UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

QIAGEN SCIENCES, LLC,
Petitioner, v.

TECAN GENOMICS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00029

U.S. Patent 10,876,108

PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS TO ADMISSIBILITY OF EVIDENCE SUBMITTED BY PATENT OWNER

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b) and the Federal Rules of Evidence ("FRE"), Petitioner QIAGEN Sciences, LLC, hereby objects as follows to the admissibility of evidence filed by Patent Owner Tecan Genomics, Inc. in conjunction with the Patent Owner Sur-Replies, filed on December 19, 2025.

Exhibit	Objections
Ex.2201 - *ArcherDX, LLC v. QIAGEN Sciences*, LLC, No. 1:18- cv-01019-MN, D. Del. (filed July 10, 2018)	**FRE 402 and 403**: The exhibit is improper "new" evidence under 37 C.F.R. § 42.23 and is not cited in any paper in the proceeding. Further, exhibits and arguments that are not incorporated in papers are waived and incorporation by reference is strictly prohibited. 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3); 37 C.F.R. § 42.22; see also *Parus Holdings, Inc. v. Google LLC*, 70 F.4th 1365, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2023). Furthermore, the exhibit is not prior art and is related to an entirely separate proceeding involving different technology and therefore is not relevant to any question of patentability. **FRE 802**: To the extent it is being offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted, this Exhibit constitutes inadmissible hearsay. **FRE 901**: Patent Owner has not produced evidence or certification sufficient to support a finding that the exhibit is what Patent Owner claims it is.
Ex.2202 - Plaintiffs' Identification of Accused Products, *ArcherDX, LLC v. QIAGEN Sciences, LLC*, No. 1:18- cv-01019-MN (D. Del. Aug. 23, 2021), Doc. No. 451	**FRE 402 and 403**: First, the exhibit is "new evidence" under 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b) and therefore is improper to introduce in a sur-reply and is not relevant to any ground upon which trial was instituted. Second, the exhibit is not prior art and therefore is not relevant to any question of patentability. Third, the exhibit is not prior art and is related to an entirely separate proceeding involving different technology and therefore is not relevant to any question of patentability.

	FRE 802: To the extent it is being offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted, this Exhibit constitutes inadmissible hearsay. **FRE 901**: Patent Owner has not produced evidence or certification sufficient to support a finding that the exhibit is what Patent Owner claims it is.
Ex.2203 - Public Version of Declaration of Eric J. Rutt in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment of No Invalidity as to U.S. Patent No. 10,450,597 and to Strike and Preclude Testimony, *ArcherDX, LLC v. QIAGEN Sciences, LLC*, No. 1:18- cv-010109-MN (D. Del. Mar. 8, 2021), Doc. No. 338	**FRE 402 and 403**: First, the exhibit is "new evidence" under 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b) and therefore is improper to introduce in a sur-reply and is not relevant to any ground upon which trial was instituted. Second, the exhibit is not prior art and therefore is not relevant to any question of patentability. Third, the exhibit is not prior art and is related to an entirely separate proceeding involving different technology and therefore is not relevant to any question of patentability. **FRE 802**: To the extent it is being offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted, this Exhibit constitutes inadmissible hearsay. **FRE 901**: Patent Owner has not produced evidence or certification sufficient to support a finding that the exhibit is what Patent Owner claims it is.
Ex.2204 - Public Version of Declaration of Eric J. Rutt in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment of No Invalidity as to U.S. Patent No. 10,450,597 and to Strike and Preclude Testimony, ArcherDX, LLC v. QIAGEN Sciences, LLC, No. 1:18-cv-010109-MN (D. Del. Mar. 8, 2021), Doc. No. 338-1	**FRE 402 and 403**: The exhibit is improper "new" evidence under 37 C.F.R. § 42.23 and not cited in any paper in the proceeding. Further, exhibits and arguments that are not incorporated in papers are waived and incorporation by reference is strictly prohibited. 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3); 37 C.F.R. § 42.22; see also *Parus Holdings, Inc. v. Google LLC*, 70 F.4th 1365, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2023). Furthermore, the exhibit is not prior art and is related to an entirely separate proceeding involving different technology and therefore is not relevant to any question of patentability.

