

CBM2014-00112
Patent 7,942,317 B2

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner

v.

SMARTFLASH LLC,
Patent Owner

Case CBM2014-00112¹
Patent 7,942,317 B2

Before the Honorable JENNIFER S. BISK, RAMA G. ELLURU, JEREMY M. PLENZLER, and MATTHEW R. CLEMENTS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

**PETITIONER'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS
MOTION TO STRIKE PORTIONS OF THE DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPT
OF ANTHONY WECHSELBERGER CONCERNING PETITIONER'S
PRODUCTS AND FOR COSTS**

¹ Case CBM2014-00113 has been consolidated with the instant proceeding.

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
PO	Patent Owner
Mot. or Motion	Petitioner's Motion to Strike Portions of the Deposition Transcript of Anthony Wechselberger Concerning Petitioner's Products and for Costs (Paper 19)
Opp.	Patent Owner's Opposition to Petitioner's Motion to Strike Portions of the Deposition Transcript of Anthony Wechselberger Concerning Petitioner's Products and for Costs (Paper 21)
Pap.	Paper in CBM2014-00112

**All emphasis added unless otherwise indicated

Petitioner hereby replies in support of its Motion to Strike (Pap. 19) (“Mot.”), and in response to Patent Owner’s (“PO”) Opposition (“Opp.”) (Pap. 21).

I. STATEMENT/RESPONSE TO STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS

Petitioner’s Statement is in Motion at 1-7. As to PO’s Statement: 1. Admitted.

II. THE TESTIMONY AT ISSUE WAS OUTSIDE THE PROPER SCOPE

PO does not argue that Mr. Wechselberger’s testimony, in the declarations on which he was deposed, provided any opinions on the operation of Petitioner’s products or on any purported secondary indicia of non-obviousness supposedly related to commercial success. These were nonetheless the admitted subjects of PO’s unabashedly improper questioning, which should be stricken from the record, and for which costs should be awarded. Nor does PO offer the Board any excuse for seeking, without authorization, additional discovery² on supposed practicing of the patent and “commercial success”—a particularly glaring transgression when the Board had previously denied such discovery, finding PO *lacked any threshold evidence that such considerations are present* in this case, *see, e.g.*, Pap. 13 at 3; Pap. 18 at 3; *Malico, Inc. v. Cooler Master USA Inc.*, No. 2013-1680, 2014 WL 6376903, at *7 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 17, 2014) (“evi-

² Contrary to PO’s claim (Opp. 6-7), “Routine Discovery” of a declarant is limited to the scope of his declaration. §§ 42.51(b)(1)(ii) (“Routine Discovery” includes “Cross examination of affidavit testimony”), 42.53(d)(5)(ii) (“For cross-examination testimony, the scope of the examination is limited to the scope of the direct testimony.”).

dence of secondary considerations of nonobviousness must always, *when present*, be considered in the obviousness analysis”), and when this was called to PO’s attention during the deposition, but PO nonetheless continued its improper questioning. Ex. 1030 356:23-357:11.³

Instead, PO argues that any time any witness testifies at the PTAB about obviousness, he is subject to questioning at deposition—without authorization or any showing of nexus or other threshold evidence—on the supposed infringement of a petitioner’s products, including details of their operation. *E.g.*, Opp. at 2-4 (“Mr. Wechselberger provided his opinion on the obviousness of at least one challenged claim”). Indeed, PO goes further to argue a technical expert may be questioned and then criticized for suggesting another type of expert might more appropriately opine about the precise number of sales that triggers “commercial success,” when this was never raised in the deponent’s declaration. *See* Opp. 4-5 (“*how many apps would have to be sold in your opinion...?*”).⁴ Mr. Wechselberger opined about no purported secondary con-

³ PO’s suggestion that its questions regarding the operation of Petitioner’s products and “commercial success” issues were proper because of Mr. Wechselberger’s background statements about his areas of expertise (Opp. 5-6) is illogical, and simply underscores the baselessness of its position.

⁴ *See also* Ex. 1030 371:20-373:16 (supposed inability to answer stemmed from incompleteness of questions).

siderations; PO has offered no threshold evidence that any are present to begin with; and its questioning—an admitted fishing expedition *in search of* such threshold evidence (*e.g.*, Opp. at 5 (“a number of Patent Owner’s questions were related to the nexus”; “Patent Owner’s period for discovery is not yet over, so Patent Owner also can prove nexus through other witnesses”)⁵—was wholly improper. Endorsing it would render Rule 42.53(d)(ii) meaningless, improperly expand any PTAB proceeding involving obviousness into a trial-within-a-trial on supposed infringement by petitioners with commercial products, and thwart Congress’ goal in the AIA to provide, in PTAB proceedings, a timely, efficient, and inexpensive alternative to litigation for resolving disputes about the validity of a challenged patent. *See, e.g.*, 147 Cong. Rec. 1363-1364 (daily ed. Mar. 8, 2011). PO’s open flouting of the rules and guidance of the Board should not be permitted, and the transcript of this improper, out-of-scope questioning⁶ should be stricken from the record.

⁵ Tellingly, that discovery period is now closed, and PO has offered no evidence or arguments of secondary indicia in its Preliminary Response (Pap. 6), Response (Pap. 22), or accompanying testimony (*see, e.g.*, Ex. 2031)—further confirming that, in addition to being outside the scope of Mr. Wechselberger’s testimony, secondary indicia are not even presented here. *Malico*, 2014 WL 6376903, at *7.

⁶ PO’s feigned confusion aside (Opp. 7), no “guess[ing]” is required about what testimony should be struck: the entirety of the testimony cited in the Motion (Ex. 1030

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.