

EXHIBIT 1J

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

<hr/>)	
ARENDA S.A.R.L.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 12-1601-JLH
)	
MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC (f/k/a)	
MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.),)	
)	
Defendant.)	
<hr/>)	
ARENDA S.A.R.L.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 13-919-JLH
)	
GOOGLE LLC,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
<hr/>)	

JOINT STATEMENT OF UNCONTESTED FACTS

The parties submit this Joint Statement of Uncontested Facts. These uncontested facts shall require no proof at trial and will become part of the evidentiary record at trial once introduced to the jury. Any party may read or introduce any of the uncontested facts to the jury at any time without prior notice. By agreeing to this joint statement, neither party admits that any stated fact is relevant to any material issue of dispute.

I. THE PARTIES

1. Arendi S.à.r.l. is a corporation organized under Luxembourg law, where it has its principal place of business.

2. Google LLC (“Google”) is a Delaware corporation. It has its principal place of business in Mountain View, California.

3. Motorola Mobility, LLC is a Delaware corporation. It has its principal place of business in Libertyville, Illinois. Motorola Mobility, LLC (“Motorola”) was previously known as Motorola Mobility, Inc.

II. THE PATENT-IN-SUIT

4. The United States Patent and Trademark Office issued United States Patent No. 7,917,843 (“’843 Patent”) on March 29, 2011.

5. The title of the ’843 Patent is “Method, System and Computer Readable Medium for Addressing Handling From a Computer Program.”

6. The sole individual named on the face of the ’843 Patent as the inventor is Atle Hedløy.

7. Arendi S.A.R.L. is named on the face of the ’843 Patent as its assignee.

8. The ’843 Patent expired on November 10, 2018.

EXHIBIT 2P

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

<hr/>)	
ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 12-1601-JLH
)	
MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC (f/k/a)	
MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.),)	
)	
Defendant.)	
<hr/>)	
ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 13-919-JLH
)	
GOOGLE LLC,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
<hr/>)	

**PLAINTIFF ARENDI'S STATEMENT OF
ISSUES OF FACT THAT REMAIN TO BE LITIGATED**

Plaintiff's Statement of Issues of Fact to Be Litigated¹

1. Whether Arendi has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that each Defendant directly infringes claims 1, 8, 23 and 30 of the '843 Patent.

2. Whether Arendi has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that each Defendant is liable for indirect infringement by actively inducing infringement of claims 1, 8, 23 and 30 of the '843 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(b).

3. Whether Arendi has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that each Defendant is liable for indirect infringement by contributing to infringement of claims 1, 8, 23 and 30 of the '843 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(c).

4. Whether Arendi has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that each Defendant's infringement of the '843 Patent has been willful.

5. Whether Defendants have proven by clear and convincing evidence that claims 1, 8, 23 and 30 of the '843 Patent are invalid as anticipated or obvious under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103.

¹ This statement is based on the claims Arendi expects to present as well as its understanding of the defenses that Defendants are likely to present. If Defendants pursues additional defenses, or raises additional issues, Plaintiff reserves the right to supplement this statement. If an issue identified herein is more properly considered an issue of law, it should be so considered. If an issue of law is more properly considered an issue of fact, that issue is incorporated into this statement. Plaintiff reserves the right to revise this statement as necessary considering the Court's pretrial orders, including evidentiary rulings, or if any new allegations arise for which Defendants' submissions did not fairly put Plaintiff on notice. By including an issue of fact here, Plaintiff does not assume the burden of proof or production regarding the issues that are Defendants' burden to prove. Nor does Plaintiff concede that any genuine factual dispute exists as to any of the issues so listed.

6. Whether Defendants have proven by clear and convincing evidence that claims 1, 8, 23 and 30 of the '843 Patent lack adequate written description or enablement under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

7. The amount of damages that Arendi has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that it should be awarded due to each Defendant's infringement of the '843 Patent.

EXHIBIT 2D

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

C.A. No. 13-919-JLH

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,

Plaintiff,

v.

MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC (f/k/a
MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.),

Defendant.

C.A. No. 12-1601-JLH

**DEFENDANTS' STATEMENT OF ISSUES OF FACT
THAT REMAIN TO BE LITIGATED**

The following issues of fact remain to be litigated:¹

1. Whether Arendi has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that each Defendant literally and directly infringed claims 1, 8, 23, and 30 of the '843 Patent.
2. Whether Arendi has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that each Defendant's alleged infringement of the '843 Patent was willful.
3. Whether each Defendant has proven by clear and convincing evidence that claims 1, 8, 23, and 30 of the '843 Patent are invalid as anticipated or obvious under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103.
4. Whether the full scope of claims 1, 8, 23, and 30 of the '843 Patent are not adequately described by the specification and are thus invalid pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112.
5. Whether the full scope of claims 1, 8, 23 and 30 of the '843 Patent is not enabled by the specification and are thus invalid pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112.
6. The amount of damages that Arendi should be awarded for each Defendant's alleged infringement of the '843 Patent.

¹ This statement is based on the claims the parties expect to present as well as Defendants' understanding of the claims that Arendi seems likely to present. If Arendi pursues additional or altered claims, or raise additional issues, Defendants reserve the right to supplement this statement. If an issue identified herein is more properly considered an issue of law, it should be so considered. If an issue of law is more properly considered an issue of fact, that issue is incorporated into this statement. Defendants reserve the right to revise this statement as necessary considering the Court's pretrial orders, including evidentiary rulings, or if any new allegations arise for which the submissions did not fairly put Defendants on notice. By including an issue of fact here, Defendants do not assume the burden of proof or production regarding any issue that is Arendi's burden to prove. Nor do Defendants concede that any genuine factual dispute exists as to any of the issues listed.

EXHIBIT 3P

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 12-1601-JLH
)	
MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC (f/k/a)	
MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.),)	
)	
Defendant.)	
<hr/>		
ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 13-919-JLH
)	
GOOGLE LLC,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
<hr/>		

**PLAINTIFF ARENDI'S STATEMENT OF ISSUES OF LAW
THAT REMAIN TO BE LITIGATED**

Plaintiff's Statement of Issues of Law to be Litigated¹

1. Pre-Judgment and Post-Judgment Interest: Whether Plaintiff is entitled to pre-judgment and post-judgment interest. Relevant Authority: 35 U.S.C. § 284; *GM Corp. v. Devex Corp.*, 461 U.S. 648, 655 (1983) (“[P]rejudgment interest should ordinarily be awarded.”). “Generally, prejudgment interest should be awarded from the date of infringement to the date of judgment.” *Nickson Indus. v. Rol Mfg. Co.*, 847 F.2d 795, 800 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *Ironworks Patents, LLC v. Apple, Inc.*, 255 F. Supp. 3d 513,533 (D. Del. 2017). Post-judgment “[i]nterest shall be allowed on any money judgment in a civil case recovered in a district court” and “[s]uch interest shall be calculated from the date of the entry of the judgment, at a rate equal to the weekly average 1-year constant maturity Treasury yield, as published by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, for the calendar week preceding the date of the judgment.” 28 U.S.C. § 1961(a).

2. Obviousness: Whether Defendants have proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the asserted claims are invalid as obvious. Relevant Authority: “Obviousness is a question of law based on underlying factual inquiries including: (1) the scope and content of the prior art; (2) the level of ordinary skill in the art; (3) the differences between the prior art and the

¹ This statement is based on the arguments Plaintiff expects to make, and its understanding of the arguments that Defendants are likely to make. If Defendants seek to introduce different legal arguments, Plaintiff reserves the right to supplement this statement. If an issue identified herein is more properly considered an issue of fact, it should be so considered. If an issue of fact is more properly considered an issue of law, that issue is incorporated into this statement. The authorities cited herein are not exhaustive; Plaintiff may rely on authority not cited in this statement. The issues of law identified herein do not include any outstanding issues of law with respect to the parties' proposed jury instructions. Plaintiff will present those legal issues, if necessary, in its proposed instructions to the Court. Plaintiff reserves the right to revise its statement of issues of law as necessary considering the Court's pretrial orders, including evidentiary rulings, or if any new allegations arise for which Defendants' submissions did not fairly put Plaintiff on notice.

claimed invention; and (4) extent of any objective indicia of non-obviousness.” *Winner Intern. Royalty Corp. v. Wang*, 202 F.3d 1340, 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

3. Prior art: Whether Defendants have proven by clear and convincing evidence that each of the alleged systems, relied on by Defendants to establish invalidity, qualify as prior art. Relevant Authority: “Whether a reference is prior art is a question of law based on underlying factual questions.” *ATEN Int’l Co. v. Uniclass Tech. Co.*, 932 F.3d 1364, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2019).

4. IPR Estoppel: Whether each of the remaining systems relied on by Defendants to establish invalidity is cumulative of invalidity grounds Defendants raised or reasonably could have raised during *inter partes* review. Legal Authority: 35 U.S.C. § 315(e)(2) (“The petitioner in an *inter partes* review . . . may not assert . . . in a civil action . . . that the claim is invalid on any ground that the petitioner raised or reasonably could have raised during that *inter partes* review.”); *California Inst. of Tech. v. Broadcom Ltd.*, 25 F.4th 976, 991 (Fed. Cir. 2022) (“[W]e take this opportunity to overrule *Shaw* and clarify that estoppel applies not just to claims and grounds asserted in the petition and instituted for consideration by the Board, but to all grounds not stated in the petition but which reasonably could have been asserted against the claims included in the petition.”); *Innovative Memory Sys., Inc. v. Micron Tech., Inc.*, No. CV 14-1480-RGA, 2022 WL 4548644, at *5 (D. Del. Sept. 29, 2022) (“[E]ven if there were a material fact in dispute, courts in this district treat the application of IPR estoppel as a matter for the court. . . . Whether the issue is styled as a motion for summary judgment, a motion in limine, a motion to strike contentions or expert reports, or even a motion for IPR estoppel, the question is the same: could the IPR petitioner reasonably have raised the ground during the IPR. Sending that question to the jury would be contrary to one of the purposes of IPR estoppel, which is to streamline litigation, not to further complicate already complicated trials by sending questions about the reasonableness of prior art

searches to the jury.”); *Palomar Techs., Inc. v. MRSI Sys., LLC*, No. CV 18-10236-FDS, 2020 WL 2115625, at *4 (D. Mass. May 4, 2020) (“Once a *prima facie* showing has been made, the burden will be on the opposing party (that is, the petitioner in the IPR proceeding) to show that it could not have reasonably have raised the ground at issue in the IPR.”); D.I. 399 (“An invalidity ground based on a physical product . . . may be subject to IPR estoppel if a publication describing the physical product could have been raised as an invalidity ground during the IPR.”).

5. Enhanced Damages: Whether Plaintiff should be awarded enhanced damages for Defendants’ patent infringement. Relevant Authority: 35 U.S.C. § 284; *Halo Elecs. v. Pulse Elecs., Inc.*, 136 S. Ct. 1923, 1931 (2016); *SRI Int’l, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.*, 14 F.4th 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2021) (restoring enhanced damages awarded by district court in *SRI Int’l, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.*, 254 F. Supp. 3d 680 (D. Del. 2017) (Robinson, J.)); *Whitserve, LLC v. Comput. Packages, Inc.*, 694 F.3d 10, 37 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *Jurgens v. CBK, Ltd.*, 80 F.3d 1566, 1570 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

6. Attorneys’ Fees: Whether Plaintiff should be awarded its attorneys’ fees in this case under 35 U.S.C. § 285. Relevant Authority: 35 U.S.C. § 285; *Octane Fitness, LLC v. ICON Health & Fitness, Inc.*, 572 U.S. 545, 553-54 (2014).

EXHIBIT 3D

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

C.A. No. 13-919-JLH

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,

Plaintiff,

v.

MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC (f/k/a
MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.),

Defendant.

C.A. No. 12-1601-JLH

**DEFENDANTS' STATEMENT OF ISSUES OF LAW
THAT REMAIN TO BE LITIGATED**

The following issues of law remain to be litigated:¹

I. Non-Infringement

Issues To Be Litigated

1. Whether Arendi S.A.R.L. (“Arendi”) has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that each Defendant literally infringes claims 1, 8, 23, and 30 of the ’843 Patent.

Legal Authority

2. An accused infringer is liable for patent infringement if, without authorization from the patentee, the accused infringer “makes, uses, offers to sell, or sells any patented invention, within the United States or imports into the United States any patented invention during the term of the patent therefor.” 35 U.S.C. § 271(a). Arendi bears the burden of proving infringement by a preponderance of the evidence.

3. The infringement analysis comprises two steps. The first step is to define disputed terms of the asserted patent claims consistent with how those terms would be understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art. *Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*, 52 F.3d 967, 976 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (en banc), *aff’d*, 517 U.S. 370 (1996); *Philips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc).

4. The second step is to determine whether the accused products infringe the asserted patent claims, by comparing the accused products with the construed asserted patent

¹ This statement is based on the claims Defendants expect Arendi to present at trial. If Arendi seeks to introduce different legal arguments, pursue additional claims or raise additional issues, Defendants reserve the right to supplement this statement. If an issue identified herein is more properly considered an issue of fact, it should be so considered. If an issue of fact is more properly considered an issue of law, that issue is incorporated into this statement. The authorities cited herein are not exhaustive; Defendants may rely on authority not cited in this statement. The issues of law identified herein do not include any outstanding issues of law with respect to the parties’ proposed jury instructions. The parties will present those legal issues, if necessary, in their proposed instructions to the Court. Defendants reserve the right to revised their statement of issues of law as necessary considering the Court’s pretrial orders, including evidentiary rulings, or if any new allegations for which Arendi’s submissions did not fairly put Defendants on notice.

claims. *Markman*, 52 F.3d at 976; *Jeneric/Pentron, Inc. v. Dillon Co.*, 205 F.3d 1377, 1383 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

5. Mere speculation cannot satisfy the patentee's burden of proof for proving infringement. *See Brigham & Women's Hosp., Inc. v. Perrigo Co.*, 761 F. App'x 995, 1003–04 (Fed. Cir. 2019) (“At most, the study suggests that Pepcid Complete® might provide immediate and sustained relief; such speculative data, however, cannot sustain Brigham's burden of proof.”)

6. Infringement must be proven for each accused product. *AFG Indus. Inc. v. Cardinal IG Co.*, 375 F.3d 1367, 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (remanding for the district court to examine products separately). The patentee bears the burden of proof to show that each accused product infringes. *L & W, Inc. v. Shertech, Inc.*, 471 F.3d 1311, 1317–18 (Fed. Cir. 2006).

7. To establish literal infringement, a patentee must prove “each and every limitation set forth in a claim” appears in the accused system or method. *V-Formation, Inc. v. Bennetton Grp. SpA*, 401 F.3d 1307, 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2005). *See also DeMarini Sports, Inc. v. Worth, Inc.*, 239 F.3d 1314, 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (“Literal infringement of a claim occurs when every limitation in the claim appears in the accused device, i.e., when ‘the properly construed claim reads on the accused device exactly.’”) (citation omitted).

8. “Each element contained in a patent claim is deemed material to defining the scope of the patented invention.” *WarnerJenkinson Co. v. Hilton Davis Chem. Co.*, 520 U.S. 17, 29 (1997). The absence of even one claim element of an asserted claim precludes literal infringement of that claim. *Laitram Corp. v. Rexnord, Inc.*, 939 F.2d 1533, 1535 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *NOMOS Corp. v. BrainLAB USA, Inc.*, 357 F.3d 1364, 1367 n.1 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *Khan v. GMC*, 135 F.3d 1472, 1477 (Fed. Cir. 1998). If an accused product does not infringe an independent claim, it also does not infringe any claim depending therefrom. *See Wahpeton Canvas Co. v.*

Frontier, Inc., 870 F.2d 1546, 1553 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (“It is axiomatic that dependent claims cannot be found infringed unless the claims from which they depend have been found to have been infringed.”).

9. To prove infringement of a method claim, the plaintiff must prove performance of each and every step of the claimed method. *Limelight Networks, Inc. v. Akamai Tech.s, Inc.*, 572 U.S. 915, 921 (2014) (“[U]nder this Court’s case law, the patent is not infringed unless all the steps are carried out.”); *see also Meyer Intellectual Props. Ltd. v. Bodum, Inc.*, 690 F.3d 1354, 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (“[D]irect infringement of a method claim requires a showing that every step of the claimed method has been practiced.”).

II. Invalidity

Issues To Be Litigated

10. Whether Defendants have proven by clear and convincing evidence that claims 1, 8, 23, and 30 of the ’843 Patent are invalid as anticipated or obvious under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103.

11. Whether Defendants have proven by clear and convincing evidence that claims 1, 8, 23, and 30 of the ’843 Patent are not enabled or lack adequate written description under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

12. Whether secondary considerations indicate non-obviousness of any of claims 1, 8, 23, or 30 of the ’843 Patent.

13. Whether Arendi has proven that claims 1, 8, 23, and 30 of the ’843 Patent are entitled to a priority date earlier than November 10, 1998.

Legal Authority - Priority Date

14. Determination of priority date is a question of law if the facts underlying that determination are undisputed. *Broadcast Innovation, L.L.C. v. Charter Commc’ns, Inc.*, 420 F.3d

1364, 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2005); *E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. MacDermid Printing Solutions, L.L.C.*, 525 F.3d 1353, 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

15. In response to clear and convincing evidence of invalidity, Arendi bears the burden of proving that any asserted patent claim is entitled to a priority date earlier than the effective filing date of the application that matured into the patent that contains the asserted claim. *See PowerOasis, Inc. v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.*, 522 F.3d 1299, 1305–06 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

16. To claim a priority date earlier than the effective filing date of a patent application, the patentee must establish conception and “reduction to practice prior to the effective date of the reference, or conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference coupled with due diligence from prior to said date to a subsequent reduction to practice or to the filing of the application.” *In re Steed*, 802 F.3d 1311, 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2015).

17. Conception requires “formation in the mind of the inventor of a definite and permanent idea of the complete and operative invention as it is then applied in practice.” *Hitzeman v. Rutter*, 243 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2001). Conception is considered established when “the invention is made sufficiently clear to enable one skilled in the art to reduce it to practice without the exercise of extensive experimentation or the exercise of inventive skills.” MPEP § 2138.04 (quoting *Hiatt v. Ziegler*, 179 U.S.P.Q. 757, 763 (B.P.A.I. 1973)). “Conception requires an idea to be so ‘definite and permanent’ that ‘all that remains to be accomplished . . . belongs to the department of construction.’” *Dawson v. Dawson*, 710 F.3d 1347, 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2013) (quoting 1 Robinson on Patents 532 (1890)). Conception requires more than “a general idea” and “thoughts on how one might proceed.” *Id.* at 1353. “[It] requires both (1) the idea of the invention’s structure and (2) possession of an operative method of making it.” *Invitrogen Corp. v. Clontech Labs., Inc.*, 429 F.3d 1052, 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2005).

