

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GENEOSCOPY, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

EXACT SCIENCES CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

Case No.: IPR2024-01330
U.S. Patent 11,970,746

PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64, Petitioner Geneoscopy, Inc.

(“Geneoscopy”) submits the following objections to the exhibits filed by Exact Sciences Corporation (“Exact”).

1. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2001**, “Declaration of Vadim Backman, Ph.D.,” under Federal Rules of Evidence (“FRE”) 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted, and for failing to comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a) and (b).

2. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2002**, “Curriculum vitae of Vadim Backman, Ph.D.” FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted, and for failing to comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a) and (b).

3. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2003**, “Prosecution file history for application number 15/634,607, issued as patent number 11,845,991”, under FRE 401 and 402 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2003** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

4. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2004**, “Prosecution file history for application number 17/936,335, issued as patent number 11,634,781”, under FRE 401 and 402 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2004** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

5. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2006**, “Portion of prosecution file history for application number 18,919,170,” under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2006** under FRE 106 as an incomplete document. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2006** under FRE 401 and 402 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2006** as it is not cited by Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2006** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

6. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2009**, Sidney J. Winawer and Ann G. Zauber, *The advanced adenomas as the primary target of screening*, 12(1) GASTROINTESTINAL ENDOSC. CLIN. N. AM. 1, 1-9 (2002), under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2009** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant

to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2009**'s probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2009** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

7. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2010**, Daniel C. Chung, *The genetic basis of colorectal cancer: insights into critical pathways of tumorigenesis*, 119, GASTROENTEROLOGY 854, 854-865 (2000), under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2010** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2010**'s probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2010** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

8. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2011**, Hermann Brenner et al., *Risk of progression of advanced adenomas to colorectal cancer by age and sex: estimates based on 840 149 screening colonoscopies*, 56(11) GUT 1585, 1585-1589 (2007), under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2011** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2011's** probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2011** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

9. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2012**, David L. Zack et al., *Colorectal cancer screening compliance by medicine residents: perceived and actual*, 96(10) AM. J. GASTROENTEROLOGY 3004, 3004-3008 (2001), under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2012** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2012's** probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue

delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2012** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

10. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2013**, Amnon Sonnenberg and Fabiola Delcò, *Cost-effectiveness of a single colonoscopy in screening for colorectal cancer*, 162(2) ARCH INTERN MED. 163, 163-168 (2002), under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2013** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2013's** probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2013** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

11. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2014**, Peter B. Cotton et al., *Computed tomographic colonography (virtual colonoscopy): a multicenter comparison with standard colonoscopy for detection of colorectal neoplasia*, 291(14) JAMA 1713, 1713-1719 (2004), under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated

and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2014** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2014's** probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2014** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

12. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2015**, Nathalie Schoofs, et al., *A. PillCam colon capsule endoscopy compared with colonoscopy for colorectal tumor diagnosis: a prospective pilot study*, ENDOSCOPY 38, 971-977 (2006) under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2015** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2015's** probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2015** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

13. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2016**, “Exact Sciences, ‘Get Off the Bench: Hoops Themed Campaign Urges Colorectal Cancer Screening,’” dated March 2007, under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2016** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2016’s** probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2016** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

14. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2017**, “Geneoscopy Submits Premarket Approval Application to U.S. Food and Drug Administration for its Noninvasive Colorectal Cancer RNA Biomarker Screening Test,” dated January 24, 2023, under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2017’s** probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence.

15. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2018**, United States Department of Health and Human Services, “Increase the proportion of adults who get screened for colorectal cancer — C-07,” under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2018** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2018’s** probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2018** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

16. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2019**, “Declaration of Peter Wood” under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted, and for failing to comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a) and (b). Geneoscopy further objects to **EX2019** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of this proceeding and prejudicial. Geneoscopy further objects to **EX2019** under FRE 602 and 901 for lack of foundation due to insufficient personal knowledge.

17. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2020** the Deposition Transcript of Duncan Whitney Ph.D. in IPR2024-00459, dated October 10, 2024, under FRE 401 and 402 as containing testimony irrelevant to the proceeding.

18. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2021**, “Geneoscopy Series C Investor Presentation,” dated April 10, 2024, under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2021**’s probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence.

19. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2022**, “FDA ColoSense Approval Letter,” under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2022**’s probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2022** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

20. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2023**, “Vital Signs: Colorectal Cancer Tests Save Lives,” under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2023** under FRE

401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2023**'s probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2023** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

21. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2024**, Exact Sciences' 2004 Form 10-K, under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2024** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2024**'s probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2024** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

22. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2025**, Exact Sciences' 2008 Form 10-K, under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2025** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as

irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2025's** probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2025** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

23. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2026**, Exact Sciences' 2014 Form 10-K, under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2026** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2026's** probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2026** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

24. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2027**, Exact Sciences' 2016 Form 10-K, under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2027** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as

irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2027**'s probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2027** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

25. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2028**, Exact Sciences' 2018 Form 10-K, under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2028** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2028**'s probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2028** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

26. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2029**, Exact Sciences' 2023 Form 10-K, under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2029** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as

irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2029**'s probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2029** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

27. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2030**, "Printout from Exact Sciences' Internal Survey Database," under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2030** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2030**'s probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2030** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2030** for failing to meet the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a) and (b).

28. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2031**, “Exact Sciences’ Cologuard Wins prestigious Prix Galien Award for Best Medical Technology Product,” dated October 28, 2016, under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2031** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2031**’s probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2031** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

29. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2032**, “Cologuard Wins Popular Science Magazine’s 2014 ‘Best of What’s New’ Award,” dated November 12, 2014, under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2032** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2032**’s probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2032** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as

containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

30. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2033**, “Everyday Health Awards for Innovation Winners Announced at 2015 International CES,” dated January 7, 2015, under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2033** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2033**’s probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2033** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

31. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2034** “Exact Sciences Wins Wisconsin Innovation Award,” dated August 19, 2015, under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2034** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2034**’s probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or

needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2034** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

32. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2035**, “Exact Sciences Honored as 2016 Big Award Company of the Year in Healthcare,” dated October 2, 2016, under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2035** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2035’s** probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2035** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

33. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2036**, P. Schroy III et al., *Patient perceptions of stool-based DNA testing for colorectal screening cancer*, 28 AM. J. PREVENTATIVE MED. 208-214 (2005), under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2036** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of

the proceeding and because **EX2036**'s probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2036** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

34. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2037**, Lesley-Ann Miller-Wilson et al., *Cross-sectional adherence with the multi-target stool DNA test for colorectal cancer screening in a large, nationally insured cohort*, 36 INT'L J. OF COLORECTAL DISEASE 2471-2480 (2021), under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2037** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2037**'s probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2037** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

35. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2038**, John B. Kisiel et al., *Multitarget stool DNA for average risk colorectal cancer screening*, 30 GASTROINTESTINAL ENDOSCOPY CLINICS OF N. AMERICA 553-568 (2020), under 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2038** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2038** probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2038** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

36. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2039**, Jason D. Eckmann et al., *Multi-target stool DNA testing for colorectal cancer screening: emerging learning on real-world performance*, 18 CURRENT TREATMENT OPTIONS GASTRO. 109-119 (2020), under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2039** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2039's** probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice,

confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2039** under FRE 801, 802, and 803 as containing inadmissible hearsay not falling within any exception for which Exact relies upon for the truth of the matters asserted.

37. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2040**, “ColoSense Clinician Brochure”, under FRE 901 as insufficiently authenticated and not self-authenticating under FRE 902. Geneoscopy also objects to **EX2040** under FRE 401, 402, and 403 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding and because **EX2040’s** probative value with respect to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence.

38. Geneoscopy objects to **EX2042**, “Request for *Ex Parte* Reexamination under 37 C.F.R. § 1.510 of U.S. Patent No. 11,634,781”, under FRE 401 and 402 as irrelevant to the merits of the proceeding.

Dated: March 3, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/Brendan T. Jones/

Brendan T. Jones, Reg. No. 65,077

Foley Hoag LLP

155 Seaport Boulevard

Boston, MA 02210

Tel: (617) 832-1000

Email: bjones@foleyhoag.com

Counsel for Petitioner

Geneoscopy, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(c), the undersigned hereby certifies that on March 3, 2025 I caused a true and correct copy to be served on the following attorneys of record:

James M. Glass
Registration No. 46,729
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart &
Sullivan LLP
51 Madison Ave, 22nd Floor
New York, New York 10010
jimglass@quinnemanuel.com

Sandra Haberny
Registration No. 64,150
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan,
LLP
865 South Figueroa St., 10th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017
sandrahaberny@quinnemanuel.com

Jihong Lou
Registration No. 64,074
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart &
Sullivan, LLP
1300 I Street NW, Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20005
jihonglou@quinnemanuel.com

Anastasia M. Fernands
(admitted *pro hac vice*)
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan,
LLP
51 Madison Ave, 22nd Floor
New York, New York 10010
anastasiafernands@quinnemanuel.com

Dated: March 3, 2025

/Brendan T. Jones/
Brendan T. Jones, Reg. No. 65,077
Foley Hoag LLP
155 Seaport Boulevard
Boston, MA 02210
Tel: (617) 832-1000
Email: bjones@foleyhoag.com

*Counsel for Petitioner
Geneoscopy, Inc.*