

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC. and  
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,  
Petitioner

v.

SMARTFLASH LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case CBM2014-00190  
Patent 7,334,720 B2

**PATENT OWNER'S OBJECTIONS TO ADMISSIBILITY OF EVIDENCE**

Smartflash - Exhibit 2094  
Samsung et al. v. Smartflash

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64, Patent Owner hereby objects to the admissibility of certain evidence submitted with Petitioner's petition ("the Petition"). Patent Owner's objections are based on the Federal Rules of Evidence and the Board Rules and are set forth with particularity below.

**Exhibit 1003 (Declaration of Dr. Jeffrey Bloom re the '720 Patent)**

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1003, Declaration of Dr. Jeffrey Bloom re the '720 Patent ("the Bloom Declaration"), in its entirety under Fed. R. Evid. 401 as the trial as instituted is limited to patentability under 35 U.S.C. § 101. As such, paragraphs 23-112 (and any portion other of the Bloom Declaration that is directed to patentability under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102/103) is not relevant to the instituted proceeding. Fed. R. Evid. 401. Being irrelevant evidence, those paragraphs are not admissible. Fed. R. Evid. 402.

Furthermore, the remaining portions of the declaration (i.e., paragraphs 23-26 and 113-128) deal with the strictly legal issue of statutory subject matter for which Dr. Bloom is not an expert. Thus, those portions of the Bloom Declaration are objected to under Fed. R. Evid. 401 as not relevant, under Fed. R. Evid. 602 as lacking foundation, and under Fed. R. Evid. 701 and 702 as providing legal opinions on which the lay witness is not competent to testify. Being irrelevant evidence, those paragraphs are not admissible. Fed. R. Evid. 402.

In addition, the Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1003 under 37 CFR 42.65 in its entirety as it does not set forth the relative evidentiary weight (e.g., substantial evidence versus preponderance of the evidence) Dr. Bloom used in arriving at his conclusions.

The Bloom Declaration is further objected to in all instances where any paragraph relies upon an exhibit that specifically is objected to herein for the reasons set forth in those specific objections. Further, any paragraph in the Bloom Declaration that relies upon any exhibit not

Case CBM2014-00190  
Patent 7,334,720 B2

relied upon by the PTAB to institute this proceeding is further objected to (under Fed. R. Evid. 401) as not being relevant and therefore being inadmissible (under Fed. R. Evid. 402).

Patent Owner also objects to the following specific paragraphs of the Bloom Declaration:

Paragraphs 102-107 – Patent Owner objects to Paragraphs 102-107 under Fed. R. Evid. 1002 because they purport to prove the content of multiple writings without submitting into evidence the original writings to prove their content. Moreover, duplicates of the original writings as contemplated by Fed. R. Evid. 1003 have not been submitted, nor do Paragraphs 102-107 meet any of the exceptions for the requirements of an original set forth in Fed. R. Evid. 1004. Patent Owner further objects to Paragraphs 102-107 as hearsay pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. 801 and 802, not meeting any of the hearsay exceptions of Fed. R. Evid. 803 or 804.

Paragraph 122 – Patent Owner objects to Paragraph 122 on relevance grounds because the description of the ASCAP licensing scheme for performance rights is not relevant to the technological solution for digital rights management embodied in the '720 Patent. Paragraph 122 fails the test for relevant evidence because nothing in Paragraph 122 makes a fact of consequence in determining this action more or less probable than it would be without Paragraph 122. Fed. R. Evid. 401(b). Being irrelevant evidence, Paragraph 122 is not admissible. Fed. R. Evid. 402. Patent Owner further objects to Paragraph 122 under Fed. R. Evid. 1002 because it purports to prove the content of a writing without submitting into evidence the original writing to prove its content. Moreover, a duplicate of the original writing as contemplated by Fed. R. Evid. 1003 has not been submitted, nor does Paragraph 122 meet any of the exceptions for the requirements of an original set forth in Fed. R. Evid. 1004. Patent Owner further objects to Paragraph 122 as hearsay pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. 801 and 802, not meeting any of the hearsay exceptions of Fed. R. Evid. 803 or 804.

