

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CONJUPRO BIOTHERAPEUTICS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

ASCLETIS PHARMA CHINA CO. LTD.,
Patent Owner.

Case No. PGR2025-00057
Patent No. 12,234,236
Title: GLP-1R agonist and therapeutic method thereof

**PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS TO PATENT OWNER'S EVIDENCE
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1)**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64 and the Federal Rules of Evidence, as applied by the Board, Petitioner Conjupro Biotherapeutics, Inc. (“Petitioner”) provides the following objections to evidence submitted by Patent Owner Ascleitis Pharma China Co Ltd. (“Patent Owner”). These objections are timely served within five (5) business days.

Petitioner serves Patent Owner with these objections to provide notice that Patent Owner may move to exclude the challenged evidence under 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c) unless Patent Owner cures the defects associated with the challenged evidence identified below. In addition, Petitioner reserves the right to present further objections to this or additional evidence submitted by Patent Owner, as allowed by the applicable rules or other authority.

I. Exhibit 2079 – Declaration of Dr. Peter Wipf

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2079 under Fed. R. Evid. 401–403 and 702.

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2079 to the extent the testimony contained therein is not cited to or relied upon by Patent Owner. *See* 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.22-44.23; *see also* § 42.204; *Actifo, Inc. v. Delphix Corp.*, IPR2015-00108, Paper 56 at 57 (PTAB Apr. 29, 2016) (excluding evidence not relied upon). Paragraphs 32–46, 48, 50–51, 53–60, 65, 67–69, 71, 78, 82–83, 85–87, 89–91, 93–94, 97–98, 100–102, 106, 108, 110–120, 122, 125–126, 129–130, 132–139, 143, 148–152, 154–165, 168–176, 179–180, 182–183, 189–190, 192–193, 199–201, 204–206, 211–213, 218, 220–221, 223,

231–254, 257, 259–273, 275, 278, 282, 285, 287–288, 292–293, 296–297, 302–305, 309–310, 319, and 328–333 contain substantive testimony but are not cited in Patent Owner’s Response. Accordingly, this evidence is irrelevant, misleading, and confusing under Fed. R. Evid. 401–403.

Petitioner further objects to this testimony to the extent it constitutes an improper incorporation by reference under 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3). Patent Owner elected not to rely on the uncited testimony of Dr. Wipf and therefore any of his opinions and/or this evidence is not part of Patent Owner’s Response and thus should not need to be rebutted or addressed by Petitioner in its Reply. To the extent Patent Owner is attempting to rely on any of this testimony or evidence, Petitioner has not been given the opportunity to assess how Patent Owner intends to use it and/or which arguments it purportedly supports, to the extent such arguments were raised at all. This is extremely prejudicial to Petitioner.

Petitioner also objects to the portions of Exhibit 2079, pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. 702, as offering opinions beyond Dr. Wipf’s qualifications or without the appropriate qualifications.

First, Dr. Wipf offers opinions based on his own analysis of the three-dimensional cryo-EM model of orforglipron bound to the GLP-1 receptor deposited in the Protein Data Bank (PDB ID: 6XOX). (*See* EX2079, ¶¶88–98 (citing EX2035).) Dr. Wipf is allegedly a synthetic organic and medicinal chemist, and

nothing in his qualifications establishes expertise in structural biology, cryo-electron microscopy, or computational analysis of protein-ligand binding pocket geometry sufficient to render reliable opinions on the three-dimensional spatial environment of the GLP-1R binding pocket. (See EX2079, ¶¶3–12.) Specifically, Petitioner objects to Dr. Wipf’s opinions in paragraphs 88–98 of his declaration, where he opines that the binding pocket is not “spacious” and could not accommodate a bulkier substituent, based on his visualization of the 3D cryo-EM model. (EX2079, ¶¶88–98, 169–181; EX2035, 1–11.) Accordingly, this testimony is also objectionable as misleading, confusing, and unfairly prejudicial under Fed. R. Evid. 401–403.

Second, Petitioner objects to portions of Exhibit 2079 in which Dr. Wipf offers opinions on the clinical significance of Ascleitis’s ASC30 clinical trial results, including its Phase 1 and Phase 2 data. (EX2079, ¶¶326–327; EX2042; EX2066.) Dr. Wipf is not a clinician, pharmacologist, or clinical trial specialist, (see EX2079, ¶¶3–12), and he therefore lacks the qualifications to offer reliable expert opinions on the clinical significance of weight loss data, gastrointestinal tolerability comparisons, or the implications of pharmacokinetic profiles for human dosing regimens. These opinions are beyond the scope of his expertise in synthetic organic and medicinal chemistry and should be given no weight. Accordingly, this testimony

is also objectionable as misleading, confusing, and unfairly prejudicial under Fed. R. Evid. 401–403.

