

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

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

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1) and the Federal Rules of Evidence (“FRE”), Patent Owner objects to the following documents submitted by Petitioner Conjupro Biotherapeutics, Inc. in support of its Reply filed on May 28, 2026. These objections are timely served within five (5) business days.

Nothing in this paper should be construed as an admission that any rights of Patent Owner would have been waived or forfeited had the paper or any objection herein not been filed.

I. Exhibit 1035

Under FRE 602/701/801/802 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.61, this document includes testimony that is not shown to be based on first-hand knowledge, is based on speculation, and constitutes and contains inadmissible hearsay. Under FRE 401-403/701-702/801-803 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.65, this document, including, for example and without limitation, paragraphs 11-14, 17, 21-25, 27-29, 31, 33-38, 40-51, is inadmissible to the extent that it is conclusory and does not disclose bases for the opinions offered therein. Further, Figures 1A, 1B, and 2-10 in the document are inadmissible to the extent that it does not disclose a source for the figures, the figures are not cited in the Reply, and constitute impermissible hearsay. Petitioner 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.

Under FRE 401/402/403 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.23, this document, including, for

example and without limitation, paragraphs 16-20 and 45-51 and Figures 1A, 1B, and 2-10, is inadmissible as it includes testimony that is not cited to or relied upon by Petitioner in the Reply. Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3), this document, including, for example and without limitation, paragraphs 16-20 and 45-51 and Figures 1A, 1B, and 2-10, is inadmissible to the extent that it constitutes improper incorporation by reference.

Under FRE 401/402/403/702, this document, including for example and without limitation the paragraphs and figures identified earlier in this objection, includes testimony that is not reliable and not relevant to the instituted review, because, among other things, it has not been shown that the purportedly expert declarant is qualified to testify competently regarding the matters the opinions are said to address, or that the declarant's testimony is based on sufficient facts or data or arrived at by reliable legal or art principles, procedures, or methods reliably applied to the facts of this case, or that the declarant's opinion will assist the trier of fact to understand the evidence or to determine any fact in issue and does not have a greater potential to confuse and/or mislead than to enlighten.

Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)(5), this document includes testimony that should have been included with the Petition.

II. Exhibit 1036

Under FRE 401/402/403, this document is inadmissible as irrelevant because, among other things, it is not prior art, it does not form a basis of the instituted grounds, and its probative value is outweighed by other considerations including prejudice, confusion and waste of time. Under FRE 901/902, this document lacks authentication and is not self-authenticating because it lacks sufficient indicia that the exhibit is what it purports to be. Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)(5), this document is inadmissible because it should have been included with the Petition.

III. Exhibit 1037

Under FRE 401/402/403, this document is inadmissible as irrelevant because, among other things, it does not form a basis of the instituted grounds, and its probative value is outweighed by other considerations including prejudice, confusion and waste of time. Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)(5), this document is inadmissible because it should have been included with the Petition.

IV. Exhibits 1038

Under FRE 401/402/403, these documents are inadmissible as irrelevant because, among other things, they do not form a basis of the instituted grounds, and their probative value are outweighed by other considerations including prejudice, confusion and waste of time. Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)(5), these documents are inadmissible because they should have been included with the Petition.

Dated: June 4, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

COOLEY LLP

ATTN: Patent Group
1299 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20004-2400
Tel: (858) 550-6019
Fax: (858) 550-6420

By: /Geoffrey D. Biegler/
W. Chad Shear (Reg. No. 47,938)
Geoffrey D. Biegler (*pro hac vice*)
Isha Agarwal (*pro hac vice*)
Tae Yeon Kim (*pro hac vice*)
COOLEY LLP
ATTN: Patent Group
1299 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20004-2400
Tel: (858) 550-6019
Fax: (858) 550-6420

Counsel for Patent Owner

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.6(e), 42.205(a)

I, Geoffrey D. Biegler, hereby certify that on this 4th day of June, 2026, the foregoing **PATENT OWNER'S OBJECTIONS TO PETITIONER'S EVIDENCE SUBMITTED WITH PETITIONER'S REPLY** was served electronically via email on the following:

Jin Zhu, Ph.D.
Joe G. Chen, Ph.D.
FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP
212 Carnegie Center, Suite 400
Princeton, NJ 08540
jzhu@foxrothschild.com
joechen@foxrothschild.com

Luke Toft
FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP
33 South 6th Street, Suite 3600
Minneapolis, MN 55402
ltoft@foxrothschild.com

Dated: June 4, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

COOLEY LLP

ATTN: Patent Group
1299 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20004-2400
Tel: (858) 550-6019
Fax: (858) 550-6420

By: /Geoffrey D. Biegler/
W. Chad Shear (Reg. No. 47,938)
Geoffrey D. Biegler (*pro hac vice*)
Isha Agarwal (*pro hac vice*)
Tae Yeon Kim (*pro hac vice*)
COOLEY LLP
ATTN: Patent Group
1299 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20004-2400
Tel: (858) 550-6019
Fax: (858) 550-6420

Counsel for Patent Owner