

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE INC.,

*Petitioner,*

v.

SIGHTSOUND TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,

*Patent Owner.*

---

Case CBM2013-00020

Patent 5,191,573

---

**PATENT OWNER SIGHTSOUND TECHNOLOGIES, LLC'S FIRST SET  
OF OBJECTIONS TO PETITIONER APPLE INC'S EXHIBITS  
SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT OF REPLY**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), the undersigned, on behalf of and acting in a representative capacity for SightSound Technologies, LLC (“Patent Owner”), hereby submits the following objections to Petitioner Apple Inc.’s (“Petitioner”) Exhibits 4157-4267 and any reference to/reliance on the foregoing, including, without limitation, citations thereto in Petitioner’s Reply. Petitioner’s objections below apply the Federal Rules of Evidence (“F.R.E.”) as required by 37 C.F.R. § 42.62, as well as pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.23(b), 42.53, 42.61, and 42.65, as stated below.

**I. Objections to Exhibit 4256 and Exhibits 4253, 4194-4195, 4197-4198, 4199-4207, 4254, 4259-4260, 4251, and 4267 cited therein, Any Reference to/Reliance Thereon, and Improper Incorporation Thereof into Reply**

Evidence objected to: Exhibit 4256, titled “Declaration of Lawrence Kenswil,” and exhibits 4253, 4194-4195, 4197-4198, 4199-4207, 4254, 4259-4260, 4251, and 4267 cited therein.

Grounds for objection: F.R.E. 402 (“General Admissibility of Relevant Evidence”); F.R.E. 403 (“Excluding Relevant Evidence for Prejudice, Confusion, Waste of Time, or Other Reasons”); 37 C.F.R. § 42.61 (“Admissibility”); F.R.E. 601 (“Competency to Testify in General”); F.R.E. 602 (“Need for Personal Knowledge”); F.R.E. 701 (“Opinion Testimony by Lay Witness”); F.R.E. 702

(“Testimony by Expert Witnesses”); F.R.E. 703-705 (“Witness Not Qualified to Provide Expert Testimony”); F.R.E. 801, 802 (“Impermissible Hearsay”); 37 C.F.R. § 42.65 (“Expert testimony; tests and data”); 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b) (“Oppositions and replies”).

There has been no showing that Mr. Kenswil is qualified to provide expert opinions on any technical matter, including bandwidth, compression, hard drives, memory size, storage systems, hard disks, data transmission, DRM, the iTunes user interface, the prevalence of computers and access to data-enabled telecommunications lines in consumers’ homes, and encryption and purported technical problems solved or not solved by the patents (*see, e.g.*, Ex. 4256, Sections VII-VIII), rendering his opinions on these matters improper and inadmissible under at least F.R.E. 702 and F.R.E. 703-705. There has further been no showing that Mr. Kenswil is qualified to provide any expert opinion on whether the iTunes Music Store (“ITMS”) practices or is coextensive with the patented claims (*see, e.g.*, Ex 4256 ¶¶ 29-31), rendering his opinions on these matters improper and inadmissible under at least F.R.E. 702 and F.R.E. 703-705. There has further been no showing that Mr. Kenswil is qualified to provide any expert opinion on any consumer-related issue, including branding, consumer behavior, consumer purchasing patterns, and consumer demand for the ITMS or for any particular feature of the ITMS (*see, e.g.*, Ex. 4256, Section VIII), rendering his

opinions on these matters improper and inadmissible under at least F.R.E. 702 and F.R.E. 703-705. Further, Mr. Kenswil has not demonstrated that he possesses first-hand knowledge, experience, or perceptions regarding the above-identified opinions, rendering any lay testimony or lay opinions on these matters improper and inadmissible under at least F.R.E. 601, F.R.E. 602 and F.R.E. 701.

Mr. Kenswil's testimony regarding SightSound's business strategies, its operations, and the reasons for its purported failure (Ex. 4256, Section VI, ¶¶ 34-50, 77-79, 82-83) are similarly not based upon any established expertise or first-hand experience or knowledge in violation of F.R.E. 602, F.R.E. 701, F.R.E. 702 and F.R.E. 703-705. Instead, Mr. Kenswil's testimony recites and misconstrues internal SightSound documents, many of which are incomplete drafts, and thus not appropriate facts or data upon which to base expert testimony under F.R.E. 702. Mr. Kenswil's opinions regarding the failure of other digital download companies (*see, e.g.*, Ex. 4256 ¶ 32) are similarly unsupported by expertise or first-hand knowledge in violation of F.R.E. 602, F.R.E. 701, F.R.E. 702 and F.R.E. 703-705, and the documents upon which he bases his opinion regarding the failure of other digital download companies are impermissible hearsay documents in violation of F.R.E. 801 and 802.

Mr. Kenswil's statements in paragraphs 90-92 and 95-96 of Exhibit 4256 provide neither expert opinion nor facts or data upon which any testimony is based.

These paragraphs recite what SightSound's expert, Mr. Snell, testified to in deposition, and are not relied upon or commented on by Mr. Kenswil in any fashion whatsoever, and thus violate F.R.E. 402, 403 and 702.

Mr. Kenswil's opinions regarding the reasons for the commercial success of the ITMS, including that such commercial success is attributable to features or attributes other than the claimed invention or that such features are important to the success of the ITMS, are not based upon reliable facts, data, or empirical or scientific evidence (including survey evidence), and thus such testimony is improper and inadmissible. Specifically, Mr. Kenswil's opinions on the reasons for the commercial success of the ITMS appear to be based either: (1) on no evidence or data, or undisclosed evidence and data, in violation of F.R.E. 702 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.65 (*see, e.g.,* Ex. 4256 ¶¶ 67 (no data disclosed to support opinion that the ITMS success is based upon "its experience, its credibility, its established brand name . . . its user-friendly features, the existing iPod and iTunes music management software. . ."), 68 (no data disclosed to support opinion that consumers demand for content has driven the success of the ITMS), 92-94 (no data disclosed to support opinion that success of ITMS was driven by the identified features)); or (2) on impermissible hearsay documents as discussed below in violation of F.R.E. 801 and 802 (*see* Ex. 4256, Section VIII).

# 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.