Third, Petitioner objects to portions of Exhibit 2079 that rely on data presented in the Gargiulo Declaration (EX2080) and the Ascleitis laboratory notebook (EX2081) as a basis for his expert opinions on unexpected results and solubility. (EX2079, ¶¶311–325; EX2080, ¶¶6–13; EX2081.) As set forth below, the Gargiulo Declaration and laboratory notebook themselves suffer from authentication, hearsay, and foundation deficiencies that render them unreliable bases for expert opinion under FRE 703. Accordingly, this testimony is also objectionable as misleading, confusing, and unfairly prejudicial under Fed. R. Evid. 401–403.

Petitioner also objects to the figures in Exhibit 2079 at pages 11–14, 38–39, 41, 42, 44, 50, 51, 54, 57, 58, 87–91, 93–94, 96, 100–101, 103, 116, 124, 130, 136, and 141 under Fed. R. Evid. 403, 702, and 801–803. First, Dr. Wipf has not provided a source or at least an accurate source for multiple figures. Second, he has not explained why such figures or annotations on such figures are necessary to assist the trier of fact to understand evidence or determine a fact at issue in this proceeding. Third, multiple of the images are not cited in the Response and therefore are misleading, likely to cause confusion, and/or are unfairly prejudicial on issues in this proceeding. Fourth, to the extent the images were prepared by others or an unidentified program or algorithm, they constitute impermissible hearsay.

Petitioner also objects to Exhibit 2079 under Fed. R. Evid. 401–403 to the extent it contains irrelevant evidence and evidence with probative value that is substantially outweighed by a danger of unfair prejudice or confusing the issues, at least to the extent Dr. Wipf mischaracterizes, presents inaccurately incomplete summaries or citations of, and/or suggests the alleged meaning of various statements and positions of Petitioner and Dr. Pirrung (especially where Dr. Wipf does not cite to any support). (*See* Ex. 2079 ¶¶66–67, 82, 85–87, 93, 101–103, 108–109, 138–139, 141, 143–148, 150–155, 165, 167–168, 170–174, 176, 178–180, 182–183, 187–188, 192–193, 195, 199, 201–202, 209, 216–217, 221–222, 228, 240, 250, 255–256, 259–260, 262, 265, 273, 276, 279–286, 288–289, 292–293, 297, 304, 308.)

Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2079 to the extent it includes statements of opinion that do not sufficiently disclose the underlying facts or data on which the opinions are based.

II. Exhibits 2032, 2035–2041, 2043–2045, 2047, 2049, 2065, 2067, 2069, 2071, 2077, and 2082

Petitioner objects to Exhibits 2032, 2035–2041, 2043–2045, 2047, 2049, 2065, 2067, 2069, 2071, 2077, and 2082 under Fed. R. Evid. 401–403, 801–803, and 901–902.

None of these exhibits are cited to or relied upon by Patent Owner in its Response. *See* 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.22–44.23; *see also* § 42.204; *Actifo, Inc. v. Delphix*

Corp., IPR2015-00108, Paper 56 at 57 (PTAB Apr. 29, 2016) (excluding evidence not relied upon). In addition, at least Exhibits 2037–2040, 2043–2045, 2047, 2049, 2065, 2067, 2069, 2071, and 2082 are not cited in Patent Owner’s Response, not cited in any testimony cited to in the Response, and/or are not cited by any testimony at all. Accordingly, this evidence is irrelevant, misleading, confusing, and unfairly prejudicial under Fed. R. Evid. 401–403.

III. Exhibits 2053–2064

Petitioner objects to Exhibits 2053–2064 under Fed. R. Evid. 401–403, 702, and 801–803 because the evidence is irrelevant and/or more prejudicial than probative, and constitutes hearsay.

