

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

---

CBM2014-00194 (Patent 8,118,221 B2)

---

**PETITIONER'S NOTICE OF OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), Petitioner, SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC. and SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD. (“Petitioner”), hereby submits its notice of objections to certain evidence that Patent Owner, SMARTFLASH LLC, submitted in connection with Patent Owner’s Response in CBM2014-00194.

Exhibits 2056 and 2057

Petitioner objects to Exhibits 2056 and 2057 (Deposition Transcripts of Dr. Jeffrey Bloom) on several grounds. Petitioner objects to relied-on portions enumerated below in Exhibits 2056 and 2057 on grounds of relevance (FRE 401 and 402), scope (FRE 611), and foundation (FRE 701).

The following chart lists objections to specific portions in Exhibits 2056 and 2057 and the corresponding grounds for the objections.

Objections to Portions in Exhibit 2056	
179:1-20	<b>FRE 401 and 402:</b> This portion is not relevant because any insinuated infringement <sup>1</sup> by a third party company

---

<sup>1</sup> To the extent that Patent Owner requested discovery into alleged evidence of non-infringement and existence of non-infringing alternatives, the Board refused to authorize Patent Owner to file such motions to compel discovery. *See generally,*

	<p>unrelated to the CBM proceedings does not make a fact of consequence in determining the validity of the patent claims at issue here more or less probable than it would be without this portion.</p> <p><b>FRE 611(b):</b> This portion is outside the scope of the direct examination because the Petitioner did not open the door to investigating the business practice of a third-party company.</p>
--	---

Objections to Portions in Exhibit 2057	
193:17-194:8	<p><b>FRE 401 and 402:</b> This portion is not relevant because any insinuated infringement<sup>2</sup> by a third-party company unrelated to the CBM proceedings does not make a fact of consequence in determining the validity of patent claims at issue here more or less probable than it would be without this portion.</p> <p><b>FRE 611(b):</b> This portion is outside the scope of the direct examination because the Petitioner did not open the door to investigating the business practice of a third-party company.</p> <p><b>FRE 701:</b> This portion is inadmissible</p>

---

Patent Owner List of Proposed Motions, Paper 12; Order-Conduct of the Proceedings, Paper 13.

<sup>2</sup> See FN1.

	<p>pursuant to FRE 701. Dr. Bloom has not been advanced as an expert with regard to subscription-based business practice of a third-party company. To the extent that no foundation has been laid with regard to his personal knowledge of such business practice, the content of this portion is improper lay witness opinion.</p>
195:5-16	<p><b>FRE 401 and 402:</b> This portion is not relevant because any insinuated infringement<sup>3</sup> by a third-party company unrelated to the CBM proceedings does not make a fact of consequence in determining the validity of patent claims at issue here more or less probable than it would be without this portion.</p> <p><b>FRE 611(b):</b> This portion is outside the scope of the direct examination because the Petitioner did not open the door to investigating the business practice of a third-party company.</p> <p><b>FRE 701:</b> This portion is inadmissible pursuant to FRE 701. Dr. Bloom has not been advanced as an expert with regard to subscription-based business practice of a third-party company. To the extent that no foundation has been laid with regard to his personal knowledge of such business practice, the content of this portion is improper lay witness opinion.</p>

---

<sup>3</sup> See FN1.

For at least these reasons, Petitioner objects to portions of Exhibits 2056 and 2057. Petitioner further reserves the right to move to exclude these portions.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 8, 2015

/Thomas A. Rozylowicz/  
Thomas A. Rozylowicz  
Reg. No. 50,620

# 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.