18. To establish conception, a party must show possession of every feature recited in the claim, and that every limitation of the claim must have been known to the inventor at the time of the alleged conception. *See Coleman v. Dines*, 754 F.2d 353, 355 (Fed. Cir. 1985). “[C]onception by an inventor, for the purpose of establishing priority, can not be proved by his mere allegation nor by his unsupported testimony where there has been no disclosure to others or embodiment of the invention in some clearly perceptible form.” *Price v. Symsek*, 988 F.2d 1187, 1194-95 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Conception may not be complete if those skilled in the art express uncertainty that “undermines the specificity of the inventor’s idea that it was not yet a definite and permanent reflection of the complete invention as it would be used in practice.” *Burroughs Wellcome Co. v. Barr Labs., Inc.*, 40 F.3d 1223, 1229 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

19. A party seeking to prove its entitlement to an earlier priority date must also “demonstrate reasonable diligence toward reduction to practice.” *Mahurkar v. C.R. Bard, Inc.*, 79 F.3d 1572, 1578 (Fed. Cir. 1996). To establish actual reduction to practice, the party asserting an earlier priority date “must satisfy a two-prong test: (1) the party constructed an embodiment or performed a process that met every element of the [claim], and (2) the embodiment or process operated for its intended purpose.” *Eaton v. Evans*, 204 F.3d 1094, 1097 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Actual reduction to practice requires that “the constructed embodiment or performed process include the precise elements recited” in the claims. *See id.* Thus, “there can be no actual reduction to practice if the constructed embodiment or performed process lacks an element recited in the [claims] or uses an equivalent of that element.” *Id.* Moreover, there must be “some recognition of successful testing prior to the critical date for an invention to be reduced to practice.” *Estee Lauder Inc. v. L’Oreal, S.A.*, 129 F.3d 588, 593 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

20. The period for showing diligence begins just prior to the competing reference’s

effective date and ends on the date of the invention's reduction to practice. *Loral Fairchild Corp. v. Matsushita Elec.*, 266 F.3d 1358, 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2001). A patentee may rely on the filing date of a patent application as a constructive reduction to practice. *Bey v. Kollonitsch*, 806 F.2d 1024, 1026 (Fed. Cir. 1986). "The basic inquiry is whether, on all of the evidence, there was reasonably continuing activity to reduce the invention to practice." *Brown v. Barbacid*, 436 F.3d 1376, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2006).

21. When a party seeks to prove conception, reduction to practice, or diligence using the testimony of a putative inventor, the party must also provide evidence corroborating that testimony. *Allergan, Inc. v. Apotex Inc.*, 754 F.3d 952, 967 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (quoting *Shu-Hui Chen v. Bouchard*, 347 F.3d 1299, 1309 (Fed. Cir. 2003)); *In re Garner*, 508 F.3d 1376, 1380-81 (Fed. Cir. 2007); *Round Rock Rsch., LLC v. Sandisk Corp.*, 81 F. Supp. 3d 339, 349 (D. Del. 2015). The corroborating evidence must be "in addition to [the inventor's] own statements and documents." *Apator Miitors ApS v. Kamstrup A/S*, 887 F.3d 1293, 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2018). "Testimony regarding diligence from the [alleged first conceiver]," on its own, "lacks sufficient corroboration to support a finding of diligence." See *Round Rock Rsch., LLC v. Sandisk Corp.*, 81 F. Supp. 3d 339, 353 (D. Del. 2015). The corroboration requirement "exists to prevent an inventor from 'describ[ing] his actions in an unjustifiably self-serving manner' . . . [as] "[e]ven the most credible inventor testimony is a fortiori required to be corroborated by independent evidence." *Id.* (citations omitted). Moreover, the corroborating evidence of conception, reduction to practice, or diligence must be linked to the invention claimed in the patent. See *Cordance Corp. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, 658 F.3d 1330, 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2011). Thus, although the "rule of reason" requires that all pertinent evidence be examined so that a sound determination of the purported inventor's story may be reached, "evidence of corroboration must not depend solely on

the inventor himself” and must be “independent of information received from the inventor.” *Aptor Miitors*, 887 F.3d at 1295 (quoting *Cooper v. Goldfarb*, 154 F.3d 1321, 1330 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *Hahn v. Wong*, 892 F.2d 1028, 1032 (Fed. Cir. 1989)).

Legal Authority - Anticipation

22. Patents are presumed valid and a party challenging the validity of a patent must prove invalidity by clear and convincing evidence. 35 U.S.C. § 282(a); *see also Microsoft Corp. v. IAI Ltd. P’ship*, 564 U.S. 91, 95 (2011). Clear and convincing evidence is evidence that “could place in the ultimate factfinder an abiding conviction that the truth of [the] factual contentions are ‘highly probable.’” *Colorado v. New Mexico*, 467 U.S. 310, 316 (1984); *see also Procter & Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.*, 566 F.3d 989, 994 (Fed. Cir. 2009).

23. Once the challenging party “has presented a prima facie case of invalidity, the patentee has the burden of going forward with rebuttal evidence.” *Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.*, 480 F.3d 1348, 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2007). If the patentee fails to do so, the patent cannot be found valid. *See, e.g., Ralston Purina Co. v. Far-Mar-Co.*, 772 F.2d 1570, 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (“If this burden [of making a prima facie case of invalidity] is met, the party relying on validity is then obligated to come forward with evidence to the contrary.”).

24. “The courts are the final arbiter of patent validity and, although courts may take cognizance of, and benefit from, the proceedings before the patent examiner, the question is ultimately for the courts to decide, without deference to the rulings of the patent examiner.” *Quad Envtl. Techs. Corp. v. Union Sanitary Dist.*, 946 F.2d 870, 876 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Any relevant evidence, whether or not previously considered by the PTO, can be considered by the court in determining validity. *Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc.*, 848 F.2d 1560, 1571-72 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

25. A patent is invalid if “the claimed invention was patented, described in a printed publication, or in public use, on sale, or otherwise available to the public before the effective filing date of the claimed invention.” 35 U.S.C. 102(a).

26. “A finding of anticipation will invalidate the patent.” *Apeldyn Corp. v. Sony Corp.*, 87 F. Supp. 3d 681, 689 (D. Del. 2015). Anticipation is a question of fact, following the court’s construction of the claims as a matter of law. *Minnesota Min. & Mfg. Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1301 (Fed. Cir. Aug. 2002); *Key Pharm. V. Hercon Labs. Corp.*, 161 F.3d 709, 714 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (the two-step anticipation and obviousness inquiries involve “[f]irst [] construing the claim, a question of law for the court, followed by, in the case of anticipation or obviousness, a comparison of the construed claim to the prior art . . . [which] is for the fact-finder in the first instance”).

27. “To anticipate a claim, a prior art reference must disclose every limitation of the claimed invention, either explicitly or inherently.” *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Anticipation thus “can occur when a claimed limitation is ‘inherent’ or otherwise implicit in the relevant reference.” *Standard Havens Prods., Inc. v. Gencor Indus., Inc.*, 953 F.2d 1360, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 1991). “In other words, if granting patent protection on the disputed claim would allow the patentee to exclude the public from practicing the prior art, then that claim is anticipated, regardless of whether it also covers subject matter not in the prior art.” *Atlas Powder Co. v. Ireco, Inc.*, 190 F.3d 1342, 1346 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

Legal Authority - Obviousness

28. Obviousness is a question of law that is based on underlying issues of fact. *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 427 (2007).

29. The standard for whether a patent claim is obvious is whether “the differences

between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.” 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

30. Obviousness is based on four underlying factual determinations: (1) the scope and content of the prior art; (2) the differences between the claims and the prior art; (3) the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art; and (4) secondary considerations, if any, of nonobviousness. *KSR*, 550 U.S. at 406-07 (citing *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17–18 (1966)).

31. “[T]he scope of the relevant prior art . . . include[s] that reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was involved.” *In re GPAC Inc.*, 57 F.3d 1573, 1577 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (quotation omitted). “A reference is reasonably pertinent if, even though it may be in a different field of endeavor, it is one which, because of the matter with which it deals, logically would have commended itself to an inventor’s attention in considering his problem.” *Id.* at 1578 (quotation omitted). “If a reference disclosure relates to the same problem as that addressed by the claimed invention, that fact supports use of that reference in an obviousness [finding].” *Id.* (quotation omitted).

32. Obviousness can be established by noting that “there existed at the time of invention a known problem for which there was an obvious solution encompassed by the patent’s claims.” *KSR*, 550 U.S. at 420. “In determining whether the subject matter of a patent claim is obvious, neither the particular motivation nor the avowed purpose of the patentee controls. What matters is the objective reach of the claim.” *Id.* at 419. Thus, “any need or problem known in the field of endeavor at the time of invention and addressed by the patent can provide a reason for combining the elements in the manner claimed.” *Id.* at 420.

33. “The combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to

be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results.” *Id.* at 416. A critical issue is whether the “improvement is more than the predictable use of prior art elements according to their established functions.” *Id.* at 417. “Common sense teaches ... that familiar items may have obvious uses beyond their primary purposes, and in many cases a person of ordinary skill will be able to fit the teachings of multiple patents together like pieces of a puzzle.” *Id.* at 420; *see also Leapfrog Enters. v. Fisher-Price, Inc.*, 485 F.3d 1157, 1161-1162 (Fed. Cir. 2007).

34. Obviousness is judged from the perspective of a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the alleged invention was made. *Takeda Chem. Indus. v. Alphapharm Pty., Ltd.*, 492 F.3d 1350, 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2007). A person of ordinary skill is a hypothetical person who is “presumed to be aware of all the pertinent prior art.” *Std. Oil Co. v. Am. Cyanamid Co.*, 774 F.2d 448, 454 (Fed. Cir. 1985). In determining the level of ordinary skill in the art, a court should consider the following factors: (1) the types of problems encountered in the art; (2) prior art solutions to those problems; (3) the rapidity with which innovations are made; (4) the sophistication of the technology involved; and (5) the educational level of active workers in the field. *Daiichi Sankyo Co., Ltd. v. Apotex Inc.*, 501 F.3d 1254, 1256 (Fed. Cir. 2007); *see also U.S. Surgical Corp. v. Ethicon, Inc.*, 103 F.3d 1554, 1564 (Fed. Cir. 1997). “Not all such factors may be present in every case, and one or more . . . may predominate in a particular case.” *Envtl. Designs, Ltd. v. Union Oil Co. of Cal.*, 713 F.2d 693, 696-97 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

35. Obviousness is judged under “an expansive and flexible approach” driven by common sense. *KSR*, 550 U.S. at 415. The Court’s obviousness “analysis need not seek out precise teachings directed to the specific subject matter of the challenged claim, for a court can take account of the inferences and creative steps that a person of ordinary skill in the art would employ.” *Id.* at 418. “The combination of familiar elements according to known methods is

likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results.” *Id.* at 416.

36. Where a claim “simply arranges old elements with each performing the same function it had been known to perform and yields no more than one would expect from such an arrangement, the combination is obvious.” *Id.* at 417 (quotation omitted). In general, a claim is invalid for obviousness if “a skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the teachings of the prior art references to achieve the claimed invention,” and “would have had a reasonable expectation of success in doing so.” *Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.*, 480 F.3d 1348, 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2007).

37. When “there are a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp.” *KSR*, 550 U.S. at 421.

38. Routine experimentation on the part of an artisan does not support nonobviousness. *See Pfizer*, 480 F.3d at 1368 (“The experimentation needed, then, to arrive at the subject matter claimed in the ’303 patent was ‘nothing more than routine’ application of a well-known problem-solving strategy”) (citing *Merck & Co., Inc. v. Biocraft Labs., Inc.*, 874 F.2d 804, 809 (Fed. Cir. 1989)).

39. Although it “can be important to identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the elements,” a court “need not seek out precise teachings directed to the specific subject matter of the challenged claim.” *KSR*, 550 U.S. at 418. Nor can a court allow its “analysis” to “be confined by” an “overemphasis on the . . . explicit content” of prior art references. *Id.* at 419. Rather, a court must “take account of the inferences and creative steps that a person of ordinary skill in the art would employ.” *Id.* at 418.

40. Finding a motivation to combine prior art references is not a rigid endeavor. “Far

from requiring evidence of an explicit motivation to combine,” the Federal Circuit has likewise made clear that “an implicit motivation” is enough. *DyStar Textilfarben GmbH & Co. Deutschland KG v. C.H. Patrick Co.*, 464 F.3d 1356, 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2006) (emphasis removed). The Federal Circuit has “repeatedly held” that a combination may be obvious “even absent any hint of suggestion in the [prior art] references themselves.” *Id.* at 1368. A court that requires the prior art “clearly and unequivocally [to] disclose” a “motivation to combine” therefore “err[s] by taking an overly cramped view of what the prior art teaches.” *Allergan, Inc. v. Apotex Inc.*, 754 F.3d 952, 963–64 (Fed. Cir. 2014). “[T]here is no requirement that the prior art contain an express suggestion to combine known elements to achieve the claimed invention.” *Motorola, Inc. v. Interdigital Tech. Corp.*, 121 F.3d 1461, 1472 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

41. The subject matter of a patent claim can be proved obvious if there existed at the time of the alleged invention “a known problem for which there was an obvious solution encompassed by the patent’s claims.” *KSR*, 550 U.S. at 420. If “a person of ordinary skill can implement a predictable variation” or if “a technique has been used to improve one device[] and a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it would improve similar devices in the same way,” Section 103 bars patentability. *Id.* at 417. “[A]ny need or problem known in the field of endeavor at the time of invention and addressed by the patent can provide a reason for combining the elements in the manner claimed.” *Id.* at 420. A person of skill in the art’s motivation to optimize a piece of prior art or to combine pieces of prior art need not result from explicit teaching within the art but, instead, can result from “[t]he normal desire of scientists or artisans to improve upon what is already generally known” to satisfy the obviousness inquiry. *See In re Peterson*, 315 F.3d 1325, 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2003).

42. The question of obviousness may require consideration of objective indicia of

nonobviousness. *See KSR*, 550 U.S. at 406 (quoting *Graham*, 383 U.S. at 17–18). “Objective evidence of nonobviousness can include copying, long felt but unsolved need, failure of others, commercial success, unexpected results created by the claimed invention, unexpected properties of the claimed invention, licenses showing industry respect for the invention, ... skepticism of skilled artisans before the invention” and commercial success. *Power Integrations, Inc. v. Fairchild Semiconductor Int’l, Inc.*, 711 F.3d 1348, 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2013); *see also WBIP*, 829 F.3d at 1336.

43. A “nexus between the merits of the claimed invention and evidence of secondary considerations is required in order for the evidence to be given substantial weight in an obviousness decision. Put another way, commercial success or other secondary considerations may presumptively be attributed to the patented invention only where the marketed product embodies the claimed features, and is coextensive with them.” *Muniauction, Inc. v. Thomason Corp.*, 532 F.3d 1318, 1327–28 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (citations omitted). “Where the offered secondary consideration actually results from something other than what is both claimed and novel in the claim, there is no nexus to the merits of the claimed invention.” *In re Huai-Hung Kao*, 639 F.3d 1057, 1068 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (emphasis omitted); *see also In re GPAC*, 57 F.3d at 1580 (“[F]or objective evidence to be accorded substantial weight, its proponent must establish a nexus between the evidence and the merits of the claimed invention.”). Even “impressive” evidence of secondary considerations is not “entitled to weight” unless “it is relevant to the claims at issue.” *In re Paulsen*, 30 F.3d 1475, 1482 (Fed. Cir. 1994). For commercial success, the proponent must offer proof “[that] sales were a direct result of the unique characteristics of the claimed invention.” *In re Huang*, 100 F.3d 135, 140 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

44. Where “the inventions represented no more than ‘the predictable use of prior art

elements according to their established functions’ . . . the secondary considerations are inadequate to establish nonobviousness as a matter of law.” *Wyers v. Master Lock Co.*, 616 F.3d 1231, 1246 (quoting *KSR*, 550 U.S. at 417). “[S]econdary considerations of non-obviousness . . . simply cannot overcome a strong prima facie case of obviousness.” *Id.*; see also *Leapfrog*, 485 F.3d at 1162 (“[G]iven the strength of the prima facie obviousness showing, the evidence on secondary considerations was inadequate to overcome a final conclusion [of obviousness].”).

Legal Authority - Written Description

45. Written description is a question of fact. See *Gen. Hospital Corp. v. Sienna Biopharmaceuticals, Inc.*, 888 F.3d 1368, 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2018).

46. “The specification shall contain a written description of the invention.” To adequately disclose an invention, the patent must include a written description that “conveys to those skilled in the art that the inventor had possession of the claimed subject matter as of the filing date.” *Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 598 F.3d 1336, 1351 (Fed Cir. 2010).

47. To satisfy this requirement, a patent specification must describe the invention “sufficiently to convey to a person of skill in the art that the patentee had possession of the claimed invention at the time of the application, i.e., that the patentee invented what is claimed.” *LizardTech, Inc. v. Earth Res. Mapping, Inc.*, 424 F.3d 1336, 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2005); *Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1562-64 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (a patent applicant must “convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the ‘written description’ inquiry, whatever is now claimed.”). “The purpose of the written description requirement is to ensure that the scope of the right to exclude, as set forth in the claims, does not overreach the scope of the inventor’s contribution to the field of art as described in the patent specification.” *In re Katz*

Interactive Call Processing Patent Litig., 639 F.3d 1303, 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (quoting *Reiffin v. Microsoft Corp.*, 214 F.3d 1342, 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2000)). “A broad claim is invalid [for lack of adequate written description] when the entirety of the specification clearly indicates that the invention is of a much narrower scope.” *Carnegie Mellon Univ. v. Hoffmann-La Roche Inc.*, 541 F.3d 1115, 1127 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

Legal Authority - Enablement

48. Enablement is a question of law based on underlying factual inquiries. *MagSil Corp. v. Hitachi Global Storage Techs., Inc.*, 687 F.3d 1377, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2012).

49. Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, the specification must contain a sufficiently full and clear description to have allowed a person of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention as of the effective filing date without undue experimentation. *Cephalon, Inc. v. Watson Pharm., Inc.*, 707 F.3d 1330, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013); *see also* 35 U.S.C. § 112(a) (“The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same, and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor or joint inventor of carrying out the invention.”).

50. “Whether undue experimentation is required ‘is not a single, simple factual determination, but rather is a conclusion reached by weighing many factual considerations.’” *Id.* (quoting *ALZA Corp. v. Andrx Pharms., LLC*, 603 F.3d 935, 940 (Fed. Cir. 2010)).

51. Courts consider a variety of factors when assessing whether undue experimentation is required, including: “(1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4)

the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims.” *Cephalon*, 707 F.3d at 1336.

52. While enablement “is not precluded even if some experimentation is necessary ... the amount of experimentation needed must not be unduly excessive.” *Johns Hopkins Univ. v. CellPro, Inc.*, 152 F.3d 1342, 1351 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

III. Damages

Issues To Be Litigated

53. The amount of damages that Arendi has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that it should be awarded for each Defendant’s alleged infringement of the ’843 Patent.

54. Whether Arendi has proved actual notice to each Defendant by an affirmative communication specifically charging a specific accused product of infringement, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 287.

55. Whether Arendi has proved that it provided constructive notice to Defendants by marking products that practice claims 1, 8, 23, and/or 30 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 287.