Petitioner objects to Exhibits 2053 through 2064 as irrelevant and more prejudicial than probative. Patent Owner and Dr. Wipf cite these exhibits — purportedly a collection of general review articles about various heterocyclic groups used in medicinal chemistry — for the sole purpose of arguing that a skilled artisan would be “just as likely” to consider any number of alternative scaffolds and modifications as those identified by Petitioner. (Papers 26, 29–33; EX2079, ¶¶284.) However, these articles do not address the specific modifications at issue in this proceeding and there is no suggestion otherwise. The existence of other review articles discussing other substituents has no tendency to make any fact of consequence in this proceeding more or less probable. FRE 401, 402. The relevance

of these exhibits is further undermined by the fact that Patent Owner does not rely on the substance of any particular teaching in any of these articles but merely invokes all these exhibits in bulk to support a generalized argument about the breadth of allegedly prior art. Accordingly, this evidence is irrelevant, misleading, confusing, and unfairly prejudicial under Fed. R. Evid. 401–403.

Petitioner further objects to Exhibits 2053 through 2064 as containing impermissible hearsay under FRE 801–803.

IV. Exhibit 2080 – Declaration of John Gargiulo

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2080 under Fed. R. Evid. 401–403, 602, 702, 801–803, and 901–902 because the declarant lacks personal knowledge and scientific qualifications to testify regarding the experimental data, and the testimony constitutes hearsay.

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2080 to the extent it presents scientific data and test results for which Mr. Gargiulo lacks personal knowledge. (*See* EX2080, ¶¶1–13.) Mr. Gargiulo is the Chief Business Officer of Ascletis Pharma Inc., with a Master’s Degree in Business Administration from The Fuqua School of Business at Duke University and a Bachelor of Arts in Economics from Boston College. (EX2080, ¶¶3–4.) He is not a scientist, chemist, or pharmacologist. Mr. Gargiulo testifies regarding in vitro activity evaluation results (EC50 data comparing challenged compounds to orforglipron) (EX2080, ¶¶6–8), pharmacokinetic study

data (clearance, Cmax values for Compounds 1 and 19) (EX2080, ¶¶9–11), and authentication of a laboratory notebook (EX2081) (EX2080, ¶¶12–13). While Mr. Gargiulo states he has “personal knowledge of all the facts in this declaration” (EX2080, ¶1), his educational background and business-oriented role do not provide a foundation for personal knowledge of the conduct, methodology, or reliability of scientific assays and pharmacokinetic studies. (EX2080, ¶¶3–4.) The declaration does not identify who actually conducted the experiments, the protocols followed, or any quality assurance measures applied, and Mr. Gargiulo does not claim to have been present for or to have supervised any of the scientific testing. His testimony regarding the experimental data amounts to repeating what others told him or what appears in company records, and he lacks the scientific qualifications to assess the accuracy or reliability of the underlying data.

To the extent Mr. Gargiulo presents experimental data and test results that were generated by Ascleitis scientists or laboratory personnel other than himself, his testimony constitutes hearsay. (EX2080, ¶¶6–11.) The out-of-court statements (the experimental results recorded by laboratory personnel) are being offered for the truth of the matter asserted — namely, the potency, pharmacokinetic properties, and solubility of the challenged compounds. These statements do not fall within any recognized exception to the hearsay rule. To the extent Patent Owner contends that these are business records under FRE 803(6), the Gargiulo Declaration does not

provide the requisite foundation, as Mr. Gargiulo does not identify the persons who performed the assays, their qualifications, the regular practices followed, or when the data was recorded in relation to when the experiments were performed.

Accordingly, this evidence is irrelevant, misleading, confusing, and unfairly prejudicial under Fed. R. Evid. 401–403, constitutes hearsay or hearsay within hearsay under 801–805, and is not authenticated under 901–902.

V. Exhibit 2081

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2081 under Fed. R. Evid. 401–403, 801–803, 805, and 901–902 because the exhibit has not been properly authenticated, constitutes hearsay, and its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice.

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2081 on the ground that it has not been properly authenticated. The exhibit purports to be a laboratory notebook documenting solubility testing of compounds GLC02-521 (Compound 1) and GLC02-568 (Compound 65) in phosphate buffer at pH 11. (EX2081, 1; EX2080, ¶¶12–13.) Mr. Gargiulo, a business executive, authenticates this document by stating it is “a true and correct copy of Ascleitis laboratory notebook GLNB007230-3” and that “[l]aboratory notebooks, including this laboratory notebook, are maintained in the regular course of business at Ascleitis.” (EX2080, ¶12.) However, this bare assertion is insufficient. The laboratory notebook was created on March 4, 2026, by an

individual identified only as “梁斌” (Liang Bin), just one day before Patent Owner’s Response was filed on March 5, 2026. (EX2081, 1 (“创建时间:2026/03/04 16:16:04 创建人:梁斌”); Paper 26.) Neither Mr. Gargiulo nor any other declarant identifies who this individual is, what their qualifications are, whether they were supervised, or whether the notebook accurately reflects the experiments as actually performed. The notebook itself contains text in Chinese, and no certified translation has been provided for all portions of the document.