	FRE 802: To the extent it is being offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted, this Exhibit constitutes inadmissible hearsay. **FRE 901**: Patent Owner has not produced evidence or certification sufficient to support a finding that the exhibit is what Patent Owner claims it is.
Ex.2205 - Public Version of Declaration of Eric J. Rutt in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment of No Invalidity as to U.S. Patent No. 10,450,597 and to Strike and Preclude Testimony, *ArcherDX, LLC v. QIAGEN Sciences, LLC*, No. 1:18- cv-010109-MN (D. Del. Mar. 8, 2021), Doc. No. 338-2	**FRE 402 and 403**: First, the exhibit is "new evidence" under 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b) and therefore is improper to introduce in a sur-reply and is not relevant to any ground upon which trial was instituted. Second, the exhibit is not prior art and therefore is not relevant to any question of patentability. Third, the exhibit is not prior art and is related to an entirely separate proceeding involving different technology and therefore is not relevant to any question of patentability. **FRE 802**: To the extent it is being offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted, this Exhibit constitutes inadmissible hearsay. **FRE 901**: Patent Owner has not produced evidence or certification sufficient to support a finding that the exhibit is what Patent Owner claims it is.
Ex.2206 - QIAGEN'S Opposition to ArcherDX's Motion for Injunction, Ongoing Royalty, Supplemental Damages, Pre- and Post-Judgment Interest, and Enhanced Damages, No. 1:18-cv-01019-MN (D. Del. Dec. 8, 2021), Doc. No. 508	**FRE 402 and 403**: First, the exhibit is "new evidence" under 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b) and therefore is improper to introduce in a sur-reply and is not relevant to any ground upon which trial was instituted. Second, the exhibit is not prior art and therefore is not relevant to any question of patentability. Third, the exhibit is not prior art and is related to an entirely separate proceeding involving different technology and therefore is not relevant to any question of patentability. **FRE 802**: To the extent it is being offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted, this Exhibit constitutes inadmissible hearsay.

	FRE 901: Patent Owner has not produced evidence or certification sufficient to support a finding that the exhibit is what Patent Owner claims it is.
Ex.2207 - Brief for Defendants-Appellants, *ArcherDX, LLC v. QIAGEN Sciences, LLC*, No. 23-2350 (Fed. Cir. Dec. 15, 2023)	**FRE 402 and 403**: The exhibit is improper "new" evidence under 37 C.F.R. § 42.23 and not cited in any paper in the proceeding. Further, exhibits and arguments that are not incorporated in papers are waived and incorporation by reference is strictly prohibited. 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3); 37 C.F.R. § 42.22; see also *Parus Holdings, Inc. v. Google LLC*, 70 F.4th 1365, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2023). Furthermore, the exhibit is not prior art and is related to an entirely separate proceeding involving different technology and therefore is not relevant to any question of patentability. **FRE 802**: To the extent it is being offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted, this Exhibit constitutes inadmissible hearsay. **FRE 901**: Patent Owner has not produced evidence or certification sufficient to support a finding that the exhibit is what Patent Owner claims it is.
Ex.2208 - Quan Peng et al., Targeted Single Primer Enrichment Sequencing with Single End Duplex-UMI, 9 SCI REP 4810 (2019)	**FRE 402 and 403**: The exhibit is improper "new" evidence under 37 C.F.R. § 42.23 and not cited in any paper in the proceeding. Further, exhibits and arguments that are not incorporated in papers are waived and incorporation by reference is strictly prohibited. 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3); 37 C.F.R. § 42.22; see also *Parus Holdings, Inc. v. Google LLC*, 70 F.4th 1365, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2023). Furthermore, the exhibit is not prior art and is directed to different technology and is not relevant to any question of patentability. **FRE 802**: To the extent it is being offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted, this Exhibit constitutes inadmissible hearsay.

	FRE 901: Patent Owner has not produced evidence or certification sufficient to support a finding that the exhibit is what Patent Owner claims it is.
Ex.2209 - U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2025/0002900	**FRE 402 and 403**: The exhibit is improper "new" evidence under 37 C.F.R. § 42.23 and not cited in any paper in the proceeding. Further, exhibits and arguments that are not incorporated in papers are waived and incorporation by reference is strictly prohibited. 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3); 37 C.F.R. § 42.22; see also *Parus Holdings, Inc. v. Google LLC*, 70 F.4th 1365, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2023). Furthermore, the exhibit is not prior art and is directed to different technology and is not relevant to any question of patentability. **FRE 802**: To the extent it is being offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted, this Exhibit constitutes inadmissible hearsay. **FRE 901**: Patent Owner has not produced evidence or certification sufficient to support a finding that the exhibit is what Patent Owner claims it is.
Ex.2210 - European Patent Application Publication No. EP3362577B1 for European Patent Application No. 16784755.7	**FRE 402 and 403**: The exhibit is improper "new" evidence under 37 C.F.R. § 42.23 and not cited in any paper in the proceeding. Further, exhibits and arguments that are not incorporated in papers are waived and incorporation by reference is strictly prohibited. 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3); 37 C.F.R. § 42.22; see also *Parus Holdings, Inc. v. Google LLC*, 70 F.4th 1365, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2023). Furthermore, the exhibit is not prior art and is related to different technology and therefore is not relevant to any question of patentability. Last, the exhibit is not relevant to any question of patentability because it mischaracterizes the evidence and is taken from a European Patent Application that is directed to, *inter alia*, methods for improving existing single primer extension techniques with magnesium ions.

