From:	Loughran, Chelsea A.
To:	Trials
Cc:	Seikagaku-CR-IPR-PGR; PTAB Scott McKeown; FLuo-PTAB
Subject:	IPR2025-00440; PGR2025-0023
Date:	Thursday, April 23, 2026 5:09:23 PM
Attachments:	image001.png image002.png image003.png

CAUTION: This email has originated from a source outside of USPTO. **PLEASE CONSIDER THE SOURCE** before responding, clicking on links, or opening attachments.

RE: Charles River Laboratories, Inc v. Seikagaku Corporation
Case Nos. IPR2025-00440 and PGR2025-0023

Honorable Board,

Petitioner served Patent Owner with a Motion for Sanctions on March 31st, satisfying the 21-day safe harbor of 42.11(d)(2). Patent Owner responded on April 20th that it will not withdraw or appropriately correct its briefing. Patent Owner's contradictory and bad faith arguments on its missing specification disclosure being simultaneously well-known to a POSA in 2013 (in filings before the PTAB), yet unknown in 2016 (by PO's own admission in its PCT filing and defense of the same before the EPO), is a violation of Patent Owner's Duty of Candor & Good Faith and defies controlling Director precedent on inconsistent argument across forums. Petitioner seeks authorization to file its Motion to seek appropriate sanction and will do so immediately upon receiving authorization.

Patent Owner strongly opposes Petitioner's Motion for Sanctions, which is based on an unfounded claim that Patent Owner has taken inconsistent positions in these proceedings compared to its stance in an Opposition before the EPO. Petitioner fails to identify any such inconsistency, let alone justify sanctions. In fact, as detailed in Patent Owner's Preliminary Response, Patent Owner Response, and Sur-Reply, it is Petitioner who has taken inconsistent positions in these proceedings and the EPO. This makes Petitioner's sanctions motion particularly egregious. Petitioner deliberately concealed its role in the European Opposition, compelling Patent Owner to file two discovery motions to uncover a fact that Petitioner should have disclosed from the beginning. Should the Board permit Petitioner to proceed with its Motion, Patent Owner will not only oppose it but will also actively seek appropriate relief, including all available fees and costs, due to Petitioner's conduct and its insistence on pursuing a baseless sanctions campaign.

The parties are available to conference with the Board, as necessary, at the following times:

Tuesday (4/28) between 1-2:30 PM eastern; and
Wednesday (4/29) between 1-3 PM eastern

Respectfully,

Chelsea A. Loughran
Counsel for Petitioner

Chelsea A. Loughran
Pronouns: she/her/hers
Shareholder
Admitted to Practice: MA
cloughran@WolfGreenfield.com
617.646.8429

Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.
BOSTON | NEW YORK | WASHINGTON DC
wolfgreenfield.com

This e-mail message and any attachments may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify me immediately by replying to this message. Please destroy all copies of this message and any attachments. Thank you.