56. Whether Arendi has proved that the products identified by Defendants as unmarked covered products (1) do not practice the claimed invention or (2) were sufficiently marked pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 287.

57. Whether Arendi has proved that it took reasonable steps to ensure its licensees, including Microsoft Corporation, complied with the marking requirements pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 287 and whether its licenses, including Microsoft Corporation, did comply with those marking requirements.

58. Whether Arendi has proven entitlement to enhanced damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

Legal Authority - Notice

59. Failure to comply with the marking provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 287(a) bars all damages until notice is properly given. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 287(a). The notice provision in 35 U.S.C. § 287(a) states that “[i]n the event of failure so to mark, no damages shall be recovered by the patentee in any action for infringement, except on proof that the infringer was [1] notified of the infringement and [2] continued to infringe thereafter, 35 U.S.C. § 287(a) (emphasis added).

60. The law requires “the affirmative communication of a specific charge of infringement by a specific accused product or device.” *Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Recreational Prods. Inc.*, 950 F.3d 860, 864 (Fed. Cir. 2020) (“*Arctic Cat II*”). This obligation is imposed “on the patentee, and only the patentee is capable of discharging those obligations.” *Id.* at 864, 866. Thus, “[t]he correct approach to determining notice under section 287 must focus on the action of the patentee, not the knowledge of the infringer.” *Amsted Indus. Inc. v. Buckeye Steel Castings Co.*, 24 F.3d 178, 187 (Fed. Cir. 1994); *Belden Techs. Inc. v. Superior Exxex Commc’ns LP*, 733 F. Supp. 2d 517, 536–37 (D. Del. 2010) (“Mere knowledge [by the alleged infringer] of the patent[] in suit is insufficient to place [the alleged infringer] on [actual] notice.”)

Legal Authority - Marking

61. 35 U.S.C. § 287(a) provides that if a product is not marked, “no damages shall be recovered by the patentee in any action for infringement, except on proof that the infringer was notified of the infringement and continued to infringe thereafter, in which event damages may be recovered only for infringement occurring after such notice. . . .” *See also Rite-Hite Corp. v. Kelley Co.*, 56 F.3d 1538, 1549 n. 8 (Fed. Cir. 1995). Specifically, the statute requires that “[p]atentees . . . making [or] offering for sale . . . any patented article . . . give notice to the public that the same is patented, either by fixing thereon the word ‘patent’ or the abbreviation ‘pat.’

together with the number of the patent, . . . or when, from the character of the article, this can not be done, by fixing to it, or to the package wherein one or more of them is contained, a label containing a like notice.” 35 U.S.C. § 287(a). “[A] patentee cannot recover damages in the absence of actual notice when it has not marked.” *Rite-Hite Corp.*, 56 F.3d at 1549 n. 8.

62. The patent holder “bears the burden of pleading and proving [it] complied with § 287(a)’s marking requirement.” *Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Recreational Prods. Inc.*, 876 F.3d 1350, 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (“*Arctic Cat I*”). “A patentee’s licensees must also comply with § 287, because the statute extends to ‘persons making or selling any patented article for or under [the patentee].” *Id.* (quoting § 287(a)). A patentee fails to satisfy the marking requirements if it does not require its licensees to mark its licensed products with the patent numbers at issue, the licensee does not mark its licensed products with the patent numbers at issue, and the licensee sells licensed products covered by the patents at issue. *Id.* at 1367.

63. “Once an alleged infringer identifies products that it believes are unmarked patented articles subject to the notice requirements of § 287, the patentee bears the burden of proving that the identified products do not practice the claimed invention, or were adequately marked.” *Arctic Cat II*, 950 F.3d at 864.

64. The patentee must show that “substantially all of [the patented product] being distributed were marked, and that once marking was begun, the marking was substantially consistent and continuous.” *Nike, Inc. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 138 F.3d 1437, 1446 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

65. Once a patentee (or its licensee) is non-compliant with marking, damages is limited to either the period after the marking resumes or after actual notice is given. *Arctic Cat II*, 950 F.3d at 864.

Legal Authority - Reasonable Royalty

66. Upon a finding of infringement, “the court shall award the claimant damages adequate to compensate for the infringement, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty for the use made of the invention by the infringer, together with interest and costs as fixed by the court.” 35 U.S.C. § 284.

67. The plaintiff must prove the amount of damages by a preponderance of the evidence. *SmithKline Diagnostics, Inc. v. Helena Labs. Corp.*, 926 F.2d 1161, 1164 (Fed. Cir. 1991). “When a patentee seeks lost profits as the measure of damages, the patent holder bears the burden of proving the amount of the award.” *Promega Corp. v. Life Techs. Corp.*, 875 F.3d 651, 660 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (internal citation and quotation omitted).

68. To properly carry their burden of proving the amount of damages, the Plaintiff must persuade the Court using “reliable” and “legally sufficient evidence regarding an appropriate reasonable royalty.” *ResQNet.com, Inc. v. Lansa, Inc.*, 594 F.3d 860, 872 (Fed. Cir. 2010). The claim for damages cannot be speculative—there must be a reasonable certainty as to the amount of damages being claimed. *Lucent Techs., Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.*, 580 F.3d 1301, 1335, 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2009) (vacating and remanding jury award as excessive); *Oiness v. Walgreen Co.*, 88 F.3d 1025, 1029-30 (Fed. Cir. 1996). Plaintiffs “must show [their] damages by evidence.” *Promega Corp.*, 875 F.3d at 660. “Damages ‘must not be left to conjecture by the jury. They must be proved, and not guessed at.’” *Id.* (citation omitted).

69. A damages theory must be based on “sound economic and factual predicates.” *Riles v. Shell Expl. & Prod. Co.*, 298 F.3d 1302, 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2002). “Any evidence unrelated to the claimed invention does not support compensation for infringement but punishes beyond the state of the statute.” *ResQNet*, 594 F.3d at 869. If the patentee fails to tie the theory to the

facts of the case, the testimony must be excluded. *Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.*, 632 F.3d 1292, 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2011).

70. “A reasonable royalty is the predominant measure of damages in patent infringement cases.” *Uniloc*, 632 F.3d at 1312.

71. “The methodology of assessing and computing damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 is within the sound discretion of the district court.” *Nickson Indus., Inc. v. Rol Mfg. Co.*, 847 F.2d 795, 798 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Deciding the amount of the reasonable royalty is a question of fact. *See Unisplay, S.A. v. Am. Elec. Sign Co.*, 69 F.3d 512, 517 (Fed. Cir. 1995).

72. One approach for calculating a reasonable royalty is through a hypothetical negotiation analysis. *See Mahurkar v. C.R. Bard, Inc.*, 79 F.3d 1572, 1579 (Fed. Cir. 1996) (“Lacking evidence of royalties in the marketplace, this court accepts evidence about hypothetical results of hypothetical negotiations between the patentee and infringer (both hypothetically willing) at the time infringement began.”). The aim of the hypothetical negotiation approach is to capture what the infringer, acting as a prudent licensee, would have been willing to pay as a royalty and yet be able to make a reasonable profit, and what amount would have been acceptable to the patent holder, acting as a prudent patentee who was willing to grant a license. *Georgia-Pacific Corp. v. U.S. Plywood Corp.*, 318 F. Supp. 1116, 1121-22 (S.D.N.Y. 1970). Thus, to determine a reasonable royalty under this approach, a jury must find the royalty that would have been agreed to in a hypothetical negotiation between a willing licensee and willing licensor. *Lucent*, 580 F.3d at 1324-25. A determination of the reasonable royalty under the hypothetical negotiation approach is usually made by assessing factors such as those set forth in *Georgia-Pacific Rite-Hite*, 56 F.3d at 1554–55.

73. The Federal Circuit has explained that “[t]he correct determination of [the

hypothetical negotiation date] is essential for properly assessing damages.” *Integra Lifesciences I, Ltd. v. Merck KGaA*, 331 F.3d 860, 870 (Fed. Cir. 2003), vacated and remanded on other grounds, 545 U.S. 193 (2005). Generally, “the date of the hypothetical negotiation is the date that the infringement began.” *LaserDynamics, Inc. v. Quanta Comput., Inc.*, 694 F.3d 51, 75 (Fed. Cir. 2012).

74. “[T]he patent holder should only be compensated for the approximate incremental benefit derived from his invention.” *Ericsson, Inc. v. D-Link Sys., Inc.*, 773 F.3d 1201, 1233 (Fed. Cir. 2014). The patent holder must accordingly “give evidence tending to separate or apportion the defendant’s profits and the patentee’s damages between the patented feature and the unpatented features....” *VirnetX, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.*, 767 F.3d 1308, 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (quoting *Garretson v. Clark*, 111 U.S. 120, 121 (1884)). The Federal Circuit has held that “a reasonable royalty analysis requires a court to hypothesize, not to speculate.... [T]he trial court must carefully tie proof of damages to the claimed invention’s footprint in the market place.” *ResQNet*, 594 F.3d at 869; *see also Exmark Mfg. Co. v. Briggs & Stratton Power Prods. Grp., LLC*, 879 F.3d 1332, 1350-51 (Fed. Cir. 2018).

75. The presence or absence of “non-infringing alternatives” is a “core economic question” in a hypothetical negotiation. *See Aqua Shield v. Inter Pool Cover Team*, 774 F.3d 766, 770 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (“In hypothetical negotiation terms, the core economic question is what the infringer, in a hypothetical pre-infringement negotiation under hypothetical conditions, would have anticipated the profit-making potential of use of the patented technology to be, compared to using noninfringing alternatives.”); *AstraZeneca AB v. Apotex Corp.*, 782 F.3d 1324, 1334-35 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (“[I]f avoiding the patent would be difficult, expensive, and time consuming, the amount the infringer would be willing to pay for a license is likely to be greater”).

Legal Authority - Enhanced Damages

76. Under 35 U.S.C. § 284, a court, in its discretion, “may increase the damages up to three times the amount found or assessed.” 35 U.S.C. § 284. Enhanced damages “are not to be meted out in the typical infringement case, but are instead designed as a ‘punitive’ or ‘vindictive’ sanction for egregious infringement behavior”; that is, conduct that is “willful, wanton, malicious, bad-faith, deliberate, consciously wrongful, flagrant, or . . . characteristic of a pirate.” *Halo Elecs., Inc. v. Pulse Elecs., Inc.*, 579 U.S. 93, 103–04 (2016).

77. Willfulness is a question of fact and “requires a showing that the totality of the circumstances evince the egregious conduct that constitutes willful infringement. *nCube Corp. v. Seachange Int’l., Inc.*, 436 F.3d 1317, 1323–24 (Fed. Cir. 2006). A plaintiff must provide “proof that the defendant knew about the asserted patents and knew or should have known that its conduct amounted to infringement of those patents.” *ZapFraud, Inc. v. Barracuda Networks, Inc.*, 528 F. Supp. 3d 247, 249 (D. Del. 2021).

IV. Fees

Issues To Be Litigated

78. Whether Arendi or either Defendant is entitled to attorneys’ fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285.

Legal Authority

79. “The court in exceptional cases may award reasonable attorney fees to the prevailing party.” 35 U.S.C. § 285. “[F]or a party to be a prevailing party, that party must win a dispute within the case in favor of it that materially alters the legal relationship between the parties at the time of the judgment.” *Parallel Iron LLC v. NetApp Inc.*, 70 F. Supp. 3d 585, 589 (D. Del. 2014). “[A]n ‘exceptional’ case is simply one that stands out from others with respect to the substantive strength of a party’s litigating position (considering both the governing law and

the facts of the case) or the unreasonable manner in which the case was litigated.” *Octane Fitness, LLC v. ICON Health & Fitness, Inc.*, 572 U.S. 545, 554 (2014). Further, “[d]istrict courts may determine whether a case is ‘exceptional’ in the case-by-case exercise of their discretion, considering the totality of the circumstances.” *Id.* In addition, the prevailing party must prove entitlement to attorney fees under § 285 by a preponderance of the evidence. *Id.* at 1758; see also *Chalumeau Power Sys. LLC v. Alcatel-Lucent*, No. CV 11-1175-RGA, 2014 WL 4675002, at *1 (D. Del. Sept. 12, 2014).

EXHIBIT 4P

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 13-919-JLH
)	
GOOGLE LLC,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	
ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 12-1601-JLH
)	
MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC)	
f/k/a MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

PLAINTIFF ARENDI S.A.R.L WITNESS LIST

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(3) and the Court’s Standing Order Governing Proceedings in Patent Cases, Plaintiff Arendi S.A.R.L hereby submits the following list of witnesses whom Arendi S.A.R.L. expects to present at trial (other than solely for impeachment), either live or by deposition, and those witnesses whom Arendi S.A.R.L. may call if the need arises, either live or by deposition. This Witness List does not identify those witnesses whom Arendi S.A.R.L. may choose to cross-examine at trial, either live or by deposition, and Arendi S.A.R.L. hereby reserves the right to cross-examine and/or impeach any witnesses called live or by deposition at trial by any party, regardless of whether those witnesses are disclosed on this Witness List, including without limitation by counter-designations of proffered deposition

testimony. Arendi S.A.R.L. also reserves the right to present witnesses by deposition in the event that they become unavailable for trial. Arendi S.A.R.L. further reserves the right to call, live or by deposition, any witness identified on Defendants' witness lists or called at trial by Defendants Google LLC ("Google") and Motorola Mobility LLC f/k/a Motorola Mobility, Inc. ("Motorola").

Additionally, Arendi S.A.R.L. reserves the right to amend and/or supplement this Witness List to add or delete witnesses as allowed by the Court and law, including to add witnesses in rebuttal to Google and Motorola's case, arguments or evidence, and/or for purposes of authenticating evidence. Arendi S.A.R.L. notes that its identification of any witness listed herein is not an admission that the witness's testimony would be admissible into evidence if proffered by Google and Motorola and Arendi S.A.R.L. reserves the right to withdraw or choose not to call any witness identified herein.

At this time, Arendi S.A.R.L. identifies the following witnesses for trial:

Name	Fact or Expert	Will Call	May Call	Live	By Deposition	Est. Time (Hours)
Atle Hedloy	Fact	X		X		
Trevor Smedley	Expert	X		X		
Earl Sacerdoti*	Expert		X	X		
Roy Weinstein	Expert	X		X		
Syed Albiz	Fact	X			X	
Clara Bayarri	Fact	X			X	
Ted Choc	Fact	X			X	

Fergal Clarke	Fact	X			X	
Brahim Elbouchikhi	Fact	X			X	
Thomas Faulhaber	Fact	X			X	
John Hengel	Fact	X			X	
Walter Jang	Fact	X			X	
Evelyn Kao	Fact	X			X	
James Maccoun	Fact	X			X	
Sai Marri	Fact	X			X	
Kishore Papineni	Fact	X			X	
Abodunrinwa Toki	Fact	X			X	
Motorola's Corporate Representative at Trial	Fact		X			
Google's Corporate Representative at Trial	Fact		X			

*Rebuttal Witness

EXHIBIT 4D(G)

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	C.A. No. 1:13-cv-00919-JLH
)	
v.)	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
)	
GOOGLE LLC,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

DEFENDANT GOOGLE LLC’S WITNESS LIST

Defendant Google LLC (“Google”) hereby provides its witness list pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3) and the Joint Stipulation and Order Regarding Schedule for Pretrial Exchanges (D.I. 437).

Google identifies the name and, if not previously provided, the address and telephone number, of each witness it may present at trial other than solely for impeachment – separately identifying those it expects to present and those it may call if the need arises. Google reserves the right to amend and/or supplement this disclosure as allowed by the Court and law, including in rebuttal to Plaintiff’s case, arguments, or evidence, or as may be required for document authentication.

1. Witnesses Google Will Present at Trial

Name	Contact Information
Ted Choc	Mr. Choc may be contacted through the undersigned attorneys.
Anind Dey	
Brahim Elbouchikhi	Mr. Elbouchiki may be contacted through the undersigned attorneys.
Edward Fox	Dr. Fox may be contacted through the undersigned attorneys.

Douglas Kidder	Mr. Kidder may be contacted through the undersigned attorneys.
Martin Rinard	Dr. Rinard may be contacted through the undersigned attorneys.
Abodunrinwa Toki	Mr. Toki may be contacted through the undersigned attorneys.

2. Witnesses Google May Present at Trial

Name	Contact Information
Mike Pinkerton	[REDACTED]

3. Witnesses Who May Testify by Deposition

Google expects to present the testimony of the witnesses listed below by designation.

Google has separately provided the deposition designations for each of these witnesses.

- Anind Dey¹
- Thomas Faulhaber
- Atle Hedloy
- Violette Hedloy
- Jim Miller
- Giulia Pagallo

¹ Mr. Dey will appear at trial in person or by deposition, depending upon witness availability.

Dated: February 24, 2023

/s/ Robert W. Unikel

David E. Moore (No. 3983)
Bindu A. Palapura (No. 5370)
Stephanie E. O'Byrne (No. 4446)
POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON LLP
Hercules Plaza, 6th Floor
1313 N. Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 984-6000
dmoore@potteranderson.com
bpalapura@potteranderson.com
sobyrne@potteranderson.com

OF COUNSEL:

Robert W. Unikel
Michelle Marek Figueiredo
John Cotiguala
Matt Lind
PAUL HASTINGS LLP
71 South Wacker Drive, Suite 4500
Chicago, IL 60606
Tel: (312) 449-6000

Robert R. Laurenzi
Chad J. Peterman
PAUL HASTINGS LLP
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166
Tel: (212) 318-6000

Ariell Bratton
PAUL HASTINGS LLP
4747 Executive Drive, 12th Floor
San Diego, CA 92121
Tel: (858) 458-3000

Attorneys for Defendants
Google LLC and Motorola Mobility LLC
f/k/a Motorola Mobility, Inc.

EXHIBIT 5P

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 13-919-JLH
)	
GOOGLE LLC,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 12-1601-JLH
)	
MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC)	
f/k/a MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

PLAINTIFF’S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS

Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26(a)(3), Plaintiff, Arendi S.A.R.L. (“Arendi”), identifies the following excerpts of video and transcribed deposition testimony that it may offer at trial other than solely for the purposes of impeachment or rebuttal. Arendi does not waive its right to object to the witness or to the use of testimony from a witness if the witness is called by Google and Motorola. Arendi reserves the right to amend or to supplement its designations of deposition testimony, including on the basis of any information or documents obtained from discovery to the extent not yet completed, on the basis of circumstances that may evolve prior to the commencement of trial (including but not limited to Google and Motorola’s pretrial disclosures), and/or in response to any evidence offered by Google and Motorola at trial. In reliance on Google and Motorola’s disclosures of the witnesses it will call live, Arendi

reserves the right to designate or introduce any testimony from such witnesses in the event they are not called live. Arendi also reserves the right to designate testimony from any witness on Google and Motorola's list of deposition designations. At this time, Arendi designates the attached deposition testimony.

DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS OF SYED ALBIZ
OCTOBER 24, 2019

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
5:3-5:22		5:23-6:11	Lack of Relevance, Attorney Colloquy/Not Q&A, Rule 403
7:15-7:22			
11:13-11:20			
12:3-12:19			
13:11-13:17			
13:24-14:18		15:2-8	
15:9-16:1		16:2-9, 17:1-12	
26:15-27:17			
27:21-28:6			
28:12-28:23		28:24-29:3	
29:4-29:11			
67:3-67:20	R, SCOPE, V, 403	67:21-23, 67:25-68:2	
68:4-68:14	R, SCOPE, V, 403	68:16-22	
69:2-69:24	R, SCOPE, V, 403	70:2-5	
70:17-71:14	R, SCOPE, V, 403		
181:20-182:14	R, V	181:9-19	Lack of Personal Knowledge, Compound, Rule 403, Hearsay
182:15-184:25	F, R, V, 403		

DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS OF CLARA BAYARRI
NOVEMBER 12, 2019

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
5:22-6:3	R, 403		
7:8-7:17			
7:22-9:3	R, 403	7:18-21, 9:4-6	
22:19-22:24	H, INQA		
23:20-26:9	F, H, NT, R, 403, 602	23:8-19, 26:10-27:16	Lack of Relevance (26:10-27:16), Rule 403, Hearsay, Not Testimony
28:2-30:21	F, H, NT, R, V, 403, 602		
34:22-36:2	L, MT, NT, R, 403	34:6-7, 34:9-21, 36:3-24	Incomplete, Compound, Rule 403, Nonresponsive, Lack of Relevance
39:15-39:18	F, H		
40:14-40:24	F, H, R, 403, 602	40:25-41:8	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403
41:16-41:25	F, H, R, 403, 602		
42:3-42:10	F, H, R, 403	42:11-13	
42:14-42:17	R, 403	42:3-13	Rule 403, Lack of Relevance
42:25-44:8	F, H, NT, R, 403, 602		

DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS OF TED CHOC
OCTOBER 9, 2019

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
4:24-5:8			
5:21-5:24			
6:6-6:23			
7:12-8:11			
8:16-9:20		9:21-10:9	
10:10-10:13			
10:25-12:5			
12:25-13:3			
13:16-14:6			
15:8-15:12		15:13-16:11	
22:10-22:17			
24:21-25:9			
25:15-27:9		27:18-28:11	Vague, Incomplete, Rule 403, Lack of Relevance
28:12-30:7			
30:15-31:5			
33:7-33:14		33:15-25, 34:11-35:2	Hearsay, Not Q&A/Incomplete
39:6-39:13			
39:23-41:25			
56:2-57:13			
57:17-57:20			
58:8-58:20			
59:4-59:25	COMP, F, V		
64:10-64:17			
65:8-65:17			

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
67:20-68:3		67:6-18	Rule 403, Lack of Relevance, Vague
68:16-68:22			
69:13-69:19			
70:7-70:19			
71:2-71:7			
71:25-72:19	CS, F, SCOPE, 602		
73:3-73:22	COMP, V	74:11-25	Rule 403, Lack of Relevance
75:24-76:7	CS, F, SCOPE, 602	76:9-77:13	Lack of personal knowledge, Vague, Scope, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403
77:15-77:25	CS, F, SCOPE, 602	78:2-11	Lack of personal knowledge, Scope, Vague, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403
78:13-82:8		82:10-19	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403
82:21-83:2		83:4-11	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Asked & Answered
83:13-83:21	V	83:23-84:20	Assumes Facts not In Evidence, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Scope, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Nonresponsive
84:22-85:16			
85:25-86:8			
91:8-91:19		90:5-91:6	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Nonresponsive
94:5-94:12		94:14-19	Asked & Answered.
95:24-97:10	CS, F, SCOPE, 602		
97:23-99:7			
100:10-101:20	CS, F, SCOPE, 602		

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
106:8-107:1	CS, F, SCOPE, 602		
107:17-108:14	CS, F, SCOPE, 602		
111:16-113:1	CS, F, INQA, SCOPE, 602		
114:10-115:20	CS, F, SCOPE, 602	115:21-116:24	Not Testimony; Hearsay; Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403
117:1-117:10			
126:11-126:23			
127:11-128:5	CS, F, R, SCOPE, 602		
128:16-129:10	CS, F, R, SCOPE, 602		
131:4-132:4		132:6-19	
132:20-132:25			
133:2-133:20		133:21-134:25	Nonresponsive; Rule 403, Lack of Relevance, Hearsay
136:7-136:25			
137:3-137:23	CS, F, SCOPE, 602		
138:18-139:12	CS, F, SCOPE, 602	141:10-142:10	Nonresponsive, Rule 403, Lack of Relevance
143:5-143:11			
143:15-144:9			
149:3-149:10	CS, F, R, SCOPE, 602		
150:25-153:14	CS, F, SCOPE, 602		
157:19-158:23	CS, F, R, SCOPE, 602		
159:10-164:7	CS, F, R, SCOPE, 602	164:9-17	
164:19-165:7	CS, F, SCOPE, 602	165:9-18	
165:20-166:24	CS, F, SCOPE, 602		
167:1-169:22	CS, F, R, SCOPE, 602		
170:14-174:17	CS, F, R, SCOPE, 602		
175:20-176:4	CS, F, R, SCOPE, 602	176:5-19	Lack of Relevance

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
177:19-183:25	CS, F, H, R, SCOPE, 602		
184:3-184:18			
185:9-185:15			
189:9-194:2	CS, F, SCOPE, 602		
195:24-198:17	CS, F, SCOPE, 602		
200:14-201:15	CS, F, SCOPE, 602		
202:24-203:24	AAA, CS, F, SCOPE, 602		

DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS OF FERGAL CLARKE
NOVEMBER 12, 2019

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
6:9-6:11			
8:16-8:25			
9:22-10:2			
12:9-12:17	AF, H, L, R, 403		
17:9-18:12	L, R, 403		
18:17-19:9			
19:21-19:25	CS, R, V		
20:3-21:10	CS, NT, R, V, 403	21:11-13	
24:17-24:18	CS, V		
24:20-25:23	CS, V		
26:12	NT, R, 403		
26:19-27:11	AF, CS, F, L, R, V, 403		
27:13-27:24	AF, CS, F, L, R, V, 403	27:25-28:6	
28:7-28:11	CS, L, R, 403	27:25-28:6, 28:15-17	
30:4	NT, R, 403		
30:11-31:11	AF, CS, F, NT, R, 403, 602	31:12, 31:14-22, 31:24-32:3	
32:4-32:7	AF, CS, INQA, MD, NT, R, 403		
32:10-32:20	AF, CS, INQA, MD, NT, R, 403		
33:25	NT, R, 403		
34:9-34:25	AF, CS, F, MD, MT, R, 403	36:2-9	
35:3-35:12	AF, CS, F, R, 403	36:2-9	
35:21-35:23	AF, CS, F, MD, MT, R, 403	36:2-9	
35:25	AF, CS, F, MD, MT, R, 403	36:2-9	
36:10-36:12	AF, CS, F, MD, R, 403	36:2-9	

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
36:14	AF, CS, F, MD, R, 403	36:2-9	
38:16	NT, R, 403		
39:5-39:18	F, CS, F, L, MD, R, SCOPE, 403, 602	38:24-39:4	
42:24	NT, R, 403		
43:7-44:11	CS, F, L, MD, R, 403		
44:13-44:18	CS, F, L, MD, R, 403		
47:11	NT, R, 403		
47:18-48:3	CS, F, L, MD, R, 403	48:8-49:12	
49:13-49:14	F, L, MD, R, 403	48:8-49:12	
49:16-49:17	F, L, MD, R, 403	48:8-49:12	
62:4-64:4	MT, R, 403		

DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS OF BRAHIM ELBOUCHIKHI
NOVEMBER 20, 2019

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
7:9-7:11 (Ending with "...Elbouchikhri")			
11:4-11:8			
11:11-11:17			
17:7-17:12	R, 403		
20:15-20:19	R		
20:22-21:4	R		
21:10-21:12 (Ending with "...of them")	R		
21:15-21:21	R	21:22-22:5, 22:8-18	Incomplete/Not Q&A
36:22-36:23	R		
36:25-37:3	R		
37:5-37:6	R		
37:9-37:12	R		
45:25-46:1	CS, 602	44:24, 45:1-19, 45:21-23	Lack of Relevance
46:3-46:8	CS, 602		
46:23-47:4	AF, CS, F, 602	46:9-11, 46:13-17	Incomplete
47:11-47:14	AF, CS, F, 602	46:9-11, 46:13-17	Incomplete
48:5-48:7			
53:18-53:19	V, 602		
53:21-54:12	V, 602		
54:14-54:17	V, 602	54:21-55:1	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403
55:21-56:13	R, 403, 602		
56:19-56:24	R, 403, 602		
57:1-57:2	R, 403, 602		
65:20-66:9	MT, NT, R, 403, 602		

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
66:11	MT, NT, R, 403, 602		
68:23-69:6			
69:10-69:21			
73:23-74:6	AF, F, H, 402, 403, 602		
74:8-74:12	AF, F, H, 402, 403, 602		
78:6-78:16	AF, F, H, 402, 403, 602		
86:5-86:6	F, H, 602		
86:11	F, H, 602		
87:15-87:22	F, H, NT, 602		
87:24-88:3	F, H, MD, 602		
88:5	F, H, MD, 602		
93:10	F, V		
93:12-93:22	F, V		
94:9-94:11	C, F		
94:16-94:17	F		
94:19-94:22	F, L, NT		
104:6-104:10	F, H, R, 403, 602		
104:12-104:16	F, H, R, 403, 602		
104:18	F, H, R, 403, 602		
104:20-104:21	F, H, L, R, 403, 602		
104:23	F, H, L, R, 403, 602		

DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS OF THOMAS FAULHABER
OCTOBER 4, 2019

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
12:1-12:2	H, UNE	N/A	
12:10-12:20	H, R, UNE, 403	13:16-18, 13:22-24, 96:2-7	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403
15:1-16:11	H, NT, R, UNE, 403,	N/A	
17:9-17:19	H, UNE	N/A	
17:23-18:3	H, UNE	N/A	
18:19-19:17	H, UNE	19:18-22	
19:23-20:24	H, R, UNE, 403	20:25-21:1	
21:7-28:2	H, R, UNE, 403		
28:21-28:24	H, UNE	28:16-20, 28:25-29:2	Lack of Relevance
29:3-30:20	CS, H, UNE, 602	30:25-31:4	
30:25-31:4	H, R, UNE, 403	N/A	
31:7-33:9	H, NT, PK, R, UNE, 403	30:25-31:4, 33:10-12	
33:25-34:10	H, R, UNE, 403	33:13-22, 34:11-19	
37:1-38:7	H, F, R, UNE, 403, 602	38:8-13	
42:4-42:13	H, CS, NT, R, UNE, 403, 602	42:14-18	
53:9-53:21	H, UNE	52:21-23, 52:25-53:8, 53:22-54:1	403; Lack of Relevance; Not Counter-Designations; Calls for Speculation
58:15-61:1	H, NT, UNE, 602	61:2-9	
64:17-67:5	H, L, NT, UNE, 602, 701	63:15-64:16, 67:6-12	403; Lack of Relevance; Not Counter-Designations; Calls for Speculation
67:9-67:24	H, NR, NT, UNE		
68:7-68:16	H, NT, UNE, 602	67:25-68:6, 68:17-69:2	Lack of Relevance; Foundation; Calls for Speculation; 403

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
69:3-69:13	H, R, UNE, 403, 602	69:14-70:6	Lack of Relevance; Foundation; Calls for Speculation; 403
70:7-70:10	H, UNE	70:11-71:3	Lack of Relevance; Foundation; Calls for Speculation; 403
76:18-80:2	H, NR, NT, UNE, 602	80:3-81:11	Lack of Relevance; Foundation; Calls for Speculation; 403
83:24-84:5	H, INQA, NR, UNE	83:2-23, 84:9-12	Lack of Relevance; Foundation; Calls for Speculation; 403; Incomplete
84:13-86:20	CLC, H, NT, R, UNE, 403, 602, 701	86:21-87:1	Lack of Relevance; Foundation; Calls for Speculation; 403; Not Counter-Designations
87:6-88:22	H, INQA, R, UNE, 403	87:2-5, 88:23-90:3	Lack of Relevance; Foundation; Calls for Speculation; 403; Not Counter-Designations
90:13-90:21	F, H, R, UNE, 403	90:4-12, 90:22-92:6, 97:10-98:5	Lack of Relevance; Foundation; Calls for Speculation; 403; Not Counter-Designations
92:7-92:11	AF, H, R, UNE, 403	92:12-14	
92:15-93:1	H, UNE, 602	92:12-14	
94:16-94:18	H, UNE	94:19-95:20	Lack of Relevance; Calls for Speculation; Not Counter-Designations
95:21-96:1	H, UNE	96:2-7	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403
99:19-100:10	H, R, UNE, 403		
116:24-117:19	H, UNE, 602		
126:1-127:3	H, NT, UNE		
132:11-136:19	H, R, UNE, 403, 602	131:13-24, 136:20-137:8	131:13-24: Vague, leading

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
137:9-138:2	H, UNE, 602	136:20-137:8, 138:3-7	
138:8-139:6	H, R, UNE, 403, 602	138:3-7, 139:7-15	
151:10-152:7	AAA, H, L, UNE	152:8-153:3, 153:15-22, 154:3-4, 154:6-20, 156:6-18, 156:24-157:4, 158:9-14, 158:16-18, 159:7-12, 160:3-17, 161:19-162:1, 162:5-19, 162:21-23, 163:13-25, 164:1-6, 164:25-8, 169:4-13, 169:15-18, 170:21-171:13, 171:14-172:8, 173:1-6, 174:20-175:3, 175:5-9, 213:25-214:8, 214:10-15, 214:22-215:1, 232:5-11, 232:13-18, 232:20-233:10, 233:12-234:1, 234:3-8, 234:10-15, 234:17-20, 235:24-236:6, 237:14-15, 237:17-21, 237:23-25, 238:2	154:6-7: Lack of Relevance, Calls for Speculation, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Asked & Answered, IPR Estoppel, Rule 403 156:24-157:4: Lack of Relevance; Rule 403 158:9-14: Lack of Foundation, Hearsay, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Lack of Relevance, IPR Estoppel, Rule 403, Incomplete/Not Q&A 158:16-18: Vague/Ambiguous, Rule 403, Incomplete/Not Q&A, Lack of Foundation, IPR Estoppel, Hearsay, Lack of Relevance 161:19-162:1: Lack of Relevance, MIL, IPR Estoppel, Authentication, Rule 403, Vague/Confusing, Assumes Facts not in Evidence

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
			<p>162:5-19: Lack of Relevance, MIL, IPR Estoppel, Authentication, Rule 403, Vague/Confusing, Assumes Facts not in Evidence</p> <p>162:21-23: Vague/Confusing, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403</p> <p>163:13-25: Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Incomplete</p> <p>164:1-6: Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Incomplete</p> <p>164:25-165:8: Asked & Answered, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403</p> <p>169:4-10: Asked & Answered, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403</p> <p>170:21-172:8: Lack of Foundation, IPR Estoppel, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Calls for Speculation, Asked & Answered</p>

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
			<p>173:1-6: Lack of Relevance, IPR Estoppel, Rule 403</p> <p>174:20-175:3 : Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Asked & Answered, Vague/Ambiguous, Leading/Not a Question</p> <p>175:5-9: Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Asked & Answered, Vague/Ambiguous, Leading/Not a Question</p> <p>213:25-214:8: Lack of Relevance, Not a Q&A, Misstates Prior Testimony, Rule 403</p> <p>214:10-15: Lack of Relevance, Rule 403</p> <p>232:5-11, 232:13-18, 232:20-233:10, 233:12-234:1, 234:3-8, 234:10-15, 234:17-20, 235:24-236:6, 237:14-15, 237:17-21, 237:23-25, 238:2: Argumentative; Misstates Testimony; 403; Calls for Speculation; Asked and</p>

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
			Answered; Not Counter-Designations; IPR Estoppel
169:4-169:10	H, UNE	169:11-13, 169:15-18	
188:3-190:12	AF, H, R, UNE, 403, 602	190:13-23	
190:24-191:6	H, UNE	191:7-10, 191:12	
191:13-191:21	H, R, UNE, 403, 602	93:22-94:2, 191:22-25	
192:1-192:8	H, UNE, 602	93:22-94:2, 175:17-19, 176:5-12, 176:19-177:15, 191:22-25	
198:4-198:21	H, INQA, R, UNE, 403	198:23-199:8	
199:9-199:16	H, R, UNE, 403	199:17-20	
199:21-200:1	H, R, UNE, 403	200:2-6, 200:8-19	Rule 403; Lack of Relevance; Calls for Speculation; Not Testimony; Argumentative
202:2-204:4	F, H, NT, R, UNE, 403, 602	204:5-9	Rule 403; Lack of Relevance; Calls for Speculation; Not Testimony; Argumentative
204:10-207:7	F, H, NT, R, UNE, 403, 602		
215:2-215:4	H, UNE	215:5-6, 215:8-16	
220:7-223:24	CLC, CS, F, H, L, LA, NT, R, UNE, 403, 602, 701	139:7-15, 224:3-5, 224:8-14	Rule 403; Lack of Relevance; Calls for Speculation; Not Testimony; Argumentative; Not Counter-Designations
224:2	CLC, CS, F, H, L, LA, R, UNE, 403, 602, 701		
224:18-227:2	CLC, CS, F, H, MT, NT, R, UNE, 403, 602	139:7-15	

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
228:7-229:22	H, NR, NT, R, UNE, 403, 602	231:19-22, 231:24, 229:23-25, 230:2-3, 230:5-23, 231:19-22, 231:24-232:4	Argumentative; Misstates Testimony; 403; Calls for Speculation; Asked and Answered; Not Counter-Designations; IPR Estoppel
230:25-231:18	F, H, NT, R, UNE, 403, 602		
241:2-241:22	CLC, CS, F, H, LA, NT, R, UNE, 403, 602, 701	240:21-23, 240:25-241:1, 241:23-24, 242:1-7, 242:9-12, 242:14-18, 242:20-243:12, 243:14-23, 243:25-244:2, 244:6-14, 244:16-18	Argumentative; Misstates Testimony; 403; Calls for Speculation; Asked and Answered; Not Counter-Designations; IPR Estoppel

DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS OF JOHN HENGEL
NOVEMBER 1, 2019

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
7:12-7:14			
12:9 (beginning with "do you")-12:16			
13:3-13:6			
21:22-22:13			