The laboratory notebook constitutes an out-of-court statement offered for the truth of the matter asserted — that Compound 65 has 113-fold greater solubility than Compound 1 at pH 11. (EX2081, 1 (“GLC02-568 exhibited a solubility of 6.650 mg/mL in pH 11 phosphate buffer, representing a 113-fold increase over GLC02-521 (0.0587 mg/mL)”)).) No witness with personal knowledge of the experiments described in the notebook has submitted testimony, and Mr. Gargiulo’s declaration is insufficient to establish any hearsay exception. The notebook does not qualify as a business record under FRE 803(6) because (1) it was created on the eve of the filing deadline for Patent Owner’s Response, raising the inference that it was prepared in anticipation of litigation rather than in the regular course of business; (2) no qualified witness has testified to the regular practice of making and keeping

such records; and (3) the circumstances of its preparation — including the timing and the absence of any prior reference to this particular test in any other document of record — suggest a lack of trustworthiness.

In addition, the notebook's probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and misleading the Board. The solubility data was generated at a single pH value (pH 11) without explanation of why that pH was selected or how it relates to physiologically relevant conditions. (EX2081, 1; EX2079, ¶324.) The testing appears to have been conducted specifically for purposes of this proceeding, and Petitioner has had no opportunity to examine the individuals who conducted the testing, review the full experimental protocols, or verify the accuracy of the results.

VI. Exhibit 2033 – Deposition Transcript of Dr. Michael Pirrung

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2033 under Fed. R. Evid. 106, 401–403, and 801–803 because Patent Owner's selective use of deposition excerpts is misleading without additional context.

Petitioner objects to Patent Owner's selective use of Dr. Pirrung's deposition testimony, Exhibit 2033, throughout its Response and the Wipf Declaration. Patent Owner repeatedly cites isolated excerpts from Dr. Pirrung's deposition out of context. (*See, e.g.*, Papers 26, 27, 34–36, 55–56 (citing EX2033, 19:6–12, 36:17–37:7, 38:1–12, 39:13–41:3, 42:17–43:6, 45:15–46:7, 56:4–14).) Under FRE 106,

where Patent Owner introduces a portion of a deposition transcript, any other part that ought in fairness to be considered contemporaneously should also be introduced. To the extent Patent Owner relies on selective excerpts that are misleading or incomplete without additional context, Petitioner objects and reserves the right to introduce additional portions of Dr. Pirrung's testimony for completeness.

VII. Exhibit 2035 – Deposition transcript of Michael Pirrung taken on February 26, 2026

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2035 under Fed. R. Evid. 106, 401–403, 801–803, 805, and 901–902 because the exhibit is incomplete, not authenticated, constitutes hearsay, and may not have been available prior to the effective date of the patent.

Exhibit 2035 contains 11 figures or images, all of which appear to be screen shots of images or sources prepared by third-party individuals and published on a website visited by some unidentified individual on February 11, 2026. First, these images appear to be incomplete snips and therefore are improper under FRE 106's rule of completeness. Second, there is no indication that any image was available prior to February 11, 2026 or otherwise available prior to the effective date of the '236 Patent and therefore these images are irrelevant, misleading, confusing, and unfairly prejudicial under FRE 401–403. Third, these images and statements in Exhibit 2035 are out-of-court statements being offered for the truth of the matter

asserted and are therefore hearsay under FRE 801–803. In addition, since these images and possible statements were taken from another source, they also constitute hearsay within hearsay under FRE 805. Fourth, there has been no attempt to explain what Exhibit 2035 is, much less authenticate it, pursuant to FRE 901–902.

VIII. Exhibit 2036

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2036 under Fed. R. Evid. 401–403, 801–803, 805, and 901–902 because the exhibit is not authenticated, constitutes hearsay, and was not shown to be available prior to the effective date of the patent.

