

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 THIRD MOTION TO SEAL**

***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 ..... 1

II. GOVERNING RULES AND PTAB GUIDANCE..... 1

III. IDENTIFICATION OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION ..... 2

    A. Patent Owner’s Reply in Support of the Motion to Terminate .....2

IV. GOOD CAUSE EXISTS FOR GRANTING HALOZYME’S MOTION TO SEAL ..... 2

V. CONCLUSION..... 4

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.14 and 42.54, Patent Owner Halozyme, Inc. (“Halozyme”) respectfully submits this Motion to Seal the confidential version of Patent Owner’s Reply in Support of the Motion to Terminate this Post-Grant Review Proceeding according to the terms of the Default Protective Order entered into this proceeding by the Board.

All of the allegedly confidential material belongs to Petitioner Merck Sharp & Dohme LLC (“Petitioner”) or its parent company Merck & Co., Inc. (collectively, “Merck”). The parties have met and conferred and Petitioner does not oppose this Motion.

## **II. GOVERNING RULES AND PTAB GUIDANCE**

In determining whether to grant a motion to seal, the Board must find “good cause,” 37 C.F.R. § 42.54(a), and “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,” Consolidated Trial Practice Guide, November 2019 (“TPG”), 19. The Board identifies confidential information in a manner “consistent with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c)(1)(G), which provides for protective orders for ... confidential research, development, or commercial information.” *Id.*

Based on the procedure set forth in the TPG, Halozyme seeks to prevent the

disclosure of information Petitioner has alleged is confidential.

### **III. IDENTIFICATION OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION**

Specifically, based on procedure provided in the TPG, Halozyme seeks to prevent the disclosure of information Petitioner has alleged is confidential contained in the Patent Owner's Reply in Support of the Motion to Terminate this Post-Grant Review Proceeding.

#### **A. Patent Owner's Reply in Support of the Motion to Terminate**

Portions of Halozyme's Reply in Support of the Motion to Terminate contain discussions of Merck's information and documents that Petitioner has marked as "PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL." The discussions of Merck's information and documents include references to certain categories of confidential information. Based on Petitioner's representation that the documents and information contained therein are indeed confidential, the information sought to be sealed has not been published or otherwise made public.

Halozyme has, to the best of its ability, limited material in its Reply in Support of the Motion to Terminate to alleged non-confidential information. A public, redacted version of Halozyme's Reply in Support of the Motion to Terminate is filed herewith.

### **IV. GOOD CAUSE EXISTS FOR GRANTING HALOZYME'S MOTION TO SEAL**

Petitioner has represented that public disclosure of information contained in

Patent Owner's Reply in Support of the Motion to Terminate this Post-Grant  
Review Proceeding would significantly harm Petitioner.

The public interest will not be harmed by granting this Motion to Seal. To the contrary, at least according to Petitioner's representations regarding the confidentiality of the underlying information, granting this Motion to Seal would achieve "a balance between the public's interest in maintaining a complete and understandable file history and the parties' interest in protecting truly sensitive information." 77 Fed. Reg. 48,755, 48,760 (Aug. 14, 2012). Therefore, good cause exists for granting this Motion to Seal.

**V. CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Patent Owner respectfully requests that the Board seal the confidential version of Patent Owner's Reply in Support of the Motion to Terminate this Post-Grant Review Proceeding.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC

/Eldora L. Ellison/

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

Date: February 26, 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 THIRD MOTION TO SEAL** was served in its entirety on February 26, 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)  
Amy Mahan (Back-up Counsel) [Amy.mahan@sidley.com](mailto:Amy.mahan@sidley.com)  
Blaine Hackman (Back-up Counsel) [Blaine.Hackman@dechert.com](mailto:Blaine.Hackman@dechert.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  
Lead Attorney for Patent Owner

Date: February 26, 2026

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