50-largest-companies/">https://www.drugdiscoverytrends.com/2023-pharma-50-largest-companies/</a> (last accessed April 28, 2025)
<b>2047</b>	“Merck Announces Fourth-Quarter and Full-Year 2024 Financial Results,” Merck Press Release, February 4, 2025
<b>2048</b>	“Products list,” Merck.com, accessible at <a href="https://www.merck.com/products/">https://www.merck.com/products/</a> (last accessed April 28, 2025)
<b>2049</b>	<i>Intentionally Left Blank</i>
<b>2050</b>	“Merck & Company, Inc. Common Stock (new) (MRK),” Nasdaq.com, accessible at <a href="https://www.nasdaq.com/market-activity/stocks/mrk">https://www.nasdaq.com/market-activity/stocks/mrk</a> (last accessed April 28, 2025)
<b>2051</b>	“Halozyme Therapeutics, Inc. Common Stock (HALO),” Nasdaq.com, accessible at <a href="https://www.nasdaq.com/market-activity/stocks/halo">https://www.nasdaq.com/market-activity/stocks/halo</a> (last accessed April 28, 2025)
<b>2052</b>	“Halozyme reports full year 2024 record revenue of \$1.015 billion and Exceeds its Financial Guidance for Royalty Revenue, Adjusted EBITDA and Non-GAAP Diluted EPS,” Halozyme.com, accessible at <a href="https://ir.halozyme.com/news/news-details/2025/HALOZYME-REPORTS-FULL-YEAR-2024-RECORD-REVENUE-OF-1.015-BILLION-AND-EXCEEDS-ITS-FINANCIAL-GUIDANCE-FOR-ROYALTY-REVENUE-ADJUSTED-EBITDA-AND-NON-GAAP-DILUTED-EPS/default.aspx">https://ir.halozyme.com/news/news-details/2025/HALOZYME-REPORTS-FULL-YEAR-2024-RECORD-REVENUE-OF-1.015-BILLION-AND-EXCEEDS-ITS-FINANCIAL-GUIDANCE-FOR-ROYALTY-REVENUE-ADJUSTED-EBITDA-AND-NON-GAAP-DILUTED-EPS/default.aspx</a> (last accessed April 28, 2025)
<b>2053</b>	“Commercial Products,” Halozyme.com, accessible at <a href="https://halozyme.com/commercial-products/">https://halozyme.com/commercial-products/</a> (last accessed April 28, 2025)
<b>2054</b>	“About Us,” Halozyme.com, accessible at <a href="https://halozyme.com/about-us/#our-focus">https://halozyme.com/about-us/#our-focus</a> (last accessed April 28, 2025)
<b>2055</b>	Second Declaration of Barbara Triggs-Raine, Ph.D. in Support of Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response (WITHDRAWN)

<b>Ex. No.</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>2056</b>	Petition for Post-Grant Review, <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00042 (P.T.A.B.), April 15, 2025
<b>2057</b>	Declaration of Michael Hecht, Ph.D. (Exhibit 1003), <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00042 (P.T.A.B.), April 15, 2025
<b>2058</b>	Complaint for Patent Infringement and Declaratory Judgment of Patent Infringement, <i>Halozyme, Inc. v. Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme Corp.</i> , Civil Action No. 2:25-cv-03179-ES (D.N.J.), filed April 24, 2025
<b>2059</b>	“Alteogen announces amendment to license agreement with MSD,” Alteogen Press Release, February 22, 2025, accessible at <a href="https://www.alteogen.com/en/ir_1/?uid=2223&amp;mod=document&amp;pageid=1">https://www.alteogen.com/en/ir_1/?uid=2223&amp;mod=document&amp;pageid=1</a> (last accessed April 28, 2025)
<b>2060</b>	Petition for Post-Grant Review, <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00046 (P.T.A.B.), April 29, 2025
<b>2061</b>	Declaration of Michael Hecht, Ph.D. (Exhibit 1003), <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00046 (P.T.A.B.), April 29, 2025
<b>2062</b>	Petition for Post-Grant Review, <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00050 (P.T.A.B.), May 7, 2025
<b>2063</b>	Declaration of Michael Hecht, Ph.D. (Exhibit 1003), <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00050 (P.T.A.B.), May 7, 2025
<b>2064</b>	Declaration of Michael Hecht, Ph.D. (Exhibit 1003), <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00053 (P.T.A.B.), June 6, 2025
<b>2065</b>	Petition for Post-Grant Review, <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00053 (P.T.A.B.), June 6, 2025
<b>2066</b>	Petition for Post-Grant Review, <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00052 (P.T.A.B.), June 27, 2025
<b>2067</b>	Declaration of Michael Hecht, Ph.D. (Exhibit 1003), <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme Inc.</i> , Case No. PGR2025-00052 (P.T.A.B.), June 27, 2025
<b>2068-2201</b>	<i>Intentionally Left Blank</i>
<b>2202</b>	Declaration of Tyler C. Liu ( <i>served not filed</i> )