Exhibit 2036 appears to be a March 3, 2026 printed PDF of a definition or explanation of standard amino acids from Britannica. First, there is no indication that this content was available prior to March 3, 2026 or otherwise available prior to the effective date of the '236 Patent. In fact, the only two dates visible are both in March 2026. Therefore, this Exhibit is irrelevant, misleading, confusing, and unfairly prejudicial under FRE 401–403. Second, Exhibit 2036 contains out-of-court statements being offered for the truth of the matter asserted and are therefore hearsay under FRE 801–803. In addition, the content includes citations to and statements from other linked sources and thus also constitutes hearsay within hearsay under FRE 805. Third, there has been no attempt to explain what Exhibit 2036 is, much less authenticate it, pursuant to FRE 901–902. Exhibit 2036 is also not stamped with an exhibit or page number.

IX. Exhibit 2042

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2042 under Fed. R. Evid. 401–403, 801–803, 805, and 901–902 because the exhibit is a self-serving press release that constitutes hearsay and is more prejudicial than probative.

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2042, which is a press release issued by Ascletis Pharma Inc. dated December 8, 2025, announcing Phase II clinical trial results for ASC30. (EX2042.) This document constitutes hearsay under 801–803 and/or 805 as it is an out-of-court statement offered for the truth of the matter asserted — that ASC30 achieved certain weight loss and safety endpoints. Press releases are self-serving promotional materials issued by the party offering them and do not fall within any recognized hearsay exception. The press release does not constitute a learned treatise, public record, or business record. Moreover, the data presented in the press release has not been peer-reviewed or independently verified, and the underlying clinical trial data has not been produced or made available for scrutiny.

The press release is also objectionable under FRE 403 because its promotional nature creates a substantial danger of misleading the Board. The document is designed to generate favorable publicity and investor interest, not to provide an objective, balanced account of clinical findings. Patent Owner uses this exhibit to argue that its drug candidate has a “best-in-class profile” and compares ASC30 favorably to orforglipron in a cross-trial comparison, but such cross-trial

comparisons are inherently unreliable without access to the underlying data and study designs.

X. Exhibit 2044

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2044 under Fed. R. Evid. 106, 401–403, 801–803, 805, and 901–902 because the exhibit is incomplete, not authenticated, constitutes hearsay, and was not shown to be available prior to the effective date of the patent.

Exhibit 2044 appears to be excerpts from a book, and specifically just chapter 7. First, this excerpt is incomplete as it contains only one chapter of a larger book and is therefore improper under FRE 106’s rule of completeness. Second, there is no indication that the excerpts in the book were available prior to March 5, 2026 (the date it was filed) or otherwise available prior to the effective date of the ’236 Patent and therefore this Exhibit is irrelevant, misleading, confusing, and unfairly prejudicial under FRE 401–403. Third, the statements in Exhibit 2044 are out-of-court statements being offered for the truth of the matter asserted and are therefore hearsay under FRE 801–803. In addition, multiple statements in Exhibit 2044 are provided by or quotes from other sources and thus constitute hearsay within hearsay under FRE 805. Fourth, there has been no attempt to explain what Exhibit 2044 is, much less authenticate it, pursuant to FRE 901–902.

XI. Exhibit 2047

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2047 under Fed. R. Evid. 106, 401–403, 801–803, 805, and 901–902 because the exhibit is incomplete, not authenticated, constitutes hearsay, and was not shown to be available prior to the effective date of the patent.

Exhibit 2047 appears to be an excerpt from a larger publication (it starts on page 2866). First, this excerpt is incomplete as it contains only one portion of the larger publication and is therefore improper under FRE 106’s rule of completeness. Second, there is no indication that the excerpts were available prior to the effective date of the ’236 Patent. In fact, the excerpt is dated December 20/27, 2025. Therefore, this Exhibit is irrelevant, misleading, confusing, and unfairly prejudicial under FRE 401–403. Third, the statements in Exhibit 2047 are out-of-court statements being offered for the truth of the matter asserted and are therefore hearsay under FRE 801–803. In addition, the statements in Exhibit 2047 rely on other out-of-court statements for their truth of the matter asserted and thus constitute hearsay within hearsay under FRE 805. Fourth, there has been no attempt to explain what Exhibit 2047 is, much less authenticate it, pursuant to FRE 901–902.

XII. Exhibit 2049

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2049 under Fed. R. Evid. 106, 401–403, 801–803, 805, and 901–902 because the exhibit is incomplete, not authenticated,

constitutes hearsay, and was not shown to be available prior to the effective date of the patent.