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
22:24-23:23	CS, R, 403	22:15-18	
24:2-24:4	CS, R, 403		
27:20-27:24	AF, F, V, 403		
29:4-29:5	AF, F, V, 403, 602	27:25-28:6	
29:8-29:18	AF, F, V, R, 403, 602	27:25-28:6	
29:21	AF, F, R, 403		
30:9-30:11	AF, F, R, 403	27:25-28:6	
30:14-30:20	AF, F, R, 403	27:25-28:6, 30:21-31:2	
32:13-32:15	AF, F, R, SCOPE, 403		
32:18-33:8	AF, F, R, SCOPE, 403		
33:11-33:14	AF, F, L, R, 403		
35:13-36:2	AF, F, L, R, 403		
36:20-36:23	AF, CS, F, NT, R, SCOPE, V, 403		
37:2-37:7	AF, CS, F, R, SCOPE, V, 403		
37:13-37:14	AF, CS, F, R, 403		
37:17-37:20	AF, F, R, SCOPE, 403		
37:23-38:3	AF, F, R, SCOPE, 403		
38:9-38:10	AF, CS, F, R, SCOPE, 403		
38:13-38:20	AF, CS, F, R, SCOPE, 403		
38:23-38:25	AF, CS, F, R, SCOPE, 403		
40:18-40:24	AF, F, R, SCOPE, 403	40:25-41:9	
41:10-41:11	CS, R, SCOPE, 403, 602		
41:14-41:18	CS, R, SCOPE, 403, 602		
41:21-41:23	CS, R, SCOPE, 403, 602		
42:2-42:3	CS, R, SCOPE, 403, 602		
42:6-42:9	AF, CS, F, R, SCOPE, 403, 602		

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
42:12-42:19	AF, F, R, 403		
49:18-49:21	AF, CS, F, R, SCOPE, 403, 602		
49:24	AF, CS, F, R, SCOPE, 403, 602		
114:10-115:9	F, L		
118:24-119:12	AF, CS, MIL, R, V, 403, 701		
119:15-119:20	AF, CS, MIL, R, SCOPE, 403, 701		
119:23-120:19	AF, CS, L, MIL, R, SCOPE, 403, 701		
120:22-120:24	AF, CS, L, MIL, R, SCOPE, 403, 701		
131:24-132:4	CS, R, SCOPE, V, 403, 602	133:15-22	
132:7-133:2	CS, R, SCOPE, V, 403, 602	133:15-22	
135:13-135:16	CS, R, SCOPE, 403, 602	136:9-15, 136:20	
135:19-135:23	CS, R, SCOPE, 403, 602	136:9-15, 136:20	

DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS OF WALTER JANG
OCTOBER 10, 2019

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
6:5-7:3	R		
7:18-10:20	R, 403		
12:11-16:3	R, 403, SCOPE, NT		
16:13-16:20	R, 403, SCOPE, NT		
20:10-21:8	R, 403, SCOPE, NT		
21:21-24:16	R, 403, SCOPE, NT		
28:15-29:13	R, 403, SCOPE, NT		
30:4-33:22	R, 403, NT		
35:16-38:14	AF, CS, F, MD, NT, SCOPE, V, 602	38:15-16, 38:19, 38:22-39:7, 39:9-15	Relevance
39:16-40:9	R, 403		
41:3-41:15	AF, F, L, NT, R	41:16-20	Relevance
41:21-42:10	R, 403		
45:2-45:12	AF, F, NT, SCOPE	44:10-17, 44:19-45:1	Relevance; 403
45:15-45:18	AF, F, SCOPE		
46:1-48:17	AF, F, NT, SCOPE		
56:11-57:25	R, 403, NT, SCOPE	58:2-15	
58:16-58:25			
61:3-61:20	V, NT	61:22-23, 61:25-16	
62:17-62:21		61:22-23, 61:25-16, 62:22-24, 63:1-3, 65:5-11	
63:5-65:4	NT, L	65:5-11	
65:12-66:1	403, L	65:5-11, 66:2-6, 66:8-14	
66:16-67:12		66:2-6, 66:8-14, 67:13-24	
67:25-68:5	MT, 403		
68:14-69:16	NT		

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
69:22-70:15		70:16-20, 70:22-71:21, 70:16-20, 70:22-72:15	
72:16-73:24	CS, 602	71:3-72:15	
74:12-74:17	MT, 403, 602	74:18-20	
74:21-74:25	403, V	74:18-20	
76:7-76:10	403	75:17-20, 75:22-76:3, 76:11-78:15, 78:17-21	Not Counter-Designations; Relevance; 403
78:23-80:5	MT	76:11-78:15, 78:17-21, 80:6-81:15, 81:17-25, 82:2-16	Not Counter-Designations; Relevance; 403
85:9-86:11	F, H, MD, MT, NT		
93:3-93:9	AF, F, V	91:12-92:22, 92:24-93:1	Not Counter-Designations; Relevance; 403
96:25-97:12	AF, INQA, MT, 403	94:19-96:24	Not Counter-Designations; Relevance; 403
99:17-100:17	CS, NT, R, 403, 602		
101:10-102:25	R, 403	103:1-3	
103:4-103:7			
106:3-108:17	MT, NT, R, SCOPE, 403	108:18-109:8	Non-Responsive; Vague; Relevance; 403
109:13-112:21	NT, R, SCOPE, 403	112:22-113:4	
113:5-114:13	CS, F, R, 403, 602	114:14-21	Relevance; 403
114:22-116:2	R, MT, NT	114:14-21	Relevance; 403
117:21-121:11	L, NT, SCOPE	117:11-20	Incomplete; Non-responsive; Relevance; 403; Vague
122:1-122:7	MT, R	121:21-25, 122:8-16	
122:17-127:18	F, L, NT, R, SCOPE, 403, 602	121:21-25, 122:8-16, 128:2-4, 128:6-18	128:2-4, 128:6-18; Not Counter-Designations; Non-responsive; Relevance; 403

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
132:20-133:7	CLC, LA, NT, R, 403, 701	132:12-14, 132:16-18	Not Counter-Designations; Non-responsive; Relevance; 403
133:13-134:3	R, 403		
137:13-138:16	F, NT, R, SCOPE, 403, 602	138:17-19, 138:21-139:2, 139:4-7	Relevance; 403; Vague; Non-responsive
139:9-140:2	NT, R, SCOPE	138:17-19, 138:21-139:2, 139:4-7	Relevance; 403; Vague; Non-responsive

DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS OF EVELYN KAO
OCTOBER 23, 2019

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
5:3-5:22		5:23-6:13	Not Testimony/Attorney Colloquy, Rule 403, Not Relevant
7:22-8:1			
8:11-8:25			
9:14-10:8		10:9-12	
10:13-11:4		11:5-7	
11:12-11:16			
12:6-12:11		12:13-18, 13:17-21, 14:1-7	
15:5-15:9	R, V	16:1-3	MIL/Stipulation, Rule 403
20:21-21:6			
21:21-21:24			
22:8-22:17	R, V		
24:15-25:20			

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
25:25-26:6			
26:16-26:20			
28:3-28:6	R, V	26:7-11, 26:13-14	Nonresponsive, Not Relevant
53:9-54:1	R, SCOPE, V, 403		
64:8-64:19	R, SCOPE, V, 403		
68:13-68:23	R, V, 403		
71:7-71:18	R		
71:22	INQA		
85:19-86:1			
86:19-89:10	R, SCOPE, V, 403		
90:3-92:7	R, SCOPE, V, 403		
118:22-119:17	V		
127:13-127:24		127:25-128:15	
128:16-129:2		129:13-130:22	
130:23-131:11			
131:16-132:1	R, V		
133:4-135:18	R, V, 403		
136:18-137:19			
142:3-142:6	F, NT, R, SCOPE, V, 403		
147:17-148:20	F, MT		
149:20-150:8	R, V		
151:4-151:6			
151:10-151:20	F, R, SCOPE, V, 403	151:21-152:6	
152:15-153:24	F, R, SCOPE, V, 403		
154:24-156:11	V		
158:10-161:7	F, R, SCOPE, V, 403		
161:16-161:21	F, R, SCOPE, V, 403		
162:13-163:11	F, R, SCOPE, V, 403		

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
167:10-168:7	R, V, 403		
170:18-171:12	SCOPE, V		
172:5-172:9			
172:16-173:16	F, R, SCOPE, V, 403		
173:24-174:10	F, R, SCOPE, V, 403	174:11-16, 174:18-19, 174:21-24, 175:1-5, 175:7-12, 175:14-17, 176:9-16	
179:24-180:3	R, SCOPE, V, 403		
181:2-181:9	R, SCOPE, V, 403		
182:9-182:17	R, SCOPE, V, 403	182:19-21, 182:23-24, 183:7-10, 183:12-13	
183:15-184:1	R, V		
185:2-186:5	R, V	186:6-18	
195:11-195:24	F, R, SCOPE, V, 403		
197:11-198:2	CLC, CS, F, R, SCOPE, V, 403		
201:4-201:13	F, R, SCOPE, V, 403		

DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS OF JAMES MACCOUN
OCTOBER 2, 2019

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
5:22-6:7			
6:14-6:23			
9:8-9:12			
14:25-15:2			
15:20-16:9	COMP		
16:11	COMP		
16:13-16:25			
17:3-17:5			
17:7-17:12			
20:1-20:3	R, V, 403		
20:5	R, V, 403		
24:4-24:5	V		
24:7	V		
24:9-25:1			
25:4-27:7			
28:9-29:8	INQA	29:18-30:2	INQA (Optional completeness with 30:3-21)
33:15-34:2	INQA		
34:13-35:11	INQA	34:3-9, 35:12-14	INQA (Optional completeness with 35:16-36:10)
37:1-37:21	CS, SCOPE, V		
37:23-38:5	CS, SCOPE, V		
40:1-40:10			
41:18-41:23	AAA		
43:21-44:6	R, V, 403		
64:19-65:3	INQA	64:5-11	

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
67:21-69:4	PRIV, R, 403		
69:8	PRIV, R, 403		
69:10-69:12	PRIV, R, 403		
104:24-104:25			
105:4-109:1	PRIV, R, 403		
109:3	AAA, AF, CS, 403		
109:5-109:12	AF, COMP, R, 403		
109:15-109:23	R, 403		
109:25-110:14	R, 403		
110:18-110:20	R, 403, INQA	111:4-14	Relevance, 403
111:18-112:12	R, 403, INQA	112:19-25, 113:18-21	
117:12-118:18	R, 403	118:19-119:12	403, Argumentative, Legal Conclusion, Assumes Facts Not in Evidence, Lacks Foundation
119:24-120:19	R, SCOPE, 403		
122:11-122:22	R, SCOPE, 403		
131:7-131:11	AF, CLC, R, SCOPE, V, 403		
133:13-134:4			

DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS OF SAI MARRI
OCTOBER 30, 2019

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
7:14-7:21	R, 403		
9:23-10:8	R, 403		
10:21-11:17	H, R, 403		
11:23-13:9	H, NT, R, SCOPE, 403		
13:12-22:22	H, INQA, NT, R, SCOPE, 403	22:24-23:10	Relevance, 403
24:3-24:7	R, 403	24:8-15	
24:16-24:19	R, 403		
25:1-25:11	H, R, 403	25:12-17, 25:22-26:4	
26:5-27:2	R, 403	25:12-17, 25:22-26:4	
28:18-29:22	R, 403		
29:25-30:3	INQA, R, 403		
30:22-31:22	R, 403		
32:3-32:12	AF, F, R, 403	33:3-11	
33:12-33:14		33:3-11	
35:2-37:16	CS, NT, R, V, 403	34:22-35:1	
38:1-39:12	H, NT, R, 403		
40:7-42:17	INQA, H, R, 403	44:5-11, 44:15-45:13	
43:22-44:4	AAA, L	44:5-11, 44:15-45:13	
45:14-46:21	AF, H		
47:4-47:17	H, R, 403, 602		
47:24-57:4	AF, CS, F, H, L, NT, SCOPE, R, 403, 602	47:18-23, 57:6-7, 57:10-12	Relevance, 403, Foundation, Non-Answer
57:14-57:18	CS, R, SCOPE, 403, 602		
59:22-60:6	AF, INQA, R, 403	60:7-18	
60:22-61:4	CS, R, SCOPE, 403, 602	61:6-24	

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
62:19-64:10	AF, H, MD, NT, R, SCOPE, 403, 602	64:14-18, 65:4-10	Optional Completeness (64:19-65:3.
66:5-68:25	CS, NT, R, SCOPE, 403, 602		
69:9-71:19			
74:12-75:7		75:8-10	
75:11-76:4	H	75:8-10, 76:12-17	Non-Answer, Relevance, 403, Foundation
76:12-76:17			
77:10-77:19			
78:2-78:7		78:8-10	
78:11-78:19		78:8-10	
79:9-79:20	AF, CS, MD, R, SCOPE, 403, 602	79:22-25	Non-Answer, Relevance, 403, Foundation
80:21-81:1	CS, R, 403, 602	81:2-20	
82:8-84:13	CS, L, NT, SCOPE, 602	84:15-18	
84:19-85:9	CS, SCOPE, 602		
88:11-92:7	AF, R, SCOPE, 403, 602		
92:16-93:20			
95:3-96:17		96:18-97:4	
97:9-98:16	INQA	97:5-8, 99:3-21	
99:22-100:4	INQA	99:3-21	
102:13-102:19		102:8-12	
104:9-104:25	AF, F, NT, R, V, 403	105:13-23	
105:24-106:20	CS, NT, SCOPE, 403, 602	105:13-23	
107:13-109:9	AF, ARG, CS, NT, R, SCOPE, 403, 602	109:10-16	
110:7-110:15	CS, R, SCOPE, 403, 602		
122:23-123:7	AF, F, INQA, R, SCOPE, 403, 602		

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
123:12-126:21	L, MT		
128:19-131:6	AF, CS, F, H, MD, NT, R, SCOPE, 403, 602		
131:15:131:17	R, SCOPE, 403, 602	131:18-132:1	
132:2-133:20	AF, ARG, CS, L, NT, R, SCOPE, 403, 602	133:21, 133:23-134:1	
134:3-134:19	AF, CS, NT, R, SCOPE, 403, 602	133:23-134:1	
140:1-141:11	CS, L, NT, R, SCOPE, 403, 602	141:12-142:6	
142:7-142:21			
143:15-143:17			
144:1-149:1	AF, CS, F, L, MD, NT, R, SCOPE, 403, 602	149:2, 149:4-10	Non-Answer, Relevance, 403, Foundation
152:9-153:21	AF, CS, F, R, SCOPE, 403, 602		
156:7-157:14	AF, F, MT, R, 403		
158:12-164:12	CS, INQA, R, SCOPE, 403, 602	164:13	
164:23-166:19	AF, CS, F, NT, R, SCOPE, 403, 602		

DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS OF SAI MARRI
DECEMBER 13, 2019

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
6:7-6:22			
7:6-7:15	F, NT, R, 403		
7:23-8:8	F, NT, R, 403		
8:19-13:11	F, NT, R, 403	13:12-18	
19:9-20:25	AF, CS, L, MD, NT, R, SCOPE, 403, 602		
25:24-26:25	AF, F, NT		
27:7-33:6	AF, F, H, L, NT		
33:15-33:19	L, R, 403		
34:16-34:24	AF		
35:18-38:2	AF, CS, H, NT, R, 403, 602		
39:12-40:6	AF, F, R, 403		
43:14-43:25	CS, L, MT, R, 403	44:2-6	Non-Answer, Relevance, 403, Foundation
44:7-44:21	CS, H, R, 403		
45:18-46:5			
47:6-50:11	CS, MD, NT, R, SCOPE, 403, 602		
53:6-54:14	AAA, F, L, MT, NT, R, 403		
54:22-55:4	AAA, L, MT		
55:17-55:22	L, MT		

DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS OF KISHORE PAPINENI
NOVEMBER 14, 2019

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
8:9-8:15		6:15-7:20	403; Lack of Relevance; Not Testimony; Legal Argument
8:25-9:9			
9:22-10:25		11:3-20	Lack of Relevance
15:16-16:19			
17:3-17:5			
56:5-56:21	R		
58:19-61:2	R, V		
74:3-75:18	V, 403, 602	73:4-74:2, 75:19-76:3, 77:17-78:11 (ending at "the whole phrase.")	403; Vague; Foundation; Optional Completeness (78:11-16)

DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS OF ABODUNRINWA TOKI
NOVEMBER 22, 2019

<u>PLAINTIFF'S DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>DEFENDANTS COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTER DESIGNATIONS</u>
7:10-7:15			
9:12-11:18			
20:17-21:11			
31:20-33:10	R, 403	31:1-9, 31:15-19	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403
33:22-34:9	INQA, R, 403		
78:3-81:1	COMP, V		
81:13-81:25			
107:16-107:18	COMP, INQA		
107:20-107:21			
122:25-123:9			
123:14-126:2			
147:5-147:20			
147:24-149:5		149:8-14	Hearsay
149:15-149:22		149:23-150:19	Hearsay
155:18-156:2			

EXHIBIT 5D

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

ARENDI S.A.R.L., Plaintiff, v. MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC f/k/a MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC., Defendant.	C.A. No. 1:12-cv-01601-JLH JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
---	---

ARENDI S.A.R.L., Plaintiff, v. GOOGLE LLC, Defendant.	C.A. No. 1:13-cv-00919-JLH JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
---	---

**PLAINTIFF’S AMENDED COUNTER-DESIGNATIONS AND OBJECTIONS TO
DEFENDANTS’ DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS**