<b>Ex. No.</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>2203-2399</b>	<i>Intentionally Left Blank</i>
<b>2400</b>	Merck & Co., Inc. Form 10-Q, Securities and Exchange Commission, November 5, 2025
<b>2401</b>	E-mail Correspondence between Counsel for Petitioner and Patent Owner, January 6, 2026 (CONFIDENTIAL – PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL)
<b>2402</b>	MERCK_PGR00006 - 30November2023 Merck 031988 Master Agreement - executed 4932-6153-3216 1_Redacted (CONFIDENTIAL – PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL)
<b>2403</b>	MERCK_PGR00056 - MSA - Term 4 - Dechert LLP_Signed_Redacted (CONFIDENTIAL – PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL)
<b>2404</b>	MERCK_PGR00467 - Mark Stewart Offer Letter_Redacted (CONFIDENTIAL – PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL)
<b>2405</b>	MERCK_PGR00052 - Hecht Engagement Letter (7-19)_Signed (Redacted)_Redacted (CONFIDENTIAL – PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL)
<b>2406</b>	MERCK_PGR00086 - Park Engagement Letter with signature - sjp (redacted)_Redacted (CONFIDENTIAL – PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL)
<b>2407</b>	“Executive team,” MSD, accessible at <a href="http://www.msd.com/company-overview/leadership/executive-team/">http://www.msd.com/company-overview/leadership/executive-team/</a> (last accessed January 5, 2026)
<b>2408</b>	“Executive team,” Merck, accessible at <a href="http://www.merck.com/company-overview/leadership/executive-team/">http://www.merck.com/company-overview/leadership/executive-team/</a> (last accessed January 5, 2026)
<b>2409</b>	“Board of directors,” MSD, accessible at <a href="http://www.msd.com/company-overview/leadership/board-of-directors/">http://www.msd.com/company-overview/leadership/board-of-directors/</a> (last accessed January 5, 2026)
<b>2410</b>	“Board of directors,” Merck, accessible at <a href="http://www.merck.com/company-overview/leadership/board-of-directors/">http://www.merck.com/company-overview/leadership/board-of-directors/</a> (last accessed January 5, 2026)
<b>2411</b>	“Contact us,” MSD, accessible at <a href="http://www.msd.com/contact-us/">http://www.msd.com/contact-us/</a> (last accessed January 5, 2026)
<b>2412</b>	“Contact us,” Merck, accessible at <a href="http://www.merck.com/contact-us/">http://www.merck.com/contact-us/</a> (last accessed January 5, 2026)
<b>2413</b>	“Who we are,” MSD, accessible at <a href="http://www.msd.com/company-overview/">http://www.msd.com/company-overview/</a> (last accessed January 5, 2026)