	FRE 802: To the extent it is being offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted, this Exhibit constitutes inadmissible hearsay. **FRE 901**: Patent Owner has not produced evidence or certification sufficient to support a finding that the exhibit is what Patent Owner claims it is.
Ex.2211 - October 26, 2020 Reply to the Communication pursuant to Article 94(3) EPC dated 18 June 2020, European Patent Application No. 16784755	**FRE 402 and 403**: The exhibit is improper "new" evidence under 37 C.F.R. § 42.23 and not cited in any paper in the proceeding. Further, exhibits and arguments that are not incorporated in papers are waived and incorporation by reference is strictly prohibited. 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3); 37 C.F.R. § 42.22; see also *Parus Holdings, Inc. v. Google LLC*, 70 F.4th 1365, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2023). Furthermore, the exhibit is not prior art and is related to different technology and therefore is not relevant to any question of patentability. Last, the exhibit is not relevant to any question of patentability because it mischaracterizes the evidence and is taken from a European Patent Application that is directed to, *inter alia*, methods for improving existing single primer extension techniques with magnesium ions. **FRE 802**: To the extent it is being offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted, this Exhibit constitutes inadmissible hearsay. **FRE 901**: Patent Owner has not produced evidence or certification sufficient to support a finding that the exhibit is what Patent Owner claims it is.
Ex.2212 - U.S. Patent No. 10,941,438	**FRE 402 and 403**: The exhibit is improper "new" evidence under 37 C.F.R. § 42.23 and not cited in any paper in the proceeding. Further, exhibits and arguments that are not incorporated in papers are waived and incorporation by reference is strictly prohibited. 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3); 37 C.F.R. § 42.22; see also *Parus Holdings, Inc. v. Google LLC*, 70 F.4th 1365, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2023). Furthermore,

	the exhibit is not prior art and is related to different technology and therefore is not relevant to any question of patentability. Last, the exhibit is not relevant to any question of patentability because it mischaracterizes the evidence and is taken from a European Patent Application that is directed to, *inter alia*, methods for improving existing single primer extension techniques with magnesium ions. **FRE 802**: To the extent it is being offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted, this Exhibit constitutes inadmissible hearsay. **FRE 901**: Patent Owner has not produced evidence or certification sufficient to support a finding that the exhibit is what Patent Owner claims it is.
Ex.2213 - Transcript for the December 3, 2025 Deposition of Dr. Michael L. Metzker	Petitioner hereby preserves and renews all objections made on the record during the December 3, 2025 Deposition of Michael L. Metzker, including all objections made during the deposition to the introduction of new exhibits. **FRE 402 and 403**: The exhibit refers to and discusses Ex.2201-Ex.2212, which are "new evidence" under 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b). Therefore, portions of this exhibit that reference or discuss Ex.2201-Ex.2212 are improper and not relevant to this proceeding. **FRE 106:** This exhibit may be an incomplete and/or inaccurate transcript of the December 3, 2025 deposition because the transcript does not include any forthcoming errata sheet. To the extent the witness submits an errata sheet, it must in fairness be considered at the same time as the exhibit.

DATED: December 31, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

By */Matthew A. Traupman/*

Matthew A. Traupman (Reg. No. 50,832)
matthewtraupman@quinnemanuel.com
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART
& SULLIVAN LLP
295 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10016
Tel: (212) 849-7000
Fax: (212) 849-7100

Attorney for Petitioner QIAGEN Sciences, LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that on December 31, 2025, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS TO ADMISSIBILITY OF EVIDENCE SUBMITTED BY PATENT OWNER to be served on counsel for Patent Owner via email at:

Timothy J. Beavers	tbeavers@goodwinlaw.com
Linnea P. Cipriano	lcipriano@goodwinlaw.com
John P. Padro	jpadro@goodwinlaw.com
Scott T. Weingaertner	sweingaertner@goodwinlaw.com

DATED: December 31, 2025

/Matthew A. Traupman/

Matthew A. Traupman (Reg. No. 50,832)
matthewtraupman@quinnemanuel.com
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART
& SULLIVAN LLP
295 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10016
Tel: (212) 849-7000
Fax: (212) 849-7100

Attorney for Petitioner QIAGEN Sciences, LLC