

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AJINOMOTO CO., INC.
Petitioner,

v.

ABTIS CO., LTD.
Patent Owner

Patent No. 11,896,675
Issue Date: February 13, 2024

Title: SITE-SPECIFIC ANTIBODY CONJUGATION AND ANTIBODY-DRUG
CONJUGATE AS SPECIFIC EMBODIMENT THEREOF

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2025-0283

**PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS TO PATENT OWNER'S EVIDENCE
SUBMITTED WITH PATENT OWNER'S REPLY TO PETITIONER'S
OPPOSITION TO PATENT OWNER'S MOTION TO AMEND**

Petitioner Ajinomoto Co., Inc. (“Petitioner”) hereby objects to the admissibility of certain evidence cited in support of Patent Owner AbTis Co., Ltd.’s (“Patent Owner”) Reply to Petitioner’s Opposition to Patent Owner’s Motion to Amend filed on March 6, 2026. Petitioner’s objections are based on the Federal Rules of Evidence (“FRE”), relevant case law, federal statute, and the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB”) Rules. Petitioner’s objections are set forth with particularity below.

EXHIBIT 2008

Exhibit 2008 is described as “Declaration of Dr. Zhaohui Sunny Zhou, Ph.D.” Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2008 under FRE 702, on the basis that the testimony is not based on sufficient facts or data, with respect to reliance on experimental data disclosed in references, and on other informal and unpublished documents that are hearsay under FRE 802, have not been authenticated under FRE 901, are not self-authenticating under FRE 902, and are not duplicates as defined by FRE 1001(e). For example, paragraphs 21, 37, 38, 42, 43, and 47 lack any cited basis. Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2008 to the extent it includes subject matter that is not permitted pursuant to FRE 602 or 701, including without limitation, to the extent that the declaration presents as “facts” information that is outside the personal knowledge of the declarant, and/or to the extent that the document offers improper lay opinion testimony. Exhibit 2008 is also objected to as irrelevant under FRE 401 and 402

because it does not make any facts at issue in the *inter partes* review more or less probable than it would have been without the evidence. Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2008 as unfairly prejudicial, confusing the issues, and a waste of time under FRE 403. Petitioner objects to the portions of Exhibit 2008 that cite to and rely on the other exhibits objected to herein for the reasons stated herein. Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2008 under FRE 802 as hearsay without exception. Petitioner objects to paragraph 38 of Exhibit 2008 under 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(b) to the extent that it relies on improper Exhibit 2010 and fails to provide a complete translation of EX2010 with a verified translator declaration. Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2008 under FRE 901-902 as lacking authentication and not self-authenticating because it lacks sufficient indicia that the exhibit is what it purports to be.

Petitioner objects under FRE 105 that use of Exhibit 2008 should be restricted to the purpose for which it was admitted.

EXHIBIT 2009

Exhibit 2009 is described by Patent Owner as “English Translation of Kirmse et al., “Destabilisierte 2-Norbornyl.” Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2009 under 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(b) because the rule requires an affidavit attesting to the accuracy of a translation of a foreign language publication.

Petitioner objects under FRE 105 that use of Exhibit 2009 should be restricted to the purpose for which it was admitted.

EXHIBIT 2010

Exhibit 2010 is described by Patent Owner as “Zeitschrift für Chemie, 1980, 20 (11), 416-417; English translation of title by the Chemical Abstract Service (CAS): Decomposition of iso-butylammonium N-alkylmonothiocarbamates in weakly acidic and neutral aqueous solutions.” Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2010 under 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(b) because the rule requires a translation and an affidavit attesting to accuracy for foreign language publications. Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2010, which is purported to be a German academic journal article, under FRE 802. The Patent Owner relies on this exhibit to prove the truth of the matter asserted therein, but it fails to meet the requirements of any hearsay exception or exemption under FRE 803-807.

Petitioner objects under FRE 105 that use of Exhibit 2010 should be restricted to the purpose for which it was admitted.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 13, 2026

By: /Stephen B Maebius/
Stephen Maebius
Registration No. 35,264
Foley & Lardner LLP
Counsel for Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing Petitioner's Objections to Patent Owner's Evidence Submitted with Patent Owner's Reply to Petitioner's Opposition to Patent Owner's Motion to Amend was served on March 13, 2026, by electronic mail to the attorneys of record for Patent Owner at the following address:

Jason A. Engel
Jason.Engel.PTAB@klgates.com

Anna Rebekah Hill
Rebekah.hill@klgates.com

Peter L. Giunta
peter.giunta@klgates.com

K&L GATES LLP
70 W. Madison Street, Suite 3100
Chicago, IL 60602

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 13, 2026

/Stephen B Maebius/
Stephen B. Maebius
Registration No. 35,264
Foley & Lardner LLP
Counsel for Petitioner