<b>Ex. No.</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>2414</b>	“Who we are,” Merck, accessible at <a href="http://www.merck.com/company-overview/">http://www.merck.com/company-overview/</a> (last accessed January 5, 2026)
<b>2415</b>	Merck & Co., Inc. Form 10-K, Securities and Exchange Commission, February 25, 2025
<b>2416</b>	USPTO OED Practitioner Search - Mark J. Stewart
<b>2417</b>	Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. The Johns Hopkins University</i> , IPR2024-00240 (P.T.A.B.), November 30, 2023
<b>2418</b>	Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. The Johns Hopkins University</i> , IPR2024-00622 (P.T.A.B.), March 4, 2024
<b>2419</b>	Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. The Johns Hopkins University</i> , IPR2024-00623 (P.T.A.B.), March 4, 2024
<b>2420</b>	Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. The Johns Hopkins University</i> , IPR2024-00624 (P.T.A.B.), March 4, 2024
<b>2421</b>	Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. The Johns Hopkins University</i> , IPR2024-00625 (P.T.A.B.), March 4, 2024
<b>2422</b>	Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. The Johns Hopkins University</i> , IPR2024-00647 (P.T.A.B.), March 13, 2024
<b>2423</b>	Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. The Johns Hopkins University</i> , IPR2024-00648 (P.T.A.B.), March 13, 2024
<b>2424</b>	Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. The Johns Hopkins University</i> , IPR2024-00649 (P.T.A.B.), March 13, 2024
<b>2425</b>	Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, <i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. The Johns Hopkins University</i> , IPR2024-00650 (P.T.A.B.), March 13, 2024
<b>2426</b>	MERCK_PGR00035 - 20250813 Payment Remittance_Redacted (CONFIDENTIAL – PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL)
<b>2427</b>	MERCK_PGR00042 - Dechert T360 Halozyme - 202500327_Redacted (CONFIDENTIAL – PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL)

<b>Ex. No.</b>	<b>Description</b>
2428	MERCK_PGR00045 - FW_ Attn_ Accounts Receivable Dept - PAYMENT REMITTANCE DETAIL (Nov 2025)_Redacted (CONFIDENTIAL – PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL)
2429	MERCK_PGR00049 - Halozyme - 202000447 - Invoices 5_1_2024-12_22_2025_1 of 3_Redacted (CONFIDENTIAL – PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL)
2430	MERCK_PGR00465 - Mark Stewart Payroll Statement for Dec 12 2025_Redacted (CONFIDENTIAL – PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL)
2431	MERCK_PGR00001 - Workday - Ginkel Organization Screen Shot (CONFIDENTIAL – PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL)
2432	MERCK_PGR00002 - Workday - Lally Organization Screen Shot (CONFIDENTIAL – PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL)
2433	MERCK_PGR00003 - Workday - Majchrzak Organization Screen Shot (CONFIDENTIAL – PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL)
2434	MERCK_PGR00004 - Workday - Stewart Organization Screen Shot (CONFIDENTIAL – PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL)
2435	MERCK_PGR00005 - Workday - Su Organization Screen Shot (CONFIDENTIAL – PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL)
2436	MERCK_PGR00036 - 20250903 Payment Remittance_Redacted (CONFIDENTIAL – PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL)
2437	MERCK_PGR00037 - 20251001 Payment Remittance_Redacted (CONFIDENTIAL – PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL)
2438	MERCK_PGR00038 - 20251203 Payment Remittance_Redacted (CONFIDENTIAL – PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL)
2439	MERCK_PGR00040 - 20251215 Payment Remittance_Redacted (CONFIDENTIAL – PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL)
2440	MERCK_PGR00046 - FW_ Attn_ Accounts Receivable Dept - PAYMENT REMITTANCE DETAIL (Oct 2025)_Redacted (CONFIDENTIAL – PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL)
2441	MERCK_PGR00047 - FW_ Attn_ Accounts Receivable Dept - PAYMENT REMITTANCE DETAIL (Sept 2025)_Redacted (CONFIDENTIAL – PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL)
2442	MERCK_PGR00048 - Halozyme - 202000447 - Invoice IN00125072310 Review History (CONFIDENTIAL – PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL)

<b>Ex. No.</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>2443</b>	MERCK_PGR00050 - Halozyme - 202000447 - Invoices 5_1_2024-12_22_2025_2 of 3_Redacted (CONFIDENTIAL – PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL)
<b>2444</b>	MERCK_PGR00051 - Halozyme - 202000447 - Invoices 5_1_2024-12_22_2025_3 of 3_Redacted (CONFIDENTIAL – PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL)
<b>2445</b>	By-Laws of Merck & Co., Inc., Effective as of November 19, 2024

As authorized by email on December 19, 2025, Patent Owner Halozyme, Inc., moves for additional discovery from Merck Sharp & Dohme LLC (“MSD”).