Anind Dey
November 12, 2019

Defendants’ Designations	Plaintiff’s Objections	Plaintiff’s Counter-Designations	Defendants’ Objections to Counter-Designations
13:16	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403		
13:18-19	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403		
14:16-18	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
15:14-16:5	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, MIL		
16:7-17:3	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
17:25-18:15	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403		
19:4-15	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403		
20:21-21:2	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
21:7-22:3	21:14-24; Lacks foundation, speculation, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
22:8-23:10	22:8-11; Lacks foundation, speculation, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
23:13-24:1	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
24:2-25:12	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
26:6-27:6	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
27:11-12	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
27:15-21	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
28:1-10	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	28:17-29:3	IMP C
29:4-30:9	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
30:12-31:9	Incomplete (ll. 10-11); Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
31:10-32:8	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
32:9-13	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
32:14-25	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
33:1-12	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel; Incomplete (ll. 13-15)	33:13-15	
33:16-23	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	33:24-34:12	IMP C
34:13-14	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403; Lack of Foundation; Authentication		
34:18-22	Lacks foundation, speculation; Lack of Relevance, Rule 403; Authentication	34:23-35:3	IMP C
36:17-20	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel; Incomplete	36:21-37:16	IMP C, R, 403
37:20-23	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	37:24-38:2	
38:3-39:4	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel; Lack of Foundation; Authentication		
39:23-40:12	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
40:16-21	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
42:10-43:13	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
45:20-46:20	Lack of Foundation; Authentication; Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403	46:21-23	
46:24-47:2	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
47:11-25	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Incomplete; Lack of Foundation; Authentication		
48:1-12	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Lack of Foundation; Authentication		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
48:16-24	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Lack of Foundation; Authentication		
49:3-5	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
49:6-50:23	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
51:1-25	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
52:1-2	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
52:6-54:13	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
54:15-56:18	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403	56:23-57:9 57:14-17	
57:20-58:18	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Incomplete (ll: 18-19); Mischaracterizes evidence; Assumes facts not in the evidence; Improper hypothetical of lay witness		
58:20-59:9	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Not a question; Leading; Assumes facts not in evidence		
59:11-19	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Compound; Assumes facts not in evidence		
59:21-60:6	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Compound; Assumes facts not in evidence		
60:7-61:14	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Speculation; Leading; Compound		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
61:16-62:17	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Leading; Compound		
62:24-63:4	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
63:9-11	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Leading		
63:13-64:13	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Speculation; Improper lay hypothetical		
64:16-65:1	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403	65:2-5	
65:6-66:21	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Not a question/attorney testifying		
67:17-18	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
67:21-68:17	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
68:21-69:19	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
69:24-71:10	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Lack of foundation; Authentication; Leading; Not a question; Mischaracterizes testimony		
71:12	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Leading; Not a question; Mischaracterizes testimony		
73:23-24	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
74:2-15	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Attorney testifying		
74:18-76:7	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
76:10-12	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403	77:6-25	IMP C
78:15-79:1	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Speculation		
79:19-21	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
80:1-2	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
80:6-81:19	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
81:21-83:9	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Assumes facts not in evidence; Compound		
83:13-14	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Leading		
83:16-20	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Leading		
83:22-84:2	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Assumes facts not in evidence; Calls for speculation; MIL		
84:4-85:4	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Assumes facts not in evidence; Calls for speculation; MIL		
85:7-86:15	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Assumes facts not in evidence; Calls for speculation; MIL; Leading		
86:22-88:6	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
88:10-22	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Improper lay hypothetical; MIL;		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	Assumes facts not in evidence; Calls for speculation		
88:24-89:11	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Improper lay hypothetical; MIL; Assumes facts not in evidence; Speculation		
89:13-22	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Incomplete; Not Q&A; Leading; Assumes facts not in evidence; Calls for speculation; Improper lay hypothetical; MIL		
89:24-91:7	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Assumes facts not in evidence; Calls for speculation; MIL; Improper lay testimony; Leading		
91:9-92:11	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; MIL; Improper lay testimony; Speculation; Assumes facts not in evidence		
92:13-15	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Assumes facts not in evidence; Speculation; Improper lay testimony; MIL		
92:17-93:10	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Assumes facts not in evidence; Speculation; Improper lay testimony; MIL		
93:12-95:22	Incomplete question; Lack of Relevance; IPR		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	Estoppel; Rule 403; Improper lay hypothetical; Leading		
95:24-96:5	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Mischaracterizes testimony;		
96:7-9	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
96:11-24	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
96:25-97:1	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
97:4-99:3	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Incomplete		
99:5-7	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Incomplete		
99:9-11	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
99:14-100:8	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403	100:9-11	IMP C
100:12-18	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
100:19-22	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
101:11-15	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
101:17-25	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Vague/Ambiguous		
102:2-6	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Vague/Ambiguous		
102:7-103:3	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Calls for speculation		
103:4-16	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
103:17-105:4	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
106:4-107:9	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
107:11	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Leading; Incomplete designation		
107:24-108:1	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
108:2-8	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Calls for speculation; Leading/not a question		
108:10-18	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
108:19-109:1	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
109:12-16	Incomplete question; Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Lack of foundation		
109:19-112:1	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Lack of foundation; Assumes facts not in evidence		
112:4-22	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Lack of foundation; Authentication; Assumes facts not in evidence; Leading		
112:24-114:2	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Lack of foundation; Leading; Assumes facts not in evidence		
114:4-10	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Lack of foundation; Leading; Assumes facts not in evidence		
114:12-115:2	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Lack of foundation; Leading;		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	Assumes facts not in evidence		
115:4-5	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Lack of foundation; Leading; Assumes facts not in evidence; Mischaracterizes testimony		
115:7-8	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Lack of foundation; Leading; Assumes facts not in evidence		
115:10-13	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Lack of foundation; Leading; Assumes facts not in evidence		
115:15-116:12	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Lack of foundation; Leading		
116:14-18	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Lack of foundation; Leading; Assumes facts not in evidence; Ambiguous; Compound		
116:21-24	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Leading		
117:5-16	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
117:19-119:15	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
119:20-123:14	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
123:18-124:13	Relevance, Estoppel (Pandit); 403; IPR Estoppel; MIL		
124:17-125:3	Relevance, Estoppel (Pandit); 403; IPR Estoppel; MIL		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
125:7-18	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
126:4-6	Lack of Relevance; Rule 403; Assumes facts not in evidence		
126:8-12	Lack of Relevance; Rule 403; Asked & answered		
126:15-16	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
126:19-128:15	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403	128:16-18	IMP C
128:19-129:4	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
129:7-131:7	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
131:9-17	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
131:20-132:5	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
132:11-133:4	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
133:7-23	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
134:1-135:18	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
135:21-136:3	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
136:5-16	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
137:20-23	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
137:25-138:14	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
138:20-140:11	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
140:13	Incomplete; Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
140:18-22	Incomplete designation; Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
141:2-142:9	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403;		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	Assumes facts not in evidence; Improper lay testimony; MIL		
142:11-14	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Assumes facts not in evidence; Improper lay testimony; MIL		
142:16-143:6	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
143:7-144:16	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
144:17-145:2	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
145:3-4	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Assumes facts not in evidence		
145:6-146:25	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Leading; Assumes facts not in evidence		
147:2-18	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Leading Assumes facts not in evidence		
147:19-21	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
147:24-148:19	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Attorney testifying; Lack of foundation; Authentication		
148:20-149:2	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
149:4-150:12	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Incomplete; Calls for speculation; Improper lay testimony; MIL		
150:14-23	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Speculation; Improper		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	lay testimony/hypothetical; MIL; Assumes facts not in evidence		
150:25-152:13	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Speculation; Improper lay testimony/hypothetical; MIL		
152:15-20	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Speculation; Improper lay testimony/hypothetical; MIL		
152:21-153:1	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Speculation; Improper lay testimony/hypothetical; MIL		
153:6-12	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
153:15-154:6	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Lawyer testifying; Leading; Vague; Not Q&A		
154:18-155:13	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
155:16-157:15	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
157:18-158:2	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Leading		
158:4-160:15	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Improper expert testimony; MIL		
160:18-24	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
161:2-19	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Improper lay testimony; MIL		
161:22-163:10	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Improper lay testimony; MIL		
163:12-164:3	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Improper lay testimony; MIL; Calls for speculation		
164:6-13	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
164:16-166:23	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Calls for speculation; Improper lay testimony; MIL; Leading		
166:25-167:14	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Leading; Improper lay testimony; MIL; ; Lack of foundation; Authentication		
167:17-168:15	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Lack of foundation; Authentication		
169:3-6	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403	169:7-9	IMP C
169:10-18	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Lack of foundation; Authentication		
170:2-12	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Lack of foundation; Authentication; Rule 612; Assumes evidence not in record		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
170:14-25	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Rule 612; Asked & Answered		
171:3-172:23	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; MIL		
173:18-174:4	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403	174:5-8	
174:9-13	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Vague		
174:15-19	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Leading		
174:21-21	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Leading		
175:4-12	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Leading; Vague/Ambiguous		
175:14-20	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Improper lay hypothetical/testimony		
175:22-176:1	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Improper lay hypothetical/testimony; Assumes facts not in evidence		
176:4-9	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Vague/Ambiguous		
176:11-177:17	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
177:20-24	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403	177:25-178:20	IMP C
178:21-179:17	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
179:20-23	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
179:25-181:18	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403	184:11-184:21 184:23-185:3	IMP C, COMP, L, CS IMP C, COMP, L, CS

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
		186:24-25 187:2-23 190:17-25 191:3 195:15-23 195:25-196:1 196:17-197:4 198: 3-9 205:3-17 207:15-22	IMP C, V IMP C, V IMP C, V, L IMP C, V, L IMP C, V IMP C, V IMP C IMP C, L IMP C, V IMP C
208:18-20	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
208:22-210:9	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Incomplete		
210:12-211:3	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
215:11-216:6	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
217:23-218:14	Incomplete designation; Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
219:20-220:5	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
220:8-12	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Not Q&A/Incomplete		
220:21-221:1	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Not Q&A/Incomplete	221:2-5 221:8-24	IMP C, COMP, V, INQA
223:13-16	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
223:18-224:6	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403		
224:8-12	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403	224:13-225:17 225:19-25 228:11-12 228:15-229:4 229:6-23 230:2-4 230:6 230:14-17	IMP C, INQA, V IMP C, INQA, V, COMP IMP C, INQA, V IMP C, L IMP C, L IMP C, V

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
		230:19-22 231:9-20 232:16-18 232:20 235:18-20 236: 3-17 243:1-6 243:9 243:17-22 250:2-12 250:18-25 251:23-253: 24 264:25-265:1 265: 3 265:5-12	IMP C, V IMP C IMP C, V IMP C, V IMP C, V, COMP IMP C, V, COMP IMP C, INQA, V, L IMP C, INQA, V, L IMP C IMP C, INQA, V IMP C IMP C, R, 403, INQA IMP C, INQA, L, R, 403 IMP C, INQA, L, R, 403 IMP C, INQA, R, 403
266:2-267:2	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Vague/Ambiguous; Calls for speculation		
267:4-9	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Vague/Ambiguous; Calls for speculation		
267:11-16	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Vague/Ambiguous		
267:18-268:11	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Vague/Ambiguous; Incomplete		
268:13-20	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Vague/Ambiguous; Mischaracterizes evidence; Leading/Not a question		
268:22-269:9	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Improperly lay hypothetical		
269:11-21	Lack of Relevance; IPR Estoppel; Rule 403; Improperly lay		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	hypothetical; Calls for speculation		

Thomas Faulhaber
October 4, 2019

<u>Defendants' Designations</u>	<u>Plaintiff's Objections</u>	<u>Plaintiff's Counter-Designations</u>	<u>Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations</u>
12:1-2			
13:16-24	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403		
14:22-25	Lack of Relevance		
15:5-18			
15:23-16:11		17:9-19	IMP C
18:1-3			
18:7-18			
20:1-10	Lack of Relevance		
24:23-25:1			
25:12-26:20			
26:25-27:1			
27:4-24			
28:16-29:2	Lack of Relevance	29:3-19 30:2-10	AF, CS, IMP, C, R, 403, 602
30:11-20	Rule 403, Vague/Confusing, Assumes Facts Not in Evidence,	30:25-33:9 33:25-34:10 37:1-4	AF, CS, F, H, IMP C, L, NT, R, 403, 602
43:9-24	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Incomplete	43:25-44:8	
54:2-3	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Incomplete/Not Q&A		
54:8-9	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Incomplete/Not Q&A		
54:14-22			
55:1-11	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Incomplete/Not Q&A	55:12-18	
55:19-25	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Lack of Foundation	56:1-4 56:13-16	
57:22-58:24	Lack of Foundation	58:25-61:1	CS, NT, R, 403, 602, 702
92:7-93:1	Misstates Prior Testimony, Confusing/Incomplete	90:13-21	IMP C, R, 403
96:2-7	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403	95:21-25	INQA, L

<u>Defendants' Designations</u>	<u>Plaintiff's Objections</u>	<u>Plaintiff's Counter-Designations</u>	<u>Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations</u>
98:6-7	Lack of Foundation, Authentication, IPR Estoppel, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403		
98:14-99:18	Lack of Foundation, Authentication, IPR Estoppel, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403	99:19-100:10	IMP C
100:11-24	Asked and Answered, Rule 403, Lack of Relevance, Lack of Foundation, IPR Estoppel		
101:12-14	Lack of Foundation, Authentication, IPR Estoppel, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403	101:19-102:17 102:22-103:8	IMP C, R, 403
103:9-21	Lack of Foundation, Authentication, IPR Estoppel, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Hearsay		
104:1-22	Lack of Foundation, Authentication, IPR Estoppel, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Hearsay		
105:10-11	Lack of Foundation, Authentication, IPR Estoppel, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Asked & Answered, Assumes Facts not in Evidence,		
105:13-22	Lack of Foundation, Authentication, IPR Estoppel, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Asked &		

<u>Defendants' Designations</u>	<u>Plaintiff's Objections</u>	<u>Plaintiff's Counter-Designations</u>	<u>Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations</u>
	Answered, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Hearsay		
105:24-107:1	Lack of Foundation, Authentication, IPR Estoppel, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Asked & Answered, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Hearsay	107:6-19	CS, F, IMP C, NT, R, 403, 602, 702
108:20-109:21	Lack of Foundation, Authentication, IPR Estoppel, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Hearsay, Incomplete, Calls for Speculation	108:3-17 109:22-23	CS, F, R, 403, 602, 702
112:6-113:23	Lack of Foundation, Authentication, IPR Estoppel, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Hearsay, Call for Speculation		
117:20-118:3	Lack of Foundation, Authentication, IPR Estoppel, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Hearsay, Calls for Speculation	116:24-117:19	CS, IMP C, L, 602
118:5-8	Lack of Foundation, Authentication, IPR Estoppel, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403,		

<u>Defendants' Designations</u>	<u>Plaintiff's Objections</u>	<u>Plaintiff's Counter-Designations</u>	<u>Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations</u>
	Lack of Personal Knowledge, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Hearsay, Calls for Speculation, Mischaracterizes Evidence		
119:12-120:12	Lack of Foundation, Authentication, IPR Estoppel, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Hearsay		
120:14-121:1	Leading, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Hearsay, Vague		
121:6-21	Lack of Foundation, Authentication, IPR Estoppel, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Hearsay	121:2-5	IMP C
122:14-123:12	Lack of Foundation, Authentication, IPR Estoppel, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Hearsay, Improper Lay Testimony, Calls for Speculation	123:13-17	CS, F, NT, 602
123:21-124:2			
124:4-125:9	Not a Q&A (lawyer commentary), Lack of Foundation, Authentication, IPR Estoppel, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Hearsay, Vague		

<u>Defendants' Designations</u>	<u>Plaintiff's Objections</u>	<u>Plaintiff's Counter-Designations</u>	<u>Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations</u>
125:11-126:17	Vague, Calls for Speculation, Improper Lay Testimony, Lack of Personal Knowledge,		
126:19-126:25		127:1-3	
131:13-14	Vague, leading		
131:16-24			
132:5-133:3	Assumes Facts not in Evidence/Misstates Prior Testimony	133:4-138:2 138:8-139:6	CS, F, IMP C, L, NT, R, 403, 602
139:22-140:5	Lack of Foundation, Hearsay, Lack of Relevance	140:6-10 140:17-141:2	NT
141:3-9	Lack of Relevance	141:10-18	CS, IMP C, L, NT, R, 403, 602
152:17-154:4	Lack of Relevance, Lack of Foundation, Calls for Speculation, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Asked & Answered, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, IPR Estoppel, Rule 403		
154:6-7	Lack of Relevance, Calls for Speculation, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Asked & Answered, IPR Estoppel, Rule 403		
155:8-156:12	Lack of Foundation, Lack of Relevance		
157:22-158:14	Lack of Foundation, Hearsay, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Lack of Relevance, IPR Estoppel, Rule 403, Incomplete/Not Q&A		
158:16-160:17	Vague/Ambiguous, Rule 403, Incomplete/Not Q&A, Lack of Foundation, IPR Estoppel, Hearsay, Lack of Relevance		

<u>Defendants' Designations</u>	<u>Plaintiff's Objections</u>	<u>Plaintiff's Counter-Designations</u>	<u>Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations</u>
161:5-6	Lack of Foundation, Lack of Relevance, MIL, IPR Estoppel, Authentication, Rule 403, Vague/Confusing, Assumes Facts not in Evidence		
161:11-162:19			
162:21-25	Vague/Confusing, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403		
163:2-163:4			
163:13-164:6	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Incomplete	164:7-9	
164:25-165:8	Asked & Answered, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403		
169:4-10	Asked & Answered, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403	169:11-18	L, NT
169:19-23	Asked & Answered, Vague, Compound, Rule 403, Lack of Relevance		
169:25-172:2	Lack of Foundation, IPR Estoppel, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Calls for Speculation, Asked & Answered		
172:9-14	Lack of Relevance, IPR Estoppel, Rule 403		
172:23-173:6	Lack of Relevance, IPR Estoppel, Rule 403	173:7-17	
173:21-25	Asked & Answered		
174:20-175:3	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Asked & Answered, Vague/Ambiguous, Leading/Not a Question		
175:5-9			
213:12-214:8	Lack of Relevance, Not a Q&A, Misstates Prior Testimony, Rule 403		

<u>Defendants’ Designations</u>	<u>Plaintiff’s Objections</u>	<u>Plaintiff’s Counter-Designations</u>	<u>Defendants’ Objections to Counter-Designations</u>
214:10-15	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403	214:16-20	R, 403, 602
215:2-6			
215:8-23	Rule 403		
218:18-219:1	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403		

Atle Hedloy
October 29, 2019

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
7:25-8:4			
8:16-9:12		13:20-16:24	H, IMP C, L
35:11-16			
36:5-17			
37:3-20			
38:5-39:1			
59:19-20			
59:24-60:22			
61:3-15			
63:8-25		64:1-8	L
64:22-65:23			
66:12-67:3		68:23-69:2	H, IMP C
69:3-15			
73:4-17			
76:23-78:8	Foundation; Compound; Calls for Speculation (78:5-15)		
78:10-13			
78:15-80:1			
80:25-82:25	Foundation; Compound; Calls for Speculation (82:22-82:25)		
83:2-88:25	Foundation; Compound; Calls for Speculation (88:1-3)		
91:3-6			
94:9-95:23			
96:13-97:4			
107:15-24			
110:2-9			
112:2-4	Calls for Legal Conclusion		
112:21-114:3	Calls for Legal Conclusion; Calls for Speculation; Foundation		
114:21-115:4	Calls for Legal Conclusion		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
115:6-10	Calls for Legal Conclusion; Confusing; Incomplete Question		
115:12-20	Calls for Legal Conclusion		
115:22-117:2	Foundation; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Confusing		
126:18-127:1	Calls for Legal Conclusion		
127:3-10	Calls for Legal Conclusion		
127:12-13			
130:2-10		130:11-21	
130:22-131:20			
136:8-19	Foundation (136:16-19)		
136:21-138:19	Foundation; Compound		
138:21-139:17	Foundation; Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion	139:18-140:19	MD
140:20-142:3	Foundation; Calls for Speculation (141:5-12)		
142:17-143:1		143:2-10	H, IMP C
143:11-18			
145:18-146:18			
154:12-159:22			
166:13-167:12	Foundation; Compound; Relevance		
168:11-16	Foundation; Compound; Relevance		
175:15-176:4		174:18-175:14	R, 403, 702
179:21-180:19			
180:23-181:10	Foundation; Calls for Speculation (181:10)		
181:12-13	Foundation; Calls for Speculation		
215:4-21	Argumentative; Compound; Foundation; Not relevant; Calls for Speculation.		
264:23-265:5			
265:7-10			

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
297:18-19		297:13-17	H, L
297:21-298:4	Foundation; Calls for Speculation (298:2-4)		
298:6-12	Foundation; Calls for Speculation; Asked and Answered (298:2-4)		
298:14-18	Foundation; Calls for Speculation; Asked and Answered (298:2-4)		
298:20-299:5	Foundation; Calls for Speculation; Asked and Answered		
301:13-20			
302:17-18			
302:22-303:17	Foundation (303:16-17)		
303:19	Foundation		
305:21-24		305:12-20	