Case CBM2014-00190  
Patent 7,334,720 B2

Paragraph 123 – Patent Owner objects to Paragraph 123 on relevance grounds because the descriptions of the ASCAP licensing scheme for performance rights and audit logs is not relevant to the technological solution for digital rights management embodied in the ‘720 Patent. Paragraph 123 fails the test for relevant evidence because nothing in Paragraph 123 makes a fact of consequence in determining this action more or less probable than it would be without Paragraph 123. Fed. R. Evid. 401(b). Being irrelevant evidence, Paragraph 123 is not admissible. Fed. R. Evid. 402. Patent Owner further objects to Paragraph 123 under Fed. R. Evid. 1002 because it purports to prove the content of multiple writings without submitting into evidence the original writings to prove their content. Moreover, duplicates of the original writings as contemplated by Fed. R. Evid. 1003 have not been submitted, nor does Paragraph 123 meet any of the exceptions for the requirements of an original set forth in Fed. R. Evid. 1004. Patent Owner further objects to Paragraph 123 as hearsay pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. 801 and 802, not meeting any of the hearsay exceptions of Fed. R. Evid. 803 or 804.

Paragraph 124 – Patent Owner objects to Paragraph 124 on relevance grounds because the description of the manner in which a radio station program director plans station programming is not relevant to the technological solution for digital rights management embodied in the ‘720 Patent. Patent Owner further objects on relevance grounds because the referenced article by Keith was published after the effective filing date of the ‘720 Patent and thus has no bearing on the state of knowledge at the time the ‘720 Patent application was filed. Paragraph 124 fails the test for relevant evidence because nothing in Paragraph 124 makes a fact of consequence in determining this action more or less probable than it would be without Paragraph 124. Fed. R. Evid. 401(b). Being irrelevant evidence, Paragraph 124 is not admissible. Fed. R. Evid. 402. Patent Owner further objects to Paragraph 124 under Fed. R.

Case CBM2014-00190  
Patent 7,334,720 B2

Evid. 1002 because it purports to prove the content of a writing without submitting into evidence the original writing to prove its content. Moreover, a duplicate of the original writing as contemplated by Fed. R. Evid. 1003 has not been submitted, nor does Paragraph 124 meet any of the exceptions for the requirements of an original set forth in Fed. R. Evid. 1004. Patent Owner further objects to Paragraph 124 as hearsay pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. 801 and 802, not meeting any of the hearsay exceptions of Fed. R. Evid. 803 or 804.

Paragraph 125 – Patent Owner objects to Paragraph 125 on relevance grounds because the description of formal requirements on programming for internet radio stations is not relevant to the technological solution for digital rights management embodied in the ‘720 Patent. Paragraph 125 fails the test for relevant evidence because nothing in Paragraph 125 makes a fact of consequence in determining this action more or less probable than it would be without Paragraph 125. Fed. R. Evid. 401(b). Being irrelevant evidence, Paragraph 125 is not admissible. Fed. R. Evid. 402. Patent Owner further objects to Paragraph 125 under Fed. R. Evid. 1002 because it purports to prove the content of a writing without submitting into evidence the original writing to prove its content. Moreover, a duplicate of the original writing as contemplated by Fed. R. Evid. 1003 has not been submitted, nor does Paragraph 125 meet any of the exceptions for the requirements of an original set forth in Fed. R. Evid. 1004. Patent Owner further objects to Paragraph 125 as hearsay pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. 801 and 802, not meeting any of the hearsay exceptions of Fed. R. Evid. 803 or 804.

Paragraph 128 – Patent Owner objects to Paragraph 128 on relevance grounds because the description of the planned establishment of credit facilities into retail establishments is not relevant to the technological solution for digital rights management embodied in the ‘720 Patent. Paragraph 128 therefore fails the test for relevant evidence because nothing in Paragraph 128

# 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.