## **I. INTRODUCTION: DISCOVERY IS WARRANTED**

The Petition here names Petitioner MSD as the *sole* real party-in-interest (“RPI”). *See, e.g.*, Pet. at 6. But information obtained by Halozyme indicates that Merck & Co., Inc. (“Merck & Co.”), MSD’s corporate parent, should have been named as an RPI. Unredacted versions of documents Halozyme seeks via this motion are highly relevant because, as held in *Corning*, a petition that fails to identify all RPI cannot be considered by the Board. *Corning Optical Commc’ns RF, LLC v. PPC Broadband, Inc.*, IPR2014-00440, Paper 68 at 24 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 18, 2015) (designated precedential Oct. 28, 2025) (“*Corning*”).

Even if Petitioner chooses later to amend its Petition to correctly name all RPI, under *Corning*, the Petition will be given a new filing date, which will render it ineligible for PGR review because that date would be after the statutory deadline to file a PGR. 37 C.F.R. § 42.206; *see Corning* at 23-25. In that situation, as in *Corning*, the Board should dismiss the Petition for failure to name all RPI, vacate the Decision on Institution, and terminate the proceeding.<sup>1</sup> *Corning* at 23-25.

In this motion, Halozyme seeks targeted discovery from MSD as it relates to

---

<sup>1</sup> Halozyme expects to request leave to file a motion to dismiss the Petition after the additional discovery process concludes.

RPI. After previously refusing to produce any documents, and only after this motion was authorized, Petitioner reversed course and produced documents containing *extensive* unjustified redactions. This motion merely seeks production of unredacted versions of already produced documents. *See* EX2402-EX2406, EX2426-EX2430, EX2436-EX2441, and EX2443-EX2444.

As discussed below, information available so far indicates, beyond a mere possibility or speculation, that the requested additional discovery is likely to uncover evidence confirming that at least MSD's parent company, Merck & Co., is an unnamed RPI. *See infra* 8-9. For instance, Petitioner admitted after being pressed by Halozyme that it had "[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]" EX2401 at 5 (Dec. 30, 2025 email). Yet Petitioner still refuses to produce unredacted versions of the already produced documents. Those documents and other evidence will likely reveal blurred corporate lines between MSD and Merck & Co., as well as the ability of Merck & Co. to control and fund this PGR proceeding. *Id.*; *Corning* at 15.

Good cause exists for the Board to grant this motion, which merely asks the Board to require Petitioner to produce unredacted copies of documents it has already produced. It is clear from redacted versions already that, at minimum, unredacted versions of these documents are likely relevant to the issue of blurred

lines between MSD and Merck & Co. Unredacted versions of these documents may be produced under seal, per the Board's Default Protective Order, already agreed to by the parties. 37 C.F.R. § 42.224(a); 35 U.S.C. § 326(a)(1), (5).

## **II. BACKGROUND: PETITIONER HAS REFUSED TO PROVIDE UNREDACTED VERSIONS OF RELEVANT DOCUMENTS**

Petitioner has serially filed 15 PGR Petitions challenging 15 related patents owned by Halozyme. All 15 Petitions name MSD as the *sole* RPI. *See, e.g.*, Pet. at 6. Meanwhile, after several of the PGR Petitions were filed, Halozyme filed a lawsuit alleging that MSD's product, KEYTRUDA QLEX™, a second generation KEYTRUDA® product, infringes 12 of Halozyme's patents now involved in these PGR proceedings. EX2058.

