UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD MILTENYI BIOMEDICINE GmbH and MILTENYI BIOTEC INC. Petitioner v. THE TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

IPR Trial No. IPR2022-00855 U.S. Patent No. 9,540,445 Issue Date: January 10, 2017

Patent Owner

Title: Compositions and Methods for Treatment of Cancer

PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE SUBMITTED WITH PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE



Miltenyi Biomedicine GmbH and Miltenyi Biotec Inc. ("Petitioner") submits the following objections to the admissibility of evidence filed and served by Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania ("Patent Owner") accompanying their Patent Owner Response for *Inter Partes* Review. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.64.

Exhibit	Objections
Ex. 2001	FRE 802: To the extent that Patent Owner is offering this exhibit to prove the truth of the matter asserted, it is inadmissible hearsay.
	FRE 402 and 403: Patent Owner has not shown that this exhibit would have been readily accessible to those skilled in the art. Patent Owner has not shown that this exhibit is relevant to any question of patentability; the exhibit's probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence.
	FRE 901: Patent Owner has not produced evidence sufficient to support a finding that the item is what Patent Owner claims it is. Patent Owner has not provided a supporting declaration of authentication. Patent Owner has not shown that this exhibit would have been readily accessible to those skilled in the art.
Ex. 2002	FRE 901: Patent Owner has not produced evidence sufficient to support a finding that the item is what Patent Owner claims it is. Patent Owner has not provided a supporting declaration of authentication. Patent Owner has not shown that this exhibit would have been readily accessible to those skilled in the art.
Ex. 2003	FRE 802: To the extent that Patent Owner is offering this exhibit to prove the truth of the matter asserted, it is inadmissible hearsay.
	FRE 402 and 403: Patent Owner has not shown that this exhibit would have been readily accessible to those skilled in the art. Patent Owner has not shown that this exhibit is relevant to any question of patentability; the exhibit's probative value is



	substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence.
	FRE 901: Patent Owner has not produced evidence sufficient to support a finding that the item is what Patent Owner claims it is. Patent Owner has not provided a supporting declaration of authentication. Patent Owner has not shown that this exhibit would have been readily accessible to those skilled in the art.
Ex. 2004	FRE 802: To the extent that Patent Owner is offering this exhibit to prove the truth of the matter asserted, it is inadmissible hearsay.
	FRE 402 and 403: Patent Owner has not shown that this exhibit would have been readily accessible to those skilled in the art. Patent Owner has not shown that this exhibit is relevant to any question of patentability; the exhibit's probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence.
	FRE 901: Patent Owner has not produced evidence sufficient to support a finding that the item is what Patent Owner claims it is. Patent Owner has not provided a supporting declaration of authentication. Patent Owner has not shown that this exhibit would have been readily accessible to those skilled in the art.
Ex. 2005	FRE 802: To the extent that Patent Owner is offering this exhibit to prove the truth of the matter asserted, it is inadmissible hearsay.
	FRE 402 and 403: Patent Owner has not shown that this exhibit would have been readily accessible to those skilled in the art. Patent Owner has not shown that this exhibit is relevant to any question of patentability; the exhibit's probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence.



	FRE 901: Patent Owner has not produced evidence sufficient to support a finding that the item is what Patent Owner claims it is. Patent Owner has not provided a supporting declaration of authentication. Patent Owner has not shown that this exhibit would have been readily accessible to those skilled in the art.
Ex. 2006	FRE 802: To the extent that Patent Owner is offering this exhibit to prove the truth of the matter asserted, it is inadmissible hearsay.
	FRE 402 and 403: Patent Owner has not shown that this exhibit would have been readily accessible to those skilled in the art. Patent Owner has not shown that this exhibit is relevant to any question of patentability; the exhibit's probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence.
	FRE 901: Patent Owner has not produced evidence sufficient to support a finding that the item is what Patent Owner claims it is. Patent Owner has not provided a supporting declaration of authentication. Patent Owner has not shown that this exhibit would have been readily accessible to those skilled in the art.
Ex. 2007	FRE 802: To the extent that Patent Owner is offering this exhibit to prove the truth of the matter asserted, it is inadmissible hearsay.
	FRE 402 and 403: Patent Owner has not shown that this exhibit would have been readily accessible to those skilled in the art. Patent Owner has not shown that this exhibit is relevant to any question of patentability; the exhibit's probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence.
	FRE 901: Patent Owner has not produced evidence sufficient to support a finding that the item is what Patent Owner claims it is. Patent Owner has not provided a supporting declaration of



	authentication. Patent Owner has not shown that this exhibit would have been readily accessible to those skilled in the art.
Ex. 2008	FRE 802: To the extent that Patent Owner is offering this exhibit to prove the truth of the matter asserted, it is inadmissible hearsay.
	FRE 402 and 403: Patent Owner has not shown that this exhibit would have been readily accessible to those skilled in the art. Patent Owner has not shown that this exhibit is relevant to any question of patentability; the exhibit's probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence.
	FRE 901: Patent Owner has not produced evidence sufficient to support a finding that the item is what Patent Owner claims it is. Patent Owner has not provided a supporting declaration of authentication. Patent Owner has not shown that this exhibit would have been readily accessible to those skilled in the art.
Ex. 2009	FRE 802: To the extent that Patent Owner is offering this exhibit to prove the truth of the matter asserted, it is inadmissible hearsay.
	FRE 402 and 403: Patent Owner has not shown that this exhibit would have been readily accessible to those skilled in the art. Patent Owner has not shown that this exhibit is relevant to any question of patentability; the exhibit's probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence.
	FRE 901: Patent Owner has not produced evidence sufficient to support a finding that the item is what Patent Owner claims it is. Patent Owner has not provided a supporting declaration of authentication. Patent Owner has not shown that this exhibit would have been readily accessible to those skilled in the art.
Ex. 2010	FRE 901: Patent Owner has not produced evidence sufficient to support a finding that the item is what Patent Owner claims it is. Patent Owner has not provided a supporting declaration of



DOCKET

Explore Litigation Insights



Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time** alerts and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.

