UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

SMARTFLASH LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case CBM2015-00015
Patent 8,118,221 B2

PATENT OWNER'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner understands that "the Board, sitting as a non-jury tribunal with administrative expertise, is well-positioned to determine and assign appropriate weight to the evidence presented in this trial, without resorting to formal exclusion that might later be held reversible error." *Liberty Mutual Insurance Co. v. Progressive Casualty Insurance Co.*, CBM2012-00002, Paper 66, Final Written Decision (PTAB January 23, 2014)(citing *S.E.C. v. Guenthner*, 395 F. Supp. 2d 835, 842 n.3 (D. Neb. 2005)). At the same time, the Federal Rules of Evidence apply (37 CFR § 42.62(a)) and it is within the Board's authority to manage the record by ruling on the admissibility of evidence based on the trial as instituted so that in the event of an appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 142, a proper record exists that can be transmitted to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 143.

II. ARGUMENT

A. The Board Should Exclude Exhibit 1202

Ex. 1202 does not contain a "highly relevant admission" (Paper 43 at 2), but instead says nothing more than the patent itself in Ex. 1201 at 1:20-23 ("This invention … relates to a portable data carrier for storing and paying for data…") and 1:64-66 ("reading payment information," "validating the payment information"). Ex. 1202 therefore is inadmissible other evidence of the content of

a writing under FRE 1004, cumulative under FRE 403, and irrelevant under FRE 401, 402.

B. The Board Should Exclude Exhibits 1203 – 1204 and 1227-1229

Ex. 1203 – 1204 and 1227 – 1229 are not cited in any substantive way. As Petitioner acknowledges, the exhibits merely were listed in "Materials Reviewed and Relied Upon" by Mr. Wechselberger. Pap. 43 at 2-3. These exhibits therefore are not relevant and not admissible. FRE 401, 402.

C. The Board Should Exclude Exhibits 1205, 1206, 1207, 1212, 1215, 1217, 1218, 1220, 1231, 1232, and 1233

Exhibits 1205, 1206, 1207, 1212, 1215, 1217, 1218, 1220, 1231, 1232, and 1233 were not alleged to be invalidating prior art and should be excluded. FRE 401, 402.

D. The Board Should Exclude Exhibits 1210, 1213, 1214, 1216, and 1219

Exhibits 1210, 1213, 1214, 1216, and 1219 were originally alleged to be invalidating prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (Paper 23 at 3), but CBM review in this case was instituted on claim 1of the '221 Patent on 35 U.S.C. § 101 grounds only. No other grounds were authorized. Pap. 23 at 21-22. These exhibits therefore should no longer be in evidence. FRE 401, 402.

E. The Board Should Exclude Exhibit 1221

The Board cannot assess under FRE 702 whether Mr. Wechselberger's opinion testimony is "based on sufficient facts or data," is "the product of reliable

principles and methods," or if Mr. Wechselberger "reliably applied the principles and methods to the facts of the case" given that Mr. Wechselberger did not disclose the standard (substantial evidence or preponderance of the evidence) against which he measured the quantum of evidence in arriving at his opinions. As such, there is no basis to admit his expert testimony.[1]

F. The Board Should Exclude Exhibit 1223 Or Petitioner Should Correct The Record

Petitioner concedes that its Exhibit List and docket description do not support that Ex. 1223 is what it is purported to be. Paper 43 at 8. Exhibit 1223 therefore either should be excluded or the record should be corrected.

III. CONCLUSION

Patent Owner respectfully requests that the Board exclude the exhibits.

[1] Patent Owner acknowledges that FRE 602 is inapplicable to expert witnesses (Pap. 43 at 8). However, Mr. Wechselberger never states that he is an expert in the types of methods and systems defined by the challenged claims.

DOCKET ALARM

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.