On October 28, 2025, the USPTO Director designated *Corning* precedential for its holding that petitions failing to identify all RPI "have not met the requirements" of 35 U.S.C. § 322(a)(2), "and, therefore, are incomplete and cannot be considered." *Corning* at 24. Once *Corning* was designated precedential, rendering the RPI issue outcome-dispositive, Halozyme immediately investigated the issue and contacted Petitioner seeking relevant discovery. Petitioner refused to produce any discovery. Halozyme promptly contacted the Board and sought authorization for this motion, which the Board granted. EX2401 at 2-3.

After that authorization, Petitioner finally provided requested information and *heavily redacted* documents on December 23, 2025, while again maintaining

that Merck & Co. is not an RPI. EX2401 at 7-10 (Dec. 23, 2025 email).

Thereafter, Halozyme has repeatedly requested unredacted versions of the produced documents, and Petitioner has repeatedly refused. EX2401 at 2-3, 5. In doing so, Petitioner has effectively asserted that Halozyme must accept that the redacted portions are irrelevant simply because Petitioner says so.

### **III. ARGUMENT: PETITIONER SHOULD PROVIDE UNREDACTED VERSIONS OF ALL DOCUMENTS**

In this motion, Halozyme requests *unredacted* versions of *all* documents already produced by Petitioner. Some of the most relevant and heavily redacted documents include, for example:

- Engagement Letters for Petitioner's two outside law firms, with Guideline attachments and exhibits, which currently include heavy redactions to entire sections (~75% of ~30 pages), *see* EX2402, EX2403 (MERCK\_PGR00006-034 and MERCK\_PGR00056-85);
- Retainer letters for Petitioner's experts Dr. Hecht (MERCK\_PGR00052-055) and Dr. Park (MERCK\_PGR00086-89), which currently redact entire sections (in 2 out of 3 pages). *See* EX2405, EX2406.
- Employment Offer Letter of Petitioner's back-up counsel Mark Stewart. which currently includes heavy redactions to entire sections (>70% of 7 pages), *see* EX2404 (MERCK\_PGR00467-473);

Halozyme requests unredacted versions of these and other documents that Petitioner produced on December 23, 2025. *See* EX2402-EX2406, EX2426-EX2430, EX2436-EX2441, and EX2443-EX2444.

Notwithstanding Petitioner's conclusory statements to Halozyme, many of the redacted portions of the produced documents appear highly relevant and non-privileged. For instance, Petitioner admitted for the first time in its December 30, 2025 email that Mr. Stewart's Offer Letter "[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]" EX2401 at 5 (Dec. 30, 2025 email). Despite Halozyme's request, Petitioner has not produced an unredacted version of even this portion of his Offer Letter.

As other examples, the two outside counsel engagement agreements include sections [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. It is likely that these sections contain information that bears on the issue of RPI; for example, one or more of these sections is likely to identify or refer to MSD affiliates or corporate partners. As a matter of fairness, Halozyme needs to determine for itself whether these redacted sections are relevant to the issue of RPI and not merely depend on Petitioner's allegations that they are not.

Halozyme thus requests in this motion unredacted versions of the documents (*see* EX2402-EX2406, EX2426-EX2430, EX2436-EX2441, EX2443-EX2444), except to the extent the redacted information is privileged, reflects specific dollar amounts in relation to payment remittances or Mr. Stewart's compensation, or contains information entirely personal to Mr. Stewart, such as his social security

number or home address. EX2401 at 3-4 (Jan. 1, 2026 email). To the extent any information is redacted for these reasons, Halozyme also requests that Petitioner provide a log identifying each document by Bates number, and the exact basis for each individual redaction. *Id.*

When attempting to justify its heavy redactions, Petitioner cited rules and Board decisions that merely discuss when additional discovery is warranted at all. Nothing in those rules or Board decisions authorizes extensive redactions of the type that Petitioner applied here. EX2401 at 5 (Dec. 30, 2025 email). For example, 37 C.F.R. § 42.51(b)(2) and § 42.224 merely state in relevant part that additional discovery “is limited to evidence directly related to factual assertions advanced by either party in the proceeding.” But Halozyme’s request *is* directly related to a factual assertion it advances, i.e., the Petition fails to name all RPI because it should have named Merck & Co. in addition to MSD.