Atle Hedloy
October 30, 2019

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
395:23-24			
396:3-12			
397:13-17		397:18-21	H
399:15-19		399:20-400:5	H, IMP C, R, 403
400:6-401:7		401:8-17	403
403:23-404:3			
404:23-407:21	Foundation; Calls for Speculation (407:20-21)		
407:23-408:14	Foundation; Calls for Speculation; Misstates Prior Testimony		
408:16-22			
428:9-429:25	Relevance; Foundation		
430:2-24	Relevance; Foundation		
431:4-435:4	Relevance; Foundation; 403; Calls for Speculation; Compound; Vague		
435:6-19	Relevance; Foundation; 403; Calls for Speculation; Compound; Vague		
435:21-437:1	Relevance; Foundation; 403; Calls for Speculation; Compound; Vague		
437:11-25	Relevance; Foundation; 403; Calls for Speculation; Compound; Vague		
440:11-441:2	Relevance; Foundation; 403		
448:17-449:5			
449:9-450:11			
453:12-18	Foundation; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation		
464:4-15	Foundation; 403; Argumentative; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence;		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	Mischaracterizes Testimony; Vague		
464:17-465:1	Foundation; 403; Argumentative; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Mischaracterizes Testimony; Vague		
465:3	Foundation; 403; Argumentative; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Mischaracterizes Testimony; Vague		
469:10-470:20			
470:22-472:5	Foundation; Compound; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Vague; Calls for Speculation		
472:7-473:2	Foundation; Compound; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Vague; Calls for Speculation		
473:4	Foundation; Compound; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Vague; Calls for Speculation		
475:14-476:3	Foundation; Compound; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Vague; Calls for Speculation		
476:5-8	Foundation; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Vague; Calls for Speculation		
476:10			
477:22-478:14			
478:22-479:15	Foundation; Compound; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Mischaracterizes Evidence		
479:17			
480:25-481:24	Foundation; Compound; Assumes Facts Not in		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	Evidence; Mischaracterizes Evidence		
482:1-4			
482:9-483:9			
484:21-485:13	Calls for Legal Conclusion		
485:15-19	Calls for Legal Conclusion		
485:21-488:7	Foundation; Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Argumentative; Calls for Speculation; 403		
488:9-25			
489:25-490:8			
490:20-21			
491:1-493:19	Foundation; Vague		
493:21-494:20	Foundation; Vague; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
494:22-497:8			
497:12-499:25	Foundation; Vague; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Relevance; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
500:2-501:18	Foundation; Compound; Vague		
501:20-504:20	Foundation; Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Argumentative; 403		
504:22-505:21	Foundation; Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Argumentative; 403		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
505:23-506:3	Foundation; Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Argumentative; 403		
506:5-14	Foundation; Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Calls for Speculation; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Argumentative; 403		
506:16-507:1	Foundation; Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Argumentative; 403		
507:3-12	Foundation; Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Argumentative; 403		
507:14-24	Foundation; Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Argumentative; 403		
508:1-5	Foundation; Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Argumentative; 403		
508:7-12	Foundation; Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Argumentative; 403		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
508:14-20	Foundation; Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Argumentative; 403; Asked and Answered		
508:22-509:3			
509:7-19			
529:19-531:7	Subject to MILs/related agreements; 403		
534:20-24	Mischaracterizes Testimony; Compound; Foundation		
535:1-10	Foundation; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
535:12-14	Foundation; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Vague		
535:16-25			
536:2-11			
536:13-537:19	Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements		
537:21-539:9	Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements		
540:13-541:22	Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements		
542:25-543:2			
552:6-12			
554:4-13			
557:2-17	Relevance	557:18-22	R, 403
558:3-559:18	Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Foundation; Mischaracterizes Evidence		
559:20-561:16	Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Foundation;		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	Mischaracterizes Evidence		
561:18-23			
562:1-2			
562:4			
562:6-12			
562:14-16		562:17-24	IMP C, R, 403, 702
562:25-563:3	Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Foundation; Mischaracterizes Evidence; 403; Relevance		
563:5-8			
563:10-564:19			
565:19-21	Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Foundation; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Relevance		
565:23-567:3			
581:17-24	Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements		
586:6-14	Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Foundation; Mischaracterizes Evidence		
586:16			
586:24-587:24	Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Foundation; Mischaracterizes Evidence		
590:9-21			

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
590:23-591:1	Calls for Legal Conclusion		
591:3-18			
597:23-598:18			
599:7-20			
602:7-603:7	Foundation; Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
603:9-17	Foundation; Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
603:21-604:2	Foundation; Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
604:4-606:4	Foundation; Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Mischaracterizes Evidence		
606:6-607:24			
610:12-612:24			
636:25-637:2			
637:6-638:11		638:12-15	
640:21-25			
642:11-18			
645:14-15			
645:21-648:12	Calls for Legal Conclusion; Foundation; Compound; Mischaracterizes Evidence		
648:14-16			
651:8-11			
651:13-14	Calls for Legal Conclusion; Foundation; Compound; Mischaracterizes Evidence		
654:5-25	Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation;		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	Foundation; Mischaracterizes Evidence		
655:2-5	Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Foundation; Mischaracterizes Evidence		
655:7-10			
655:12-657:20	Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Foundation; Mischaracterizes Evidence		
657:22-658:2			
658:4-10	Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Foundation; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Vague		
658:12-18	Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Foundation; Mischaracterizes Evidence		
658:20-22			
668:2-669:11			

Atle Hedloy
November 5, 2019

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
8:1-3			
9:2-4			
9:17-10:4			
11:23-12:4			
12:15-16			
12:18-21			
12:23-13:16			
22:16-18			
22:20-23:21			
32:22-33:8			
33:20-23			
33:25-34:5			
34:11-15			
35:4-14			
35:20-36:10	Foundation; Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Relevance		
36:12-15			
36:22-37:6	Foundation; Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Relevance		
38:15-39:2			
40:25-41:8	Foundation; Calls for Speculation; Relevance; 403; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Vague		
41:10-42:5	Foundation; Calls for Speculation; Relevance; 403; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Vague		
42:7-9			
47:9-11	Foundation; Calls for Speculation; Relevance; 403; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Vague; Compound		
47:13-20			
91:5-8			

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
91:16-93:9	Subject to MILs/MIL Agreements	93:10-13 (Ending with "...settle that.")	
93:22-94:25		95:1-5	403, 702
97:8-14			
99:6-17		99:18-100:2	
100:16-101:5		101:20-102:3	IMP C
101:14-19			
102:7-9			
103:20	Relevance; 403; Calls for Speculation		
103:24-104:7	Relevance; 403; Calls for Speculation		
105:12-15	Relevance; 403; Calls for Speculation; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
105:17-106:1			
107:5-8	Relevance; 403; Calls for Speculation; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
107:10-11			
108:9-109:14	Relevance; 403		
109:20-110:4	Relevance; 403		
110:12-18	Relevance; 403		
116:23-117:10	Relevance; 403		
117:12-15	Relevance; 403		
121:23-122:7			
122:16-25			
124:18-20			
124:22-125:4			
125:8-9			
125:12-126:6			
126:8-10			
127:18-23			
128:4-14			
128:21-25			
129:2-11	Relevance; 403; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Vague; Compound; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
129:13-130:6			
130:8-12	Compound; Vague		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
130:14-18			
131:4-9			
131:24-132:2		132:3-8	IMP C
132:9-22			
133:5-11	Relevance; 403; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Vague; Compound; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
133:13-134:25	Relevance; 403; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Vague; Compound; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation		
135:2-5	Relevance; 403; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Vague; Compound; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation		
135:7-10			
135:17-23			
136:6-8			
137:10-13	Relevance; 403; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Vague; Compound; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation		
137:15			
143:14-17			
143:21-22			
150:25-151:25			
152:4-21			
152:24-25			
153:13-22	Relevance; 403; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Vague; Compound; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation		
153:24-25			

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
156:2-12	Relevance; 403; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Vague; Compound; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation		
156:14-18	Relevance; 403; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Vague; Compound; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation		
156:25-157:8	Relevance; 403; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Vague; Compound; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation		
172:14-19	Relevance; Vague; Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
172:21			
185:6-18			
185:24-186:2			
186:5-9		186:10-13	
186:19-187:5			
188:1-10	Relevance; 403; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Vague; Compound; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation		
188:12			
188:16-189:25			
190:2-191:5			
191:9-15	Relevance; 403; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Vague; Compound		
192:1-24	Relevance; 403; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Vague; Compound		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
194:3-6			
194:8-195:11	Relevance; 403; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Vague; Compound		
196:19-197:2	Relevance; 403		
197:16-198:20			
199:11-200:2	Relevance; 403		
204:17-205:10	Relevance; 403		
212:22-213:9			
213:14-24			
214:5-9			
214:11-24			
216:22-25	Foundation; Vague; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
217:2-8			
217:10			
249:8-9			
249:13-23			
251:13-252:16	Foundation; Vague; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation		
252:18-253:12	Foundation; Vague; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation		
253:14-254:3	Foundation; Vague; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation		
314:10-11			
314:15-315:7	Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Foundation;		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	Mischaracterizes Evidence		
316:11-318:7	Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Foundation; Mischaracterizes Evidence	318:8-13	
318:14-319:4	Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Foundation; Mischaracterizes Evidence		
319:6			
320:5-19	Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Foundation; Mischaracterizes Evidence		
321:6-322:14	Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Foundation; Mischaracterizes Evidence		
322:16-17			
323:15-18		324:1-4	
324:5-16	Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Foundation;		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	Mischaracterizes Evidence		
324:18-21	Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Foundation; Mischaracterizes Evidence		
324:23-25	Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Foundation; Mischaracterizes Evidence		

Atle Hedloy
November 6, 2019

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
342:25-343:22	Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Foundation; Mischaracterizes Evidence		
345:17-18	Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Foundation; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
345:20-21	Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Foundation; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
347:5-9	Compound; Vague/Confusing; Foundation; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
347:11	Compound; Vague/Confusing; Foundation; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
348:8-10	Foundation; Argumentative; Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
348:12-16	Foundation; Argumentative; Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
348:18-349:1	Foundation; Argumentative; Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Vague/Confusing		
349:3-11	Foundation; Argumentative; Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Vague/Confusing		
349:13-19	Foundation; Argumentative; Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Vague/Confusing		
349:21	Foundation; Argumentative; Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Vague/Confusing		
364:19-22	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
364:24-365:12	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
365:14-18	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
365:20-366:6	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
366:8-16	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
393:8-11	Foundation; Relevance; 403		
394:5-11	Relevance; Compound		
394:13-23	Relevance; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Foundation; 403		
394:25			
396:17-397:21			
405:18-406:13		406:14-17 406:25-407:7 407:11-408:13	H, IMP C
408:25-409:20	Vague/Confusing; Compound; Relevance; Foundation		
409:22-24	Vague/Confusing; Compound; Relevance; Foundation		
410:1-14	Vague/Confusing; 403; Relevance; Foundation		
410:16-22	Vague/Confusing; 403; Relevance; Foundation; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
410:24-411:3	Vague/Confusing; 403; Relevance; Foundation;		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
411:5-18	Vague/Confusing; 403; Relevance; Foundation; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
411:20-412:11	Vague/Confusing; 403; Relevance; Foundation; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
429:2-430:6	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
430:10-431:1	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
432:2-21	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
435:19-20	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
435:25-437:4	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
438:5-17	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
438:19-439:6	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
439:8			
443:15-444:6	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
449:9-23	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
449:25-450:2	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
450:18-21	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
450:23			
451:6-10	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
451:20-452:8			
455:5-8			
455:12-16			
455:18-21			
456:1-7			
456:17-457:16	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
457:19-458:16	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
459:1-460:10	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
462:21-463:2	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
470:1-3	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Asked and Answered		
470:5-7	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Assumes Facts Not		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	in Evidence; Asked and Answered		
474:3-7	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
474:9-22	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
476:21-477:14			
478:13-18	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
478:20-22	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
479:5-6	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
479:8-11	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation		
479:13-23	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation		
479:25-480:5	Foundation; Relevance; 403; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation		
484:16-23			

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
484:25-485:18			
487:9-19			
487:21-23			
487:25-488:9			
488:11			
492:7-16	Foundation; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
500:22-25			
502:2-21	Foundation; Relevance; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
502:23-24	Foundation; Relevance; Mischaracterizes Evidence; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Calls for Legal Conclusion;		
506:20-507:1	Foundation; 403; Vague/Confusing; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Subject to MILs/related agreements		
507:3-17	Foundation; 403; Vague/Confusing; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Subject to MILs/related agreements		
507:19-20	Foundation; 403; Vague/Confusing; Assumes Facts Not in		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Subject to MILs/related agreements		
512:4-513:4	Foundation; Vague/Confusing; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Subject to MILs/related agreements		
513:6-8			
536:22-537:9	Foundation; Relevance; Assumes Facts Not In Evidence; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
537:11-538:9	Foundation; Relevance; Assumes Facts Not In Evidence; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
538:11-539:3	Relevance; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
669:19-670:20	Foundation; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
670:22-673:24	Foundation; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
674:1-675:15	Foundation; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation;		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	Subject to MILs/related agreements; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
683:5-684:12	Foundation; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
684:14-20	Foundation; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
684:22-24	Foundation; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Subject to MILs/related agreements; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
691:8-21			
697:14-22	Foundation; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Relevance		
699:8-700:2		700:3-700:10 700:15-25	H, IMP C
704:22-706:3	Relevance; 403	704:18-21	
706:5-11	Relevance; 403		
706:13-19	Relevance; 403		
706:21-25	Relevance; 403		
707:2-15	Relevance; 403		
707:17-709:17	Relevance; 403		
710:19-21		710:3-18	

Atle Hedloy
November 7, 2019

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
770:24-772:19	771:18-772:19: Relevance; Vague; Mischaracterizes Testimony; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence		
774:9-13	Outside 30(b)(6) scope; Relevance		
774:21-775:5	Outside 30(b)(6) scope; Relevance		
775:10-14	Outside 30(b)(6) scope; Relevance		
778:13-779:1	Outside 30(b)(6) scope; Relevance		
779:8-13	Outside 30(b)(6) scope; Relevance		
779:20-780:7	Outside 30(b)(6) scope; Relevance		
856:6-19	Argumentative; Mischaracterizes Testimony; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
858:17-859:5	Foundation; 403; Relevance; Mischaracterizes Testimony; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
859:7-12	Foundation; 403; Relevance; Mischaracterizes Testimony; Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
860:16-861:7			
864:9-13	403; Mischaracterizes Testimony;		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	Vague/Confusing; Calls for Legal Conclusion		
887:4-25			
888:9-890:4			
892:8-893:10	893:3-10: Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; 403; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		
893:21-894:2	Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; 403; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		
894:4-6			
898:9-899:10	898:20-899:13: Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Calls for Legal Conclusion; 403; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		
899:12-13	898:20-899:13: Assumes Facts Not in Evidence; Calls for Speculation; Calls for Legal Conclusion; 403; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		
905:5-8	Calls for Legal Conclusion; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		
905:14-15	Calls for Legal Conclusion; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		
905:21-906:2	Calls for Legal Conclusion; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		
908:20-909:5			
909:10			
943:5-8			
945:12-16			
948:5-6	Asked and Answered; Calls for Legal Conclusion; 403; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
948:10-18	Asked and Answered; Calls for Legal Conclusion; 403; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		
948:21-23	Asked and Answered; Calls for Legal Conclusion; 403; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		
949:8-13		949:14 949:17-19	H, R, 403
949:20-22	Asked and Answered; Calls for Legal Conclusion; 403; Outside 30(b)(6) scope; Vague/Confusing; Foundation; Misstates Prior Testimony		
950:1-4	Asked and Answered; Calls for Legal Conclusion; 403; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		
950:7-12	Asked and Answered; Calls for Legal Conclusion; 403; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		
950:14	Asked and Answered; Calls for Legal Conclusion; 403; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		
951:16-956:7	Relevance; 403; Asked and Answered; Outside 30(b)(6) scope; Vague/Confusing; Argumentative		
957:6-10	Compound; 403; Asked and Answered; Outside 30(b)(6) scope; Vague		
957:12-959:24	959:21-24: Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Asked and Answered; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
960:4-8	Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Asked and Answered; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		
960:11-18	Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Asked and Answered; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		
960:21-961:4	Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Asked and Answered; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		
961:24-962:4	Foundation; Misstates Prior Testimony; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		
962:6-9	Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Asked and Answered; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		
962:15-25	Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Asked and Answered; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		
963:3-8	Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Asked and Answered; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		
964:16-22	Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Asked and Answered; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		
965:1-9	Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Asked and Answered; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		
965:15-21	Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Asked and Answered; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		
965:24-966:6	Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Asked and Answered; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
966:9	Compound; Calls for Legal Conclusion; Asked and Answered; Outside 30(b)(6) scope		
967:7-12	Relevance		

Violette Hedloy
October 29, 2019

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
10:15-19	Incomplete (10:13-14)	13:21-14:8	IMP C, R, 403
21:21-22:21			
40:7-9	Lack of Foundation, Lack of Personal Knowledge		
40:14-21	Lack of Foundation, Lack of Personal Knowledge	40:22-25	
41:1-42:2	Lack of Foundation, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Hearsay, Assumes Facts Not in Evidence	43:20-44:17 49:15-50:2	CS, F, IMP C, R, 403, 602
51:22-24	Asked & Answered, Vague/Ambiguous, Compound		
52:2-22	Asked & Answered, Vague/Ambiguous, Compound, Calls for Speculation, Lack of Personal Knowledge	53:13-17	IMP C, 403
57:3-25	Lack of Foundation, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Compound, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Not Q&A		
58:3-6	Lack of Foundation, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Compound, Assumes Facts not in Evidence		
58:9-60:11	Compound, Assumes Facts Not in Evidence, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403		
60:14-61:4		61:5-62:14	IMP C, NT
63:20-64:8	Assumes Facts not in Evidence	64:9-25 65:6-13	AF, F, IMP C, R, 403
71:11-72:3	Assumes Facts not in Evidence	72:20-25	AF, IMP C, L, R, 403

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
75:25-76:2	Lack of Foundation		
76:7-9	Lack of Foundation	76:10-77:1	
77:2-78:18	Lack of Foundation, Assumes Facts Not in Evidence, Hearsay, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403		
78:25-79:24	Lack of Foundation, Hearsay	82:11-83:1 84:3-13 84:18-85:8 91:3-9 97:3-13 102:22-103:18 111:11-20 133:25-134:17	AAA, AF, CS, F, H, IMP C, L, NT, R, 403, 602
138:17-19	Lack of Foundation, Mischaracterizes Evidence		
138:24-139:5	Lack of Foundation, Hearsay	139:6-18 140:1-23	NT
141:9-142:9	Hearsay, Lack of Foundation, Asked & Answered		
142:12-144:3	Asked & Answered, Misstates Prior Testimony, Vague/Confusing, Compound, Lack of Foundation, Hearsay, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Compound, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403		
150:9-19	Asked & Answered, Misstates Prior Testimony, MIL	150:20-151:2 152:18-20	
156:22-25	Lack of Foundation, Mischaracterizes Evidence, Assumes Facts not in Evidence		
157:5-6	Lack of Foundation, Not Q&A, Incomplete, MIL, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403	157:7-158:1	

