UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD PHARMACOSMOS A/S, Petitioner, v. LUITPOLD PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., Patent Owner. Case IPR2015-01490 (Patent 7,754,702 B2)

OBJECTIONS TO PETITIONER'S REPLY AND OPPOSITION EVIDENCE



OBJECTIONS TO PETITIONER'S REPLY AND OPPOSITION EVIDENCE

Under 37 C.F.R. 42.64(b)(1), Patent Owner Luitpold objects to the following exhibits recently served by Petitioner Pharmacosmos. These objections are being timely filed and served within five business days of the June 20, 2016 service of Petitioner's evidence in support of its reply brief and its opposition to Patent Owner's motion to amend.

The objections are based on the Federal Rules of Evidence (FRE) and the Board's rules in Part 42 of 37 C.F.R. (Bd. R.):

Exhibit No.	Objection
Exhibit 1055	FRE 401, 402, 801, 802. Lack of relevance of this purported 2015 document. Hearsay and hearsay within hearsay.
Exhibit 1056	FRE 401, 402, 801, 802. Lack of relevance of this purported 2015 document. Hearsay and hearsay within hearsay.
Exhibit 1057	FRE 401, 402, 801, 802. Lack of relevance of this purported 2014 document; hearsay.
Exhibit 1059	FRE 401, 402, 801, 802, 901. Lack of relevance; hearsay; lack of authentication. No witness testifies about any relevance of this purported 2016 document or how it supposedly bears on the



Exhibit No.	Objection
	amended claims, nor about its content or authenticity.
Exhibit 1060	FRE 401, 402, 801, 802, 901. Lack of relevance of this purported 2011 document; hearsay; lack of authentication (for example, no witness testifies about the authenticity of this document).
Exhibit 1061	FRE 401, 402, 801, 802, 901. Lack of relevance of this purported 2016 printout; hearsay; lack of authentication (for example, no witness testifies about the authenticity of this document).
Exhibit 1062	FRE 401, 402, 801, 802. Lack of relevance and hearsay; no witness testifies about the relevance or content of this 1999 document.
Exhibit 1063	FRE 401, 402, 801, 802, 901. Lack of relevance of this purported 2016 article; hearsay; lack of authentication (for example, no witness testifies about the authenticity of this document).
Exhibit 1065	FRE 401, 402, 801, 802. Lack of relevance; hearsay (for



Exhibit No.	Objection
	example, no witness testifies about the alleged relevance or the
	content of this document).

In light of these objections, Patent Owner likewise objects to any testimony or argument purporting to rely on the objected-to evidence.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 27, 2016 /s/ George E. Quillin

George E. Quillin Registration No. 32,792 Michael D. Kaminski Registration No. 32,904 Foley & Lardner LLP Counsel for Patent Owner



CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing OBJECTIONS TO PETITIONER'S REPLY AND OPPOSITION EVIDENCE is being served on June 27, 2016, by filing through the Board's Patent Review Processing System and via email directed to counsel for the Petitioner at the following address:

Lisa Kole Baker Botts L.L.P. lisa.kole@bakerbotts.com

Steven Lendaris

Baker Botts L.L.P.
steven.lendaris@bakerbotts.com

Paul Ragusa
Baker Botts L.L.P.
paul.ragusa@bakerbotts.com

Date: June 27, 2016 /s/ George E. Quillin

George E. Quillin Registration No. 32,792 Foley & Lardner LLP Counsel for Patent Owner

