NEAL GERBER EISENBERG

Publication

03/23/2020

Patents and COVID-19 Testing

Patents made the news in a horrible way last week when it was reported that a test manufacturer was being sued for developing tests for COVID-19. Making the optics even worse, the patents were originally owned by Theranos, a testing company based on a "massive fraud," according to the SEC. This news casts the patent system in an unsavory light, where it appears to impede progress rather than promote it. However, it can also illustrate the crucial role of the patent system in healthcare. Despite the bad optics created by one patent litigant in the midst of this COVID-19 crisis, Congress should (in the future) enact legislation to make patents more available for inventions related to diagnostic tests.

On March 9, 2020, Labrador Diagnostics sued BioFire and its parent company bioMérieux, alleging that BioFire's FilmArray products infringed two U.S. patents. After a flood of criticism and revulsion, Labrador announced on March 17 that it will offer a royalty-free license for COVID-19 testing, and it insisted that it did not know BioFire was developing COVID-19 tests. Labrador and BioFire have agreed to extend the date for BioFire's response to June 30, 2020.

Outrage over Labrador's suit was intensified because Labrador does not make COVID-19 tests itself, nor has it announced any plans to do so. Labrador was formed on March 6 and does not have any facilities of its own. Since Labrador is not practicing its patented technology, some called it a "patent troll," an ugly creature demanding money in the form of royalties to let others pass. But that

CLIENT SERVICES
Intellectual Property
Patents
COVID-19 Insights

RELATED PEOPLE
Michael B. Harlin

pejorative term can obscure that many non-practicing entities (such as universities, non-profit research centers, and the National Institutes of Health) regularly make crucial inventions, even though they themselves do not manufacture or distribute those inventions. Instead, the patents covering those inventions are licensed to companies for widespread distribution.

Yet patents are involved in another, less-publicized way in the Labrador story, in that they are used by the test makers to protect their innovation. BioFire's virtual patent marking page lists numerous U.S. patents covering its FilmArray instruments, kits and materials for medical testing. bioMérieux's annual reports confirm the importance of patents to the field of diagnostics:

bioMérieux's statements reflect the primary economic purpose of patents in providing incentives for innovators. The promise of patent protection encourages them to invest in costly research and development (R&D), affording a later opportunity to reap the rewards of their innovations. If bioMérieux and other diagnostic developers lose faith in the patent system, their R&D investments and efforts for diagnostic testing are likely to decline.

The COVID-19 crisis is shining a spotlight on the critical role of diagnostic tests in public health and medical care. However the availability of U.S. patents for diagnostic testing has been drastically diminished over the past decade. Since 2012, the U.S. Supreme Court has expanded the long-standing exceptions to the patent eligibility for "laws of nature" and "natural phenomena" to strike down patents related to diagnostic testing. Congress has considered legislation to reverse this expansion and heard testimony from leading life science innovators about the problem:

NEAL
GERBER
EISENBERG

Even judges from the federal appellate court that decides patent cases have voiced concern over the current state of the law:

In May 2019, a bipartisan group of legislators stated they were working on legislation to revise the patent statutes and eliminate the expanded use of judicial exceptions to strike down patents. Congress undoubtedly has a tremendous number of worries at the moment, but when the COVID-19 crisis subsides, it should resume its consideration of how to make the patent system provide greater incentives for diagnostic testing.

If you have any questions regarding patents or your intellectual property portfolio, please do not hesitate to contact Michael Harlin or your Neal Gerber Eisenberg attorney.

—

---

[1] bioMérieux, 2018 Registration Document and Annual Financial Report, p. 45.

[2] *Id.*

[3] Testimony of Peter O'Neill, Executive Director of Cleveland Clinic Innovations, to the U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Intellectual Property, June 11, 2019.

NEAL
GERBER
EISENBERG

[4] *Athena Diagnostics, Inc. v. Mayo Collaborative Servs., LLC*, 927 F.3d 1333, 1358, 2019 BL 246748, 24 (Fed. Cir. 2019) (Moore, J., dissenting from denial of *en banc* rehearing).