Exhibit 2049 is an article. First, this article is an excerpt of a larger publication (it starts on page 215) and is therefore incomplete and improper under FRE 106's rule of completeness. Second, there is no indication that the article was available prior to the effective date of the '236 Patent. In fact, the article states it was revised throughout 2024 and may not have been published until 2025. Therefore, this Exhibit is irrelevant, misleading, confusing, and unfairly prejudicial under FRE 401–403. Third, the statements in Exhibit 2049 are out-of-court statements being offered for the truth of the matter asserted and are therefore hearsay under FRE 801–803. In addition, the statements in Exhibit 2049 rely on other out-of-court statements for their truth of the matter asserted and thus constitute hearsay within hearsay under FRE 805. Fourth, there has been no attempt to explain what Exhibit 2049 is, much less authenticate it, pursuant to FRE 901–902.

XIII. Exhibit 2050

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2050 under Fed. R. Evid. 401–403, 801–803, 805, and 901–902 because the exhibit is not authenticated, constitutes hearsay, and was not shown to be available prior to the effective date of the patent.

Exhibit 2050 is an article. First, there is no indication that the article was available prior to the effective date of the '236 Patent. In fact, the only date on the

article is April 14, 2025. Therefore, this Exhibit is irrelevant, misleading, confusing, and unfairly prejudicial under FRE 401–403. Second, the statements in Exhibit 2050 are out-of-court statements being offered for the truth of the matter asserted and are therefore hearsay under FRE 801–803. In addition, Exhibit 2050 includes quotes by others and thus constitutes hearsay within hearsay under FRE 805. Third, there has been no attempt to explain what Exhibit 2050 is, much less authenticate it, pursuant to FRE 901–902.

XIV. Exhibit 2051

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2051 under Fed. R. Evid. 401–403, 801–803, 805, and 901–902 because the exhibit is not authenticated, constitutes hearsay, and was not shown to be available prior to the effective date of the patent.

Exhibit 2051 is an article. First, there is no indication that the article was available prior to the effective date of the '236 Patent. In fact, the only date on the article appears to say August 5, 2025. Therefore, this Exhibit is irrelevant, misleading, confusing, and unfairly prejudicial under FRE 401–403. Second, the statements in Exhibit 2051 are out-of-court statements being offered for the truth of the matter asserted and are therefore hearsay under FRE 801–803. In addition, Exhibit 2051 includes quotes by others and thus constitutes hearsay within hearsay under FRE 805. Third, there has been no attempt to explain what Exhibit 2051 is, much less authenticate it, pursuant to FRE 901–902.

XV. Exhibit 2053

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2053 under Fed. R. Evid. 106, 401–403, 801–803, 805, and 901–902 because the exhibit is incomplete, not authenticated, constitutes hearsay, and was not shown to be available prior to the effective date of the patent.

Exhibit 2053 is an article. First, this article is an excerpt of a larger publication (it starts on page 4540) and is therefore incomplete and improper under FRE 106's rule of completeness. Second, there is no indication that the article was available prior to the effective date of the '236 Patent. In fact, the article suggests it was not published until 2025. Therefore, this Exhibit is irrelevant, misleading, confusing, and unfairly prejudicial under FRE 401–403. Third, the statements in Exhibit 2053 are out-of-court statements being offered for the truth of the matter asserted and are therefore hearsay under FRE 801–803. In addition, the statements in Exhibit 2053 rely on other out-of-court statements for their truth of the matter asserted and thus constitute hearsay within hearsay under FRE 805. Fourth, there has been no attempt to explain what Exhibit 2053 is, much less authenticate it, pursuant to FRE 901–902.

XVI. Exhibit 2057

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2057 under Fed. R. Evid. 106, 401–403, 801–803, 805, and 901–902 because the exhibit is incomplete, not authenticated, constitutes hearsay, and was not shown to be available prior to the effective date of the patent.

Exhibit 2057 is an article. First, this article appears to be part of a larger publication and is therefore incomplete and improper under FRE 106's rule of completeness. Second, there is no indication that the article was available prior to the effective date of the '236 Patent. Therefore, this Exhibit is irrelevant, misleading, confusing, and unfairly prejudicial under FRE 401–403. Third, the statements in Exhibit 2057 are out-of-court statements being offered for the truth of the matter asserted and are therefore hearsay under FRE 801–803. In addition, the statements in Exhibit 2057 rely on other out-of-court statements for their truth of the matter asserted and thus constitute hearsay within hearsay under FRE 805. Fourth, there has been no attempt to explain what Exhibit 2057 is, much less authenticate it, pursuant to FRE 901–902.

