

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INARI AGRICULTURE, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

CORTEVA AGRISCIENCE LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2024-01014
Patent No. 8,901,378

PATENT OWNER'S OBJECTIONS TO PETITIONER'S EVIDENCE

The Federal Rules of Evidence (“FRE”) generally apply to proceedings before the Board. 37 C.F.R. § 42.62(a). Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1) and the FRE, Patent Owner Corteva Agriscience LLC (“Corteva” or “Patent Owner”) submits the following objections to certain exhibits submitted by Petitioner Inari Agriculture, Inc. (“Inari” or “Petitioner”). These objections apply equally to Petitioner’s reliance on these exhibits in any subsequently filed documents. These objections are timely filed and served within ten business days of the Board’s decision to institute trial in this proceeding.

Exhibit 1003

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1003 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit relates to European patent proceedings under different legal standards. It also does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1003 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1004

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1004 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit relates to European patent proceedings under different legal standards. It also does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1004 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1007

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1007 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1007 under FRE 602 as lacking sufficient support to find that Dr. Aron Silverstone has personal knowledge of the subject matter to which he is testifying. As one example, Dr. Silverstone states that “it would have been essentially impossible [without a deposit of TC1507] . . . for a POSA to

make or use the inventions of the Challenged Claims” (Exhibit 1007, ¶ 111) but fails to provide any support based on his personal knowledge or experience other than relying on statements made by the Patent Owner during prosecution of a European patent before the EPO. *See* Exhibit 1007, ¶ 112.

Corteva further objects to Exhibit 1007 as improper expert testimony under FRE 702-703 and FRE 705 to the extent Exhibit 1007 does not sufficiently set forth the bases for the testimony provided.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1007 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807. Until Petitioner offers Dr. Silverstone for cross-examination as part of routine discovery under 37 C.F.R. § 42.51(b)(1)(ii), Exhibit 1007 is inadmissible hearsay under FRE 802.

Exhibit 1008

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1008 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1008 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and

807. Until Petitioner offers Dr. Silverstone for cross-examination as part of routine discovery under 37 C.F.R. § 42.51(b)(1)(ii), Exhibit 1008 is inadmissible hearsay under FRE 802.

Exhibit 1009

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1009 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Petitioner has not established that Exhibit 1009, which published after the earliest effective filing date of U.S. Patent No. 8,901,378, is prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Exhibit 1010

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1010 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time, at least because it is not prior art.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1010 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Corteva also objects to this Exhibit under FRE 901 as not being properly authenticated.

Exhibit 1011

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1011 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time, at least because it is not prior art.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1011 as lacking authenticity (*see* FRE 901). Petitioner offers no explanation as to whether Exhibit 1011 is the same document that was provided at the Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations House of Representatives One Hundred Ninth Congress, First Session. On its face, the produced version of Exhibit 1011 states that it is “a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google” (Exhibit 1011, 1) and includes a “Digitized by Google” watermark in the footer of every page of the 714-page document. *See generally* Exhibit 1011.

Corteva further objects to Exhibit 1011 under FRE 1002, which requires production of the original of a document to prove its contents. Petitioner offers no explanation as to whether Exhibit 1011 is the same document that was provided at the Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations House of Representatives One Hundred Ninth Congress, First Session. On its face, the produced version of Exhibit 1011 states that it is “a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google” (Exhibit 1011, 1) and includes a “Digitized by Google” watermark in the footer of every page of the 714-page document. *See generally* Exhibit 1011.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1011 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1012

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1012 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time, at least because it is not prior art.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1012 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1013

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1013 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time, at least because it is not prior art.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1013 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1014

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1014 under FRE 106 because this Exhibit appears to be an excerpt from a book and not the entire book.

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1014 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time, at least because it is not prior art.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1014 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1015

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1015 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1015 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1016

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1016 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1016 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1017

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1017 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1017 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1018

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1018 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1018 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1019

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1019 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1019 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1020

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1020 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1020 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1021

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1021 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1021 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1022

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1022 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1022 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1023

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1023 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1023 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1024

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1024 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1024 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1025

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1025 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1025 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1026

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1026 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1026 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1027

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1027 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1027 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1028

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1028 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1028 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1029

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1029 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1029 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1030

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1030 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1030 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1031

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1031 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1031 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1032

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1032 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1032 as lacking authenticity (*see* FRE 901).

Corteva further objects to Exhibit 1032 under FRE 1002, which requires production of the original of a document to prove its contents. The produced version of Exhibit 1032 is provided as an archived website printout from the Wayback Machine, and Petitioner has also failed to provide the full website address for Exhibit 1032. *See* Exhibit 1032 (missing entire website URL from top of each page of exhibit); Pet., ix (same).

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1032 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1033

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1033 under FRE 106 because this Exhibit appears to be an excerpt from a book and not the entire book.

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1033 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1033 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1034

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1034 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1034 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1035

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1035 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1035 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1036

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1036 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time, at least because it is not prior art.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1036 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1037

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1037 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1037 as lacking authenticity (*see* FRE 901).

Corteva further objects to Exhibit 1037 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1040

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1040 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1040 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1041

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1041 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1041 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1042

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1042 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1042 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1043

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1043 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1043 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1044

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1044 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1044 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1045

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1045 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1045 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1046

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1046 under FRE 106 because this Exhibit appears to be an excerpt.

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1046 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1046 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Corteva further objects to this Exhibit under FRE 901 as not being properly authenticated.

