

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 CBM2013-00009  
Patent 8,140,358

---

PATENT OWNER'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE  
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c)

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c) and Notice of Stipulation of Due Dates (Paper Nos. 30), Patent Owner Progressive Casualty Ins. Co. (“Progressive”) hereby moves to exclude Exhibits 1027-1029, 1031, and 1034-1038 filed by Liberty Mutual Insurance Co. (“Liberty”) with its Reply (Paper No. 27.)

## **I. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT**

Liberty and its reply declarants have belatedly sought to introduce new prior art references, new invalidity arguments and theories, and new declarations with Liberty’s Reply in an effort to plug the holes in its original case. This is not proper rebuttal evidence, and is without justification. Liberty’s belated new evidence not only violates the Board’s rules, but it unfairly prejudices Progressive. Because Liberty delayed in submitting this improper new evidence with its Reply, Progressive has no opportunity to respond by surreply or with declarations of its own expert witnesses. The Board should grant Progressive’s motion to exclude, otherwise Liberty would be rewarded with an unfair procedural advantage resulting from shifting its theories and evidence of unpatentability at the Reply stage, in an effort to now make out a *prima facie* case that the Board’s rules required them to establish with their Petition.

## **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

### **A. Petition Must Identify *All* Supporting Evidence**

A petition to institute a Covered Business Method (“CBM”) Review must be

accompanied by *all* the evidence upon which the petitioner relies in challenging patentability. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(4),(5); 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,756-57 (Aug. 14, 2012) (petition must be “accompanied by the evidence the petitioner seeks to rely upon” and “identif[y] all...supporting evidence on a claim-by-claim basis.”) It must also “identify[] the specific portions of the evidence that support the challenge,” including “specify[ing] where each element of the claim is found in the prior art[.]” *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(4),(5); *see also* 77 Fed. Reg. at 48,757. The Board will not consider any basis for invalidity that is not specifically identified in a petition and will “resolve all vagueness and ambiguity in Petitioner’s arguments against the Petitioner.” (Ex. 2005 at 10.)

**B. Reply Evidence Cannot Fix Deficiencies In *Prima Facie* Case**

A “reply may only respond to arguments raised in the...patent owner response.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b). A Petitioner is prohibited from using its reply to submit (i) new evidence necessary to make out its *prima facie* case, or (ii) new evidence that could have been presented in its petition. *See* 77 Fed. Reg. at 48,767. The Office Patent Trial Practice Guide further explains this prohibition:

While replies can help crystallize issues for decision, a reply that raises a new issue or belatedly presents evidence will not be considered and may be returned....**Examples of indications that a new issue has been raised in a reply include new evidence necessary to make out a *prima facie* case for**

the patentability or unpatentability of an original or proposed substitute claim, and **new evidence that could have been presented in a prior filing.**

77 Fed. Reg. at 48,767 (emphasis added). The Board has quoted and referenced this language, explaining that “a reply that raises a new issue or belatedly presents evidence will not be considered” and “a new issue is raised if the reply includes new evidence necessary to make out a *prima facie* case for the unpatentability of a challenged claim.” *BlackBerry Corp v. MobileMedia Ideas, LLC*, No. IPR2013-00036 (JYC), Paper 40, at 2. Further, such evidence would be both irrelevant and unfairly prejudicial and therefore not admissible under F.R.E. 402 and 403.

**C. Unreliable Testimony Improper Under F.R.E. 702**

Pursuant to Federal Evidence Rule 702, expert testimony can only be admitted if it is reliable. Rule 702 requires the Board to act as a gatekeeper for expert testimony and exclude such testimony if it is unreliable. *See Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharm., Inc.*, 509 U.S. 579 (1993); *see also* 37 C.F.R. § 42.62 (Federal Rules of Evidence apply to proceedings before the Board).

**D. Board May Exclude Or Not Consider Improper Evidence**

The Board has two options if a petitioner submits improper evidence with its reply. *CBS Interactive Inc. v. Helferich Patent Licensing, LLC*, No. IPR2013-00033 (JYC), Paper 79, at 3. It can exclude or decline to consider the evidence. *See id.* (“Should there be improper...evidence presented with a reply, the Board,

exercising its discretion, may exclude the...related evidence in their entirety, or alternatively, decline to consider the...related evidence.”).

### III. ARGUMENT

#### A. Improper New Evidence As To Kosaka’s Deficient Disclosure

Liberty’s Petition cited and relied exclusively on the fuzzy logic disclosure of Kosaka (Exhibit 1003) in arguing that the ’358 patent is unpatentable over the combination of RDSS (Exhibit 1004) and Kosaka. Moreover, Liberty offered no evidence with its Petition that a POSITA would have experience with or any knowledge of fuzzy logic as used in Kosaka. As discussed below, Liberty submitted with its Reply new prior art references to combine with Kosaka, as well as Declarations addressing this new prior art and asserting new invalidity arguments based on Kosaka’s alleged disclosure of defuzzification, crisp values, and non-fuzzy logic disclosure. This is improper new evidence that violates the prohibition on raising new issues with a reply brief and is unreliable. Progressive timely objected (Paper No. 28), and Liberty’s new evidence should be excluded.

##### 1. *Liberty’s Petition Based On Kosaka’s Fuzzy Logic Disclosure*

Liberty based its invalidity argument in its Petition solely on Kosaka’s fuzzy logic disclosure. Indeed, the phrase “fuzzy logic” appears 47 times in the Petition and the supporting Andrews Petition Declaration (Exhibit 1014). And, Liberty quoted Kosaka’s “fuzzy logic” disclosure as the basis for invalidating *every* claim

# 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.