XVII. Exhibit 2058

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2058 under Fed. R. Evid. 106, 401–403, 801–803, 805, and 901–902 because the exhibit is incomplete, not authenticated, constitutes hearsay, and was not shown to be available prior to the effective date of the patent.

Exhibit 2058 is a letter. First, this letter appears to be part of a larger publication (starts on page 123) and is therefore incomplete and improper under FRE 106's rule of completeness. Second, there is no indication that the letter was available prior to the effective date of the '236 Patent and there is a suggestion it was

not published until at least 2025. Therefore, this Exhibit is irrelevant, misleading, confusing, and unfairly prejudicial under FRE 401–403. Third, the statements in Exhibit 2058 are out-of-court statements being offered for the truth of the matter asserted and are therefore hearsay under FRE 801–803. In addition, the statements in Exhibit 2058 rely on other out-of-court statements for their truth of the matter asserted and thus constitute hearsay within hearsay under FRE 805. Fourth, there has been no attempt to explain what Exhibit 2058 is, much less authenticate it, pursuant to FRE 901–902.

XVIII. Exhibit 2059

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2059 under Fed. R. Evid. 106, 401–403, 801–803, 805, and 901–902 because the exhibit is incomplete, not authenticated, constitutes hearsay, and was not shown to be available prior to the effective date of the patent.

Exhibit 2059 is an article. First, this article appears to be part of a larger publication and is therefore incomplete and improper under FRE 106’s rule of completeness. Second, there is no indication that the article was available prior to the effective date of the ’236 Patent and instead there is a suggestion that it was published after the effective date. Therefore, this Exhibit is irrelevant, misleading, confusing, and unfairly prejudicial under FRE 401–403. Third, the statements in Exhibit 2059 are out-of-court statements being offered for the truth of the matter

asserted and are therefore hearsay under FRE 801–803. In addition, the statements in Exhibit 2059 rely on other out-of-court statements for their truth of the matter asserted and thus constitute hearsay within hearsay under FRE 805. Fourth, there has been no attempt to explain what Exhibit 2059 is, much less authenticate it, pursuant to FRE 901–902.

XIX. Exhibit 2060

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2060 under Fed. R. Evid. 106, 401–403, 801–803, 805, and 901–902 because the exhibit is incomplete, not authenticated, constitutes hearsay, and was not shown to be available prior to the effective date of the patent.

Exhibit 2060 is an article. First, this article appears to be part of a larger publication and is therefore incomplete and improper under FRE 106’s rule of completeness. Second, there is no indication that the article was available prior to the effective date of the ’236 Patent and instead there is a suggestion that it was published after the effective date. Therefore, this Exhibit is irrelevant, misleading, confusing, and unfairly prejudicial under FRE 401–403. Third, the statements in Exhibit 2060 are out-of-court statements being offered for the truth of the matter asserted and are therefore hearsay under FRE 801–803. In addition, the statements in Exhibit 2060 rely on other out-of-court statements for their truth of the matter asserted and thus constitute hearsay within hearsay under FRE 805. Fourth, there

has been no attempt to explain what Exhibit 2060 is, much less authenticate it, pursuant to FRE 901–902.

XX. Exhibit 2062

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2062 under Fed. R. Evid. 106, 401–403, 801–803, 805, and 901–902 because the exhibit is incomplete, not authenticated, constitutes hearsay, and was not shown to be available prior to the effective date of the patent.

Exhibit 2062 is an article. First, this article appears to be part of a larger publication and is therefore incomplete and improper under FRE 106’s rule of completeness. Second, there is no indication that the article was available prior to the effective date of the ’236 Patent and instead there is a suggestion that it was published after the effective date. Therefore, this Exhibit is irrelevant, misleading, confusing, and unfairly prejudicial under FRE 401–403. Third, the statements in Exhibit 2062 are out-of-court statements being offered for the truth of the matter asserted and are therefore hearsay under FRE 801–803. In addition, the statements in Exhibit 2062 rely on other out-of-court statements for their truth of the matter asserted and thus constitute hearsay within hearsay under FRE 805. Fourth, there has been no attempt to explain what Exhibit 2062 is, much less authenticate it, pursuant to FRE 901–902.

