Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

Paper 31
Date: January 5, 2026

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

QIAGEN SCIENCES, LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

TECAN GENOMICS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00026 (Patent 11,098,357 B2)
IPR2025-00028 (Patent 10,036,012 B2)
IPR2025-00029 (Patent 10,876,108 B2)[1]

Before DEBORAH KATZ, ZHENYU YANG, and
TIMOTHY G. MAJORS, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

PER CURIAM.

ORDER
Conduct of the Proceeding
Authorizing Petitioner's Request to File Motion to Strike
37 C.F.R. § 42.5

---

[1] We use this caption for efficiency. These cases are not joined. The parties may not use such a caption without prior authorization from the Board.

On December 29, 2025, Petitioner requested the Board's authorization for a motion to strike in each of the above-captioned proceedings. Ex. 3002.

Specifically, in IPR2025-00026, Petitioner seeks authorization to file a motion to strike all arguments regarding paragraph 99 of Schmitt (Paper 28 at 17–18) and the entire motivation to combine section (Paper 28 at 20–23). *Id.* According to Petitioner, Patent Owner waived these arguments because they address alleged deficiencies in the Petition, but were not included in the Patent Owner Response. *Id.*

In each of IPR2025-00028 and IPR2025-00029, Petitioner alleges that Exhibits 2201–2212 are new exhibits and seeks authorization to file a motion to strike them. *Id.* Petitioner also seeks authorization to strike portions of the Sur-replies relying on or referencing those exhibits (Paper 27 at 1–2, 9–10, 18–19, 26–28), and portions of Dr. Metzker's December 3 deposition transcript (Ex. 2213) directed or related to those exhibits. *Id.*

Patent Owner opposes Petitioners' request, stating that "all arguments included in its Sur-Replies are proper" because they "directly respond to arguments raised in Petitioner's Replies" and "are not new substantive positions." *Id.* Patent Owner argues that "the exhibits Petitioner seeks to strike are from Dr. Metzker[']s deposition and are properly used to challenge the credibility of Petitioner's positions." *Id.*

Having considered the parties' respective positions, we authorize Petitioner to file a motion to strike and Patent Owner to file an opposition to such motion to strike. No reply or sur-reply briefing on the motion to strike is authorized and the due dates and page limits for the respective motion and opposition are set forth below. No new evidence is authorized for submission with the authorized motion and opposition.

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby:

ORDERED that Petitioner's request for authorization to file a motion to strike addressing the exhibits and issues noted above is *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner's motion to strike must be filed no later than January 9, 2026, and shall not exceed ten pages; and

FURTHER ORDERED that Patent Owner may file an opposition to Petitioners' motion to strike, which opposition must be filed no later than January 16, 2026, and shall not exceed ten pages.

IPR2025-00026 (Patent 11,098,357 B2)
IPR2025-00028 (Patent 10,036,012 B2)
IPR2025-00029 (Patent 10,876,108 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

David Bilsker
Matthew Traupman
Tara Srinivasan
Landon Smith
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART
& SULLIVAN, LLP
davidbilsker@quinnemanuel.com
matthewtraupman@quinnemanuel.com
tarasrinivasan@quinnemanuel.com
landonsmith@quinnemanuel.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Linnea Cipriano
Scott Weingaertner
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
lcipriano@goodwinlaw.com
sweingaertner@goodwinlaw.com