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
158:2-24	Lack of Foundation, Hearsay, MIL		
159:2-20	Lack of Foundation, Hearsay, MIL		
160:25-161:2	Lack of Foundation, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Lack of Relevance		
161:7-11	Lack of Relevance	161:12-162:1	
162:2-6	MIL, Best Evidence Rule		
163:16-25	Hearsay, Lack of Foundation, Rule 403, Lack of Relevance, MIL, Best Evidence Rule		
164:3-6	Hearsay, Lack of Foundation, Rule 403, Lack of Relevance, MIL, Best Evidence Rule		
164:9	Hearsay, Lack of Foundation, Rule 403, Lack of Relevance, MIL, Best Evidence Rule		
165:2-4	Lack of Foundation, Incomplete, Not Q&A,	165:17-24	
165:9-16	Lack of Foundation, MIL, Best Evidence Rule		
165:25-167:10	MIL, Best Evidence Rule		
168:6-8			
168:13-169:1		169:2-15	
174:14-175:5	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403		
175:21-24	Assumes Facts Not in Evidence, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403		
176:2-19	Misstates Prior Testimony, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Asked & Answered		
176:22-177:3	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403		
178:10-179:2	Calls for Speculation, Asked & Answered, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403		
188:21-190:1	Lack of Relevance, Not Q&A, MIL, Rule 403, Best Evidence Rule, Lack of Relevance		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
190:4-7	MIL, Rule 403, Best Evidence Rule, Lack of Relevance		
193:25-194:18	MIL, Rule 403, Best Evidence Rule, Lack of Relevance		
205:2-3	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, MIL		
205:8-23	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, MIL		
206:21-207:6	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, MIL		
208:5-22	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, MIL		
208:25-209:13	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, MIL		
209:16-22	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, MIL	220:18-221:7 222:5-12 223:4-8	AF, CS, IMP C, R, 403, 602
231:14-24	Rule 403		
232:2-4			
232:7			
241:2-5	Vague/Confusing, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403	240:4-241:1	IMP C, NT
241:8-9			
246:8-19	MIL, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Vague/Confusing		
246:22-247:3	Vague/Confusing, Lack of Relevance		
247:6-12	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, Vague, Assumes Facts not in Evidence		
247:15-24	Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403		
248:1-248:2	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403		

James Miller
October 16, 2019

Defendants’ Designations	Plaintiff’s Objections	Plaintiff’s Counter-Designations	Defendants’ Objections to Counter-Designations
13:9-11			
15:17-20			
16:2-4			
16:6-10			
17:1-18:1			
18:11-19:16			
19:19-20:6			
20:14-23			
21:2-12			
21:18-22:5			
22:9-15			
23:11-16			
23:19-24:1			
24:7-25:13			
26:3-24			
27:2-12			
28:16-29:4			
29:8			
29:11-22			
29:24-31:3			
31:9-33:2			
33:11-34:4			
34:14-35:9			
36:1-51:10		51:11-19	
51:20-53:4			
54:7-55:1		55:3-9	
55:10-56:23			
56:25-58:15			
59:14-60:4			
60:7-61:15			
62:7-8			
62:11-67:3			
67:7-16		67:17-19	
67:20-68:6			
68:9-70:13			
70:20-71:20			
71:22-76:13			
76:15-82:12			
82:14-15		82:16-25	

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
83:1-24			
84:1-87:9			
87:11-92:19			
93:22-94:15			
94:24-95:24			
96:1-2			
96:6-97:1			
97:4-102:2		102:3-7	
103:14-15			
103:18-104:18		104:19-22	
104:23-105:25			
106:2-4		106:6-18	IMP C
106:19-107:3			
107:8-108:15			
110:2-20			
110:25-111:22			
112:19-20			
112:23-114:6			
114:9-115:16			
115:24-116:18			
116:20-21			
116:24-118:12			
118:15-119:5			
119:14-126:24			
127:1-130:21			
130:24-132:14			
132:17-136:21			
136:24-137:16			
137:19-139:6			
139:9-14			
139:18-140:17		140:18-20	
140:21-143:17			
143:20-144:18			
144:24-147:3			
147:12-148:7			
148:9-149:8			
149:10-19	Improper expert opinion from fact witness		
149:22-154:15			
154:18-156:7			
156:9			

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
156:18-158:17	Improper expert opinion from a fact witness		
160:21-163:2			
163:4-5		163:7-16	
163:17-164:7			
165:17-166:12			
169:13-15	Estoppel (Pandit)		
169:18-170:23	Estoppel (Pandit)		
171:5-24			
172:14-173:4			
173:9-175:14			
176:24-177:23			
178:9-181:12		187:17-188:2 188:4 188:6 188:8-10 188:12-21 188:23 188:25-189:3 193:1-19 193:21-22 193:24-194:11 194:13 195:19-25	IMP C, INQA, V, L IMP C, INQA, V, L IMP C, INQA, V IMP C, INQA, V IMP C, L, COMP IMP C, L, COMP IMP C, INQA, V IMP C, L IMP C, L IMP C, INQA, V, L IMP C, INQA, V, L IMP C
205:8-16		205:17-18	
205:19-206:21			

Giulia Pagallo
October 4, 2019

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
10:10-18	Attorney's colloquy/Not Q&A, Mischaracterizes Evidence, Lacks Foundation, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
10:21-11:12	Attorney's colloquy/Not Q&A, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
11:14-17	Attorney's colloquy/Not Q&A, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
11:25-12:4	Attorney's colloquy/Not Q&A, Lack of Foundation, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
13:2-23	Lacks foundation, Incomplete, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
14:3-14:4	Lacks Foundation, Incomplete, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	14:5-8	
14:9-14	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	14:15-23	
14:24-15:6	Not Q&A, Authentication, Lack of Foundation, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
15:8	Not Q&A, Authentication, Lack of Foundation, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
15:10-16:3	Authentication, Lacks Foundation, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Improper use of Rule 612, Hearsay, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	16:4-7	
16:8-15	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	17:18-23 18:17-23	
19:8-13	Not Q&A, Authentication, Lacks Foundation, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Hearsay, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	19:3-7	
19:16-25	Not Q&A, Authentication, Lacks Foundation, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Incomplete, Hearsay, Improper use of Rule 612, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	20:1-7 20:10-13 20:15-17	IMP C
21:17-19	Improper use of Rule 612, Incomplete, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Lack of Foundation, Authentication, Asked & Answered, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
21:22-24	Improper use of Rule 612, Incomplete, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Lack of Foundation, Authentication, Asked & Answered, Hearsay, Calls for Speculation, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
22:2-5	Lack of Personal Knowledge, Lack of		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	Foundation, Authentication, Asked & Answered, Improper use of Rule 612, Hearsay, Calls for Speculation, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
22:8-20	Lack of Personal Knowledge, Lack of Foundation, Authentication, Attorney's colloquy/Not Q&A, Improper use of Rule 612, Incomplete, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
22:22	Not Q&A, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Lack of Foundation, Authentication, Improper use of Rule 612, Incomplete, Hearsay, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Incomplete, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	23:13-19	
23:20-21	Lack of Personal Knowledge, Lack of Foundation, Authentication, Not Q&A, Improper use of Rule 612, Incomplete, Hearsay, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
23:24-24:5	Lack of Personal Knowledge, Lack of Foundation, Authentication, Attorney's colloquy/Not Q&A, Improper use of Rule 612, Incomplete, Hearsay, Lack of	24:6-7	R, 403

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
24:8-22	Lack of Personal Knowledge, Lack of Foundation, Authentication, Not Q&A, Improper use of Rule 612, Hearsay, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
24:24-25	Lack of Personal Knowledge, Lack of Foundation, Authentication, Improper use of Rule 612, Incomplete, Hearsay, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	25:2-4	
25:5-7	Foundation, Assumes Facts Not in Evidence, Vague/Confusing, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Misstates Prior Testimony, Lack of Foundation, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
25:9-10	Foundation, Assumes Facts Not in Evidence, Vague/Confusing, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
25:12-17	Foundation, Assumes Facts Not in Evidence, Vague/Confusing, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
25:19-21	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	26:9-12	
26:18-20	Attorney Colloquy/Not Q&A, Lack of		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	Foundation, Authentication, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
26:22-24	Attorney Colloquy/Not Q&A, Lack of Relevance, Authentication, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
27:2-23	Lack of Foundation, Assumes Facts Not in Evidence, Lack of Relevance, Improper Use of Rule 612, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
28:3-6	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	28:11-25	IMP C
29:4-6	Lacks Foundation, Assumes Facts Not in Evidence, Vague, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
29:8-9			
29:18-30:2	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
30:10-31:10	Calls for legal conclusion, Lack of relevance, Lack of personal knowledge, Improper use of Rule 612, Lack of foundation, authentication, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	40:15-22	IMP C
36:15-19	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	36:10-14	IMP C
42:3-10	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
42:14-43:9	Not Q&A, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
43:17-20	Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Relevance, Incomplete, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	43:21-22	
44:1-3	Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Confusing, Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	44:4-10	
45:1-5	Lack of Personal Knowledge, Lack of Foundation, Authentication, Improper Use of Rule 612, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
45:9-13	Lack of Personal Knowledge, Lack of Foundation, Authentication, Improper Use of Rue 612, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
45:16-46:20	Lack of Foundation, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Compound, Calls for Legal Conclusion, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Not Q&A, Authentication, Improper Use of Rue 612, Hearsay, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	47:6-23	
50:15-51:4	Improper use of Rule 612, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Relevance, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Lack of Foundation, Authentication, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	50:11-14	IMP C

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
51:12-53:3	Improper use of Rule 612, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Relevance, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Lack of Foundation, Authentication, Not Q&A, Hearsay, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
54:12-55:9	Misstates Prior Testimony, Not Q&A, Compound, Confusing/Vague, Relevance, Lack of Personal Knowledge		
55:14-58:6	Not Q&A, Lack of Foundation, Compound, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Relevance, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Authentication, Improper use of Rule 612, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
58:12-59:6	Relevance, Lack, Foundation, Authentication, Improper use of Rule 612, Hearsay, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
59:8-9	Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Calls for Legal Conclusion, Compound, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	59:11-14	
60:4-61:3	Lack of Foundation, Not Q&A, Relevance, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Calls for Legal Conclusion, Compound, Calls for Speculation, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Improper		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	use of Rule 612, Authentication, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
61:5-24	Calls for Legal Conclusion, Compound, Vague, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Improper Use of Rule 612, Lack of Foundation, Authentication, Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
62:16-63:22	Lack of Personal Knowledge, Improper use of Rule 612, Asked & Answered, Compound, Foundation, Authentication, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	62:4-15	IMP C
63:24-64:10	Leading, Vague, Not Q&A, Relevance, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	64:11-19	
64:20-22	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	64:23-65:1	
65:14-66:16	Hypothetical/Calls for Speculation, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Lack of Foundation, Authentication, Improper Use of Rule 612, Not Q&A, Incomplete, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Hearsay, Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	66:17-67:8	IMP C, 403
67:12-23	Lack of Personal Knowledge, Incomplete, Lack of Foundation, Authentication, Improper Use of Rule 612, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
68:5-20	Not Q&A, Authentication, Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
68:22-69:9	Vague, Compound, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
69:19-70:15	Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
72:8-73:3	Hypothetical/Calls for Speculation; Assumes Facts not In Evidence; Incomplete Hypothetical, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	73:4-14	IMP C, 403
73:19-74:6	Improper hypothetical, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
74:10-75:5	Incomplete, Relevance, Assumes Facts Not in Evidence, Misstates Prior Testimony, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
75:17-76:14	Incomplete, Authentication, Lack of Foundation, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Hearsay, Not Q&A, Improper Use of Rule 612, Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	75:15-16	
76:22-77:23	Incomplete, Authentication, Lack of Foundation, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Hearsay, Not Q&A, Improper Use of Rule 612, Compound, Leading, Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	77:24-78:2	

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
78:12-79:15	Not Q&A, Leading, Misstates Prior Testimony, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Improper Hypothetical		
79:19-23	Confusing, leading, compound, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Not Q&A, Lack of foundation, Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	79:24-80:11	
80:12-24	Incomplete, Improper hypothetical/Calls for speculation, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	80:25	
81:1-15	Improper hypothetical/Calls for Speculation, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	81:16-82:15	
82:16-82:15	Improper hypothetical, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
83:1-2	Lack of Foundation, Authentication, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
83:5-86:12	Lack of Foundation, Authentication, Not Q&A, Hearsay, Improper Use of Rule 612, Improper Hypothetical, Incomplete, Relevance, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Lack of personal knowledge, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
86:13-87:17	Improper hypothetical/calls for	87:18-88:5	

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	speculation, lack of personal knowledge, Improper use of Rule 612, Lack of Foundation, Authentication, Relevance, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Asked & Answered, Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
88:6-89:11	Incomplete, Calls for Speculation/Improper Hypothetical, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Asked & Answered, Relevance, Incomplete, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	89:12-23 90:21-25	
91:10-93:19	Incomplete, Lack of Foundation, Authentication, Improper Use of Rule 612, Not Q&A, Relevance, Improper Hypothetical, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
93:21-98:7	Misstates Prior Testimony, Not Q&A, Authentication, Lack of Foundation, Hearsay, Improper Use of Rule 612, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Improper Hypothetical, Leading, Relevance, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
98:11-99:12	Assumes Facts Not in Evidence, Lack of Foundation, Authentication, Not Q&A, Leading, Lack of	99:13-17	IMP C

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
99:21-100:5	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
100:6-101:1	Misstates Prior Testimony, Assumes Facts not in Evidence, Not Q&A, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
101:24-102:5	Lack of Foundation, Authentication, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Misstates Prior Testimony, Leading, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel		
102:11-14	Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	102:15-20	IMP C, R, 403
102:22-103:6	Lack of Foundation, Authentication, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Misstates Prior Testimony, Asked and answered, Rule 403, Lack of Relevance, IPR Estoppel		
103:8-13	Lack of Foundation, Authentication, Hearsay, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Rule 403, Asked and answered, Lack of Relevance, IPR Estoppel		
103:15-104:7	Lack of Foundation, Authentication, Hearsay, Lack of Personal Knowledge, Rule 403, Asked and answered, Lack of Relevance, IPR Estoppel		
104:10-21	Lack of Foundation, Authentication, Hearsay,		

Defendants' Designations	Plaintiff's Objections	Plaintiff's Counter-Designations	Defendants' Objections to Counter-Designations
	Lack of Personal Knowledge, Rule 403, Asked and answered, Lack of Relevance, IPR Estoppel		
104:23	Lack of Personal Knowledge, Rule 403, Asked and answered, Lack of Relevance, Rule 403, IPR Estoppel	105:11-14	

EXHIBIT 6J

(Intentionally Omitted)

EXHIBIT 6P

Redacted in its Entirety

EXHIBIT 6D(G)

Redacted in its Entirety

EXHIBIT 7P

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

<hr/>)	
ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)	
	Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 12-1601-JLH
)	
MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC (f/k/a)	
MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.),)	
)	
	Defendant.)	
<hr/>)	
ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)	
	Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 13-919-JLH
)	
GOOGLE LLC,)	
)	
	Defendant.)	
<hr/>)	

PLAINTIFF ARENDI’S STATEMENT OF INTENDED PROOFS

By way of summary, Plaintiff intends to prove the following at trial:

1. Plaintiff intends to prove that each Defendant has directly, literally infringed claims 1, 8, 23 and 30 of the '843 Patent by making, using, offering for sale, selling, and importing each of their respective Accused Products.

2. Plaintiff intends to prove that each Defendant has indirectly infringed claims 1, 8, 23 and 30 of the '843 Patent by inducing the direct infringement by others and by contributing to direct infringement by others.

3. Plaintiff intends to prove that Defendants' infringement of the '843 Patent was willful, and that Defendants have had actual notice of infringement since the filing of Arendi's original Complaint in each case.

4. Plaintiff intends to prove damages for each of Defendants' acts of infringement of the '843 Patent, and that the damages should be an amount adequate to compensate for Defendants' infringement, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by the Court.

5. Plaintiff intends to prove that it should be awarded its costs and reasonable attorneys' fees under at least 35 U.S.C. § 285.

6. Defendants bear the burden of proving invalidity and cannot shift that burden; however, Plaintiff intends to rebut Defendants' allegations that there is clear and convincing evidence that one or more of the asserted claims of the '843 Patent are anticipated by the prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102, obvious considering prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103, or invalid for lack of written description or enablement under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Plaintiff also intends to establish that IPR estoppel bars some or all of Defendants' remaining invalidity grounds.

7. Plaintiff intends to rebut Defendants' allegations that one or more of Plaintiff's claims for infringement and damages due to Defendants' infringement of the '843 Patent should be limited, dismissed, or denied for failure to comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 287.

8. Plaintiff intends to rebut Google's allegations that one or more of Plaintiff's claims for infringement and damages due to Google's infringement of the '843 Patent should be limited, dismissed, or denied based on patent exhaustion and/or an implied license.¹

9. Plaintiff intends to rebut Google's allegations that one or more of Plaintiff's claims for infringement and damages due to Google's infringement of the '843 Patent should be limited, dismissed, or denied pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 286.²

¹ Motorola has not pleaded a patent exhaustion/licensing defense.

² The Court already granted summary judgment against Motorola with respect to its section 286 defense. D.I. 399 at 25.

EXHIBIT 7D

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

C.A. No. 13-919-JLH

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,

Plaintiff,

v.

MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC (f/k/a
MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.),

Defendant.

C.A. No. 12-1601-JLH

DEFENDANTS' STATEMENT OF INTENDED PROOFS

Defendants intend to prove the following at trial:

1. Defendants intend to prove that claims 1, 8, 23, and 30 of the '843 Patent are invalid under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103, and/or 112.

2. Plaintiff bears the burden of proving infringement, and cannot shift that burden. Defendants intend to rebut Plaintiff's claims that Defendants have literally and directly infringed claims 1, 8, 23, and 30 of the '843 patent. Defendants further intend to rebut Plaintiff's claims that Defendants willfully infringed claims 1, 8, 23, and 30 of the '843 patent.

3. Plaintiff bears the burden of proving damages for alleged infringement. Defendants intend to rebut Plaintiff's claims that it is entitled to infringement damages, and the amount of damages claimed by Plaintiff.

4. Defendants intend to prove that Plaintiff's claims for damages for alleged infringement of claims 1, 8, 23, and 30 of the '843 Patent are prohibited or limited for failure to comply with 35 U.S.C. § 287.

5. Defendant Google intends to prove that Plaintiff's claims of infringement of 1, 8, 23, and 30 of the '843 Patent should be denied or limited based on patent exhaustion and/or implied license.

6. Defendant Google intends to prove that Plaintiff's claims for damages for alleged infringement of 1, 8, 23, and 30 of the '843 Patent are prohibited or limited under 35 U.S.C. § 286.

7. Defendants intend to prove that they should be awarded their costs and reasonable attorneys' fees under at least 35 U.S.C. § 285. Defendants also intend to rebut Plaintiff's claims that it is entitled to costs and reasonable attorneys' fees under at least 35 U.S.C. § 285.

EXHIBIT 8J

Redacted in its Entirety

Ex. 8P

Redacted in its Entirety

Exhibit 8P-1

Redacted in its Entirety

EXHIBIT 8D

Redacted in its Entirety