

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LIBERTY MUTUAL INSURANCE CO.
Petitioner

v.

PROGRESSIVE CASUALTY INSURANCE CO.
Patent Owner

Case CBM2012-00004
Patent 6,064,970

PATENT OWNER'S NOTICE OF OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.64

The undersigned, on behalf of Patent Owner Progressive Casualty Insurance Co. (“Patent Owner”), hereby provides Notice to the Board that the objections made on the record herewith were served to Liberty Mutual Insurance Co. pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64. *See also* 37 C.F.R. 42, Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, part II, § I (77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,767 (Aug. 14, 2012)).

September 25, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

JONES DAY

By: /s/Calvin P. Griffith
Calvin P. Griffith
Registration No. 34,831
JONES DAY
North Point
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1190
(216) 586-3939
(216) 579-0212 (Fax)

*Attorney For Patent Owner
Progressive Casualty Insurance Co.*

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LIBERTY MUTUAL INSURANCE CO.
Petitioner

v.

PROGRESSIVE CASUALTY INSURANCE CO.
Patent Owner

Case CBM2012-00004
Patent 6,064,970

PATENT OWNER'S OBJECTIONS TO
EVIDENCE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.64

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), the undersigned, on behalf of Patent Owner Progressive Casualty Insurance Co. (“Patent Owner”), hereby submits the following objections to Exhibit 1027 filed on September 18, 2013 by Liberty Mutual Insurance Co. (“Liberty” or “Petitioner”) in response to Patent Owner’s Objections to Evidence, filed September 4, 2013. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.62, Patent Owner’s objections below apply the Federal Rules of Evidence (“F.R.E.”).

I. PATENT OWNER MAINTAINS ITS PRIOR OBJECTIONS

Patent Owner maintains all objections it previously set forth, including its objections filed on August 13, 2013 and September 4, 2013. (*See* CBM2012-00004, Paper Nos. 31 and 35).

II. EXHIBIT 1027 GOES BEYOND EVIDENCE PERMITTED UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(B)(2)

37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(2) provides that a “party relying on evidence to which an objection is timely served may respond to the objection by serving supplemental evidence within ten business days of service of the objection.” Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1027 because it goes beyond, and is not proper supplemental evidence pursuant to, 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(2).

III. OBJECTIONS TO EXHIBIT 1027 AND ANY REFERENCE TO/RELIANCE THEREON

Patent Owner hereby objects to Exhibit 1027, Declaration of Mary Lou O’Neil, dated September 18, 2013 (“O’Neil Fourth Declaration”).

Grounds for objection: 37 C.F.R. § 42.61 (Admissibility of Evidence), F.R.E. 402 (Relevance), F.R.E. 403 (Excluding Relevant Evidence for Prejudice, Confusion, Waste of Time, or Other Reasons), F.R.E. 901 (Authentication), 37 C.F.R. § 42.223 (Filing of Supplemental Evidence), F.R.E. 702, 703, 705 (Witness Not Qualified to Provide Expert Testimony), F.R.E. 602 (Lack of Personal Knowledge), F.R.E. 801, 802 (Impermissible Hearsay), 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b) (Outside Scope of Response and Petition), and the O'Neil Fourth Declaration is unauthorized testimony.

Patent Owner advanced no position that provides a proper basis for the belated submission of the O'Neil Fourth Declaration or the exhibits referenced therein, *i.e.*, Exhibit 1023 and the O'Neil Third Declaration (Exhibit 1025). (37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.223; 37 C.F.R. 42, Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, part II, § I (77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,767 (Aug. 14, 2012))). The statements in the O'Neil Fourth Declaration have no relevant bearing on any issue properly raised in this proceeding or argument raised by Patent Owner. (F.R.E. 402, 403; 37 C.F.R. § 42.61). Rather, the O'Neil Fourth Declaration is an attempt to raise new theories to support invalidity arguments in an effort to establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability of the claims that should have been submitted with the Petitioner's petition. The content of the O'Neil Third Declaration and Exhibit 1023 are either inapplicable or should have been submitted when the petition for

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.