The two Board decisions Petitioner cited are also inapposite. EX2401 at 2-3 (Jan. 2, 2026 email) (citing *Unified Patents, LLC v. American GNC Corp.*, IPR2019-00505, Paper 20 (PTAB Apr. 12, 2019) and *New World Medical, Inc. v. MicroSurgical Tech., Inc.*, IPR2020-01573, Paper 13 (PTAB Dec. 10, 2020)). *Unified Patents* does not address whether a producing party can unilaterally redact portions of a document it deems to be irrelevant in an otherwise relevant document. And *New World Medical* noted that, in contrast to the situation here,

“very little [was] masked by redaction” and that “[a]lmost all of the language of the license agreement is accessible, with only the most specific financial terms redacted.” *Id.* at 6. These specific financial terms had no bearing on RPI. *Id.* Here, on the other hand, whole sections of many documents are redacted.

It is clear from the very cases and quotes that Petitioner selects that these Board decisions do not stand, at all, for the proposition that a party may redact *ad libitum* from discovery it produces. In fact, no Board rule or decision supports Petitioner’s heavy redactions. Indeed, it would frustrate the purpose of discovery, not to mention invite gamesmanship, to allow a party to selectively redact information it judges is irrelevant in otherwise relevant documents. Moreover, especially here, where the parties have already agreed that the production will be covered by the Board’s default protective order, there is no justification merely because the redacted information is allegedly “sensitive.”

The facts here are strikingly similar to *Corning*’s in that Petitioner continues to maintain that it is the only RPI. Even after *Corning* became precedential and Halozyme raised the issue, Petitioner has insisted that its parent company, Merck & Co., is not an RPI. This posture is in stark contrast to the facts in *Adello* where the petitioner admitted its error, stated an RPI was “inadvertently omitted,” and asked to correct the error soon after Patent Owner raised the issue. *Adello Biologics LLC v. Amgen Inc.*, PGR2019-00001, Paper 11 at 2 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 14,

2019). In *Adello*, the Board noted that facts suggested “the omission may have been a human error,” and petitioner was “attempting to be diligent in updating the mandatory notices” upon discovering that error. *Id.* at 5. By contrast, MSD has doubled down on its story that its parent company is not an RPI.

**A. HALOZYME’S DISCOVERY REQUESTS SATISFY THE *GARMIN* FACTORS AND GOOD CAUSE EXISTS FOR THE REQUESTED DISCOVERY.**

Halozyme’s requests are warranted because all five *Garmin* factors are met. See *Garmin International, Inc. v. Cuozzo Speed Technologies LLC*, IPR2012-00001, Paper 26 at 6-7 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 5, 2013) (precedential), as modified by *Bloomberg, Inc. v. Market-Alerts Pty, Ltd.*, CBM2013-00005, Paper 32 at 4 (P.T.A.B. May 29, 2013) (precedential); 37 CFR § 42.224(a).

**1. *Garmin* Factor 1: More Than a Possibility And Mere Allegation that Useful Information Will Be Found**

Under the first *Garmin* factor, “the requester of information should already be in possession of a threshold amount of evidence or reasoning tending to show beyond speculation that something useful will be uncovered.” IPR2012-00001, Paper 26 at 7. MSD has represented to the Board that MSD is the *sole* RPI in these proceedings. Pet. at 6. Information available so far, however, indicates there is a significant likelihood that unredacted versions of documents Petitioner has produced will confirm Merck & Co. is an unnamed RPI.