XXI. Exhibit 2066

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2066 under Fed. R. Evid. 401–403, 801–803, 805, and 901–902 because the exhibit is not authenticated, constitutes hearsay, and was not shown to be available prior to the effective date of the patent.

Exhibit 2066 appears to be a poster. First, there is no indication that the poster was available prior to the effective date of the '236 Patent and no suggestion it was published at all. Therefore, this Exhibit is irrelevant, misleading, confusing, and unfairly prejudicial under FRE 401–403. Second, the statements in Exhibit 2066 are out-of-court statements being offered for the truth of the matter asserted and are therefore hearsay under FRE 801–803. In addition, the statements in Exhibit 2066 rely on other out-of-court statements for their truth of the matter asserted and thus constitute hearsay within hearsay under FRE 805. The poster is authored by Ascleitis employees and has not been subjected to peer review. It does not qualify as a learned treatise, public record, or business record under the hearsay exceptions. Third, there has been no attempt to explain what Exhibit 2066 is, much less authenticate it, pursuant to FRE 901–902.

XXII. Exhibit 2067

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2067 under Fed. R. Evid. 401–403, 801–803, 805, and 901–902 because the exhibit is not authenticated, constitutes hearsay, and was not shown to be available prior to the effective date of the patent.

Exhibit 2067 is a review article. First, there is no indication that the article was available prior to the effective date of the '236 Patent and instead there is a suggestion that it was published after the effective date. Therefore, this Exhibit is irrelevant, misleading, confusing, and unfairly prejudicial under FRE 401–403. Second, the statements in Exhibit 2067 are out-of-court statements being offered for the truth of the matter asserted and are therefore hearsay under FRE 801–803. In addition, the statements in Exhibit 2067 rely on other out-of-court statements for their truth of the matter asserted and thus constitute hearsay within hearsay under FRE 805. Third, there has been no attempt to explain what Exhibit 2067 is, much less authenticate it, pursuant to FRE 901–902.

XXIII. Exhibit 2082

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2082 under Fed. R. Evid. 401–403, 801–803, 805, and 901–902 because the exhibit is irrelevant, not authenticated, and constitutes hearsay.

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2082. This article describes the synthesis of tetrahydroquinoline derivatives as GLP-1 secretagogues — compounds that stimulate GLP-1 release, which are mechanistically distinct from the GLP-1 receptor agonists at issue in this proceeding. Patent Owner does not rely on any specific teaching from this article in its Response, and the article has no tendency to make any fact of consequence more or less probable. The statements in Exhibit 2082 are

out-of-court statements being offered for the truth of the matter asserted and are therefore hearsay under FRE 801–803 and/or 805. There has been no attempt to explain what Exhibit 2082 is, much less authenticate it, pursuant to FRE 901–902.

XXIV. Exhibit 2083

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2083 under Fed. R. Evid. 106, 401–403, 801–803, 805, and 901–902 because the exhibit is incomplete, not authenticated, constitutes hearsay, and was not shown to be available prior to the effective date of the patent.

Exhibit 2083 is an article. First, this article appears to be part of a larger publication and is therefore incomplete and improper under FRE 106’s rule of completeness. Second, there is no indication that the article was available prior to the effective date of the ’236 Patent and instead there is a suggestion that it was published after the effective date. Therefore, this Exhibit is irrelevant, misleading, confusing, and unfairly prejudicial under FRE 401–403. Third, the statements in Exhibit 2083 are out-of-court statements being offered for the truth of the matter asserted and are therefore hearsay under FRE 801–803. In addition, the statements in Exhibit 2083 rely on other out-of-court statements for their truth of the matter asserted and thus constitute hearsay within hearsay under FRE 805. Fourth, there has been no attempt to explain what Exhibit 2083 is, much less authenticate it, pursuant to FRE 901–902.

Dated: March 12, 2026

By: /Luke Toft/

Luke Toft

Reg. No. 75,311

Counsel for Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 37 CFR § 42.6(e), I hereby certify that on March 12, 2026, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing **Petitioner's Objections to Patent Owner's Evidence Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1)** to be served by electronic mail, as authorized by Patent Owner, at the following email addresses:

W. Chad Shear
cshear@cooley.com

Geoffrey D. Biegler
gbiegler@cooley.com

Isha Agarwal
iagarwal@cooley.com

Tae Yeon (Zoe) Kim
zoe.kim@cooley.com

Dated: March 12, 2026

By: /Luke Toft/

Luke Toft
Reg. No. 75,311
Counsel for Petitioner