Exhibit 1047

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1047 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time, at least because it is not prior art.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1047 as lacking authenticity (*see* FRE 901). The produced version of Exhibit 1047 is provided as two “broken up” pages (i.e., page 43 is missing).

Corteva further objects to Exhibit 1047 under FRE 1002, which requires production of the original of a document to prove its contents. The produced version of Exhibit 1047 is provided as two “broken up” pages (i.e., page 43 is missing).

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1047 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1048

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1048 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time, at least because it is not prior art.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1048 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1049

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1049 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time, at least because it is not prior art.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1049 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1050

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1050 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time, at least because it is not prior art.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1050 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1051

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1051 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time, at least because it is not prior art.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1051 as lacking authenticity (*see* FRE 901). Petitioner offers no explanation of whether Exhibit 1051, a press release from Westlaw's website, is the same press release that was allegedly published by Business Wire on October 16, 2003. It is also unclear whether the highlighting that is present on Exhibit 1051 was originally present.

Corteva further objects to Exhibit 1051 under FRE 1002, which requires production of the original of a document to prove its contents. Petitioner offers no explanation of whether Exhibit 1051, a press release published on Westlaw's website, is the same press release that was allegedly published by Business Wire on October 16, 2003.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1051 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1052

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1052 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time, at least because it is not prior art.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1052 as lacking authenticity (*see* FRE 901). Petitioner offers no explanation of whether Exhibit 1052, a press release from Westlaw's website, is the same press release that was allegedly published by Business Wire on November 13, 2003. It is also unclear whether the highlighting that is present on Exhibit 1052 was originally present.

Corteva further objects to Exhibit 1052 under FRE 1002, which requires production of the original of a document to prove its contents. Petitioner offers no explanation of whether Exhibit 1052, a press release published on Westlaw's website, is the same press release that was allegedly published by Business Wire on November 13, 2003.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1052 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1053

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1053 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time, at least because it is not prior art.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1053 as lacking authenticity (*see* FRE 901). Petitioner offers no explanation of whether Exhibit 1053, a press release from Westlaw's website, is the same press release that was allegedly published by ADP France News on December 19, 2003. It is also unclear whether the highlighting that is present on Exhibit 1053 was originally present.

Corteva further objects to Exhibit 1053 under FRE 1002, which requires production of the original of a document to prove its contents. Petitioner offers no explanation of whether Exhibit 1053, a press release published on Westlaw's website, is the same press release that was allegedly published by ADP France News on December 19, 2003.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1053 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1054

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1054 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time, at least because it is not prior art.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1054 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1055

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1055 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time, at least because it is not prior art.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1055 as lacking authenticity (*see* FRE 901). Petitioner offers no explanation of whether Exhibit 1055 is the same Decision Determination of the Safety of Corn Line 1507 from the Canadian Food Inspection Agency's website apart from merely stating that it is. *See* Pet., x.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1055 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1056

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1056 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time, at least because it is not prior art.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1056 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1057

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1057 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1057 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Corteva further objects to Exhibit 1057 because it is not cited in the Petition.

Exhibit 1058

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1058 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1058 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1059

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1059 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1059 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1060

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1060 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1060 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1061

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1061 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1061 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1062

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1062 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1062 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1063

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1063 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1063 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1064

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1064 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time, at least because it is not prior art.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1064 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1065

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1065 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time, at least because it is not prior art.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1065 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1066

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1066 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time, at least because it is not prior art.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1066 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1067

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1067 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time, at least because it is not prior art.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1067 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1068

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1068 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time, at least because it is not prior art.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1068 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1069

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1069 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time, at least because it is not prior art.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1069 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Exhibit 1070

Corteva objects to Exhibit 1070 under FRE 401-403 as lacking relevance to the grounds on which the Board has instituted *inter partes* review. In particular, this exhibit does not make any fact more or less probable than it would be without it. This exhibit is unfairly prejudicial, confuses the issues, misleads the factfinder, and/or is a waste of time, at least because it is not prior art.

Corteva also objects to Exhibit 1070 as inadmissible hearsay (*see* FRE 801 and 802), that does not fall under any exceptions, including FRE 803, 804, 805, and 807.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 31, 2024

By: /Erin M. Sommers/
Erin M. Sommers, Reg. No. 60,974
(Lead Counsel)
Kathleen A. Daley, Reg. No. 36,116
(Backup Counsel)
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.
901 New York Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20001-4413
(202) 408-4000

Counsel for Patent Owner
Corteva Agriscience LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing **Patent Owner's Objections to Petitioner's Evidence** was served on December 31, 2024, via e-mail directed to counsel of record for the Petitioner at the following:

Scott A. McKeown (Reg. No. 42,866)
Oona M. Johnstone (Reg. No. 68,177)
Zhiyun Ge (Reg. No. 73,869)
Thomas F. Foley (Reg. No. 76,384)
Charles T. Steenburg (*Pro Hac Vice Pending*)
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, MA 02210-2206
Phone: (617) 646-8000
Fax: (617) 646-8646
SMcKeown-PTAB@WolfGreenfield.com
OJohnstone-PTAB@WolfGreenfield.com
Jean.Ge@WolfGreenfield.com
TFoley-PTAB@WolfGreenfield.com
Charles.Steenburg@WolfGreenfield.com

Petitioner has agreed to electronic service.

Dated: December 31, 2024

/William Esper/
William Esper
Legal Assistant and PTAB Coordinator
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,
Garrett & Dunner, LLP