Examples of already available information include, for example:

- Merck & Co.’s November 5, 2025 public SEC statements and ByLaws: (1) attributing the filing and funding of the PGRs to itself; (2) indicating Merck & Co. indemnifies MSD for its expenses in “any . . . suit,” such these PGRs; (3) specifying that Merck & Co. holds an exclusive license to and pays royalties on components of KEYTRUDA QLEX™, at issue in related litigation, EX2400 at 6, 8, 21, 24-26; EX2445 at 17-18;
- Public websites indicating that MSD and Merck & Co. have the exact same executive leadership (including CEO) and Board of Directors, as well as address, phone number, and business hours, EX2407–EX2414;
- Mark Stewart, back up counsel for Petitioner, listing on an OED document that he practices on behalf of MSD and Merck & Co., EX2416; and
- MSD LLC naming Merck & Co. as an RPI in IPR proceedings related to KEYTRUDA®, a precursor to KEYTRUDA QLEX™, relevant here. EX2417–EX2425.

Consistent with this information, many redacted portions of documents produced by Petitioner appear highly relevant, such as large portions of Mr. Stewart’s Offer Letter, outside counsel engagement letters, and expert retainer agreements.

Petitioner has argued that these redacted sections are “not directly related to the RPI analysis.” EX2401 at 2 (Jan. 2, 2026 email). But surely, there is more than a mere possibility that within, for example, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

sections of the representation letter, there is discussion of corporate affiliations

having a relationship to this proceeding. The same goes for the other sections redacted by Petitioner. Again, Petitioner provides no valid justification for picking and choosing what to redact. Halozyme should be allowed to judge these sections, within otherwise relevant documents, for itself.

**2. *Garmin* Factor 2: No Request for Litigation Positions and Underlying Basis**

The request for unredacted versions of documents that Petitioner has provided does not seek MSD's or Merck & Co.'s litigation positions or basis.

**3. *Garmin* Factor 3: No Ability To Generate Equivalent Information By Other Means**

Halozyme is not able to obtain equivalent information to that redacted in the produced documents by other means. Highly relevant information Halozyme seeks is in MSD's possession and control and is not publicly available.

**4. *Garmin* Factors 4 and 5: Requests Are Easily Understandable and Not Overly Burdensome To Answer**

Halozyme's request for unredacted documents is easily understandable and are not overly burdensome. Petitioner can simply unredact information in documents it has already provided.

**IV. CONCLUSION**

The *Garmin* factors strongly support granting additional discovery.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC

/Eldora L. Ellison/

Eldora L. Ellison, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 39,967  
Attorney for Patent Owner

Date: January 6, 2026

1101 K Street, NW, 10th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 371-2600

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE (37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e))**

I certify that the above-captioned **PATENT OWNER'S MOTION FOR ADDITIONAL DISCOVERY** and Exhibits 2400-2445 were served in their entireties on January 6, 2026, upon the following parties via electronic mail:

Jeffrey P. Kushan (Lead Counsel) [jkushan@sidley.com](mailto:jkushan@sidley.com)  
Leif Peterson (Back-up Counsel) [leif.peterson@sidley.com](mailto:leif.peterson@sidley.com)  
Sue Wang (Back-up Counsel) [sue.wang@sidley.com](mailto:sue.wang@sidley.com)  
Katherine A. Helm (Back-up Counsel) [khelm@dechert.com](mailto:khelm@dechert.com)  
Blaine Hackman (Back-up Counsel) [Blaine.Hackman@dechert.com](mailto:Blaine.Hackman@dechert.com)  
Amy Mahan (Back-up Counsel) [amy.mahan@sidley.com](mailto:amy.mahan@sidley.com)  
Christine M. Engen (Back-up Counsel) [christine.engen@sidley.com](mailto:christine.engen@sidley.com)  
Amit Bhatla (Back-up Counsel) [abhatla@sidley.com](mailto:abhatla@sidley.com)  
Brian M. Goldberg (Back-up Counsel) [Brian.Goldberg@dechert.com](mailto:Brian.Goldberg@dechert.com)  
Mark Stewart (Back-up Counsel) [mark.stewart@merck.com](mailto:mark.stewart@merck.com)  
[HalozymePGRs@sidley.com](mailto:HalozymePGRs@sidley.com)

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC

/Eldora L. Ellison/

Eldora L. Ellison, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 39,967  
Attorney for Patent Owner

Date: January 6, 2026

1101 K Street, NW, 10th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 371-2600