

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner

v.

SMARTFLASH LLC,
Patent Owner

Case CBM2015-00121
Patent 8,794,516

Before the Honorable JENNIFER S. BISK, RAMA G. ELLURU, and GREGG I. ANDERSON, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

**PETITIONER APPLE INC.'S OBJECTIONS TO PATENT OWNER
SMARTFLASH LLC'S EXHIBITS**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), the undersigned, on behalf of and acting in a representative capacity for Petitioner Apple Inc. ("Petitioner"), hereby submits the following objections to Patent Owner Smartflash, LLC's ("Patent Owner") Exhibit 2105, and any reference thereto/reliance thereon, without limitation. Petitioner's objections below apply the Federal Rules of Evidence ("F.R.E.") as required by 37 C.F.R § 42.62.

These objections address evidentiary deficiencies in the new material served by Patent Owner on February 22, 2016.

The following objections apply to Exhibit 2105 as it is actually presented by Patent Owner, in the context of Patent Owner's February 22, 2016 Patent Owner's Response (Paper 17) and not in the context of any other substantive argument on the merits of the instituted grounds in this proceeding. Petitioner expressly objects to any other purported use of this Exhibit, including as substantive evidence in this proceeding, which would be untimely and improper under the applicable rules, and Petitioner expressly asserts, reserves and does not waive any other objections that would be applicable in such a context.

I. Objections to Exhibit 2105 And Any Reference to/Reliance Thereon

Evidence objected to: Exhibit 2105 ("Transcript of Deposition of Justin Douglas Tygar, Ph.D. dated January 19, 2016 taken in CBM2015-00126 and - 00129").

Grounds for objection: F.R.E. 401 ("Test for Relevant Evidence"); 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"); and 37 C.F.R. § 42.61 ("Admissibility").

Petitioner objects to the use of Exhibit 2105 under F.R.E. 401, 402, and 403, and 37 C.F.R. § 42.61 as the cited testimony (*see, e.g.*, Paper 17 at 23-24) is not relevant to the issues in the present proceeding. Apple's expert in this proceeding is Dr. John Kelly. Exhibit 2105, however, appears to be a transcript from the

deposition of Dr. Justin D. Tygar, who is not an expert for Apple in this proceeding, and appears instead to have served as an expert for Google Inc.—who is not a party to this proceeding—in other CBM proceedings (*i.e.*, CBM2015-00126, -00129), which challenge different patents than the '516 Patent challenged here—and is cited in connection with arguments about patent eligibility of system claims. *See Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int'l*, 134 S. Ct. 2347, 2360 (2014) (“[T]he system claims are no different from the method claims in substance This Court has long warned . . . against interpreting § 101 in ways that make patent eligibility depend simply on the draftsman’s art.”) (internal quotations omitted); Paper 17 at 23-24. Additionally, admission of that evidence would be doubly improper because Apple is not a party to CBM2015-00126 and CBM2015-00129 and was not given the opportunity to attend the deposition of Dr. Justin D. Tygar. Moreover, for these reasons, Apple further reserves the right to raise additional objections not already stated on the record in that deposition, including objections to form and relevance in connection with the questions in the cited portions of the transcript.

Apple hereby expressly repeats and reserves all of the objections stated on the record in that deposition (Exhibit 2105) as well as the deposition of Dr. John Kelly (Exhibit 2108), and affirmatively maintains all such objections.

Accordingly, this Exhibit does not appear to make any fact of consequence in determining this action more or less probable than it would be without them and are thus irrelevant and not admissible (F.R.E. 401, 402); permitting reference to/reliance on this document in any future submissions of Patent Owner would also be impermissible, misleading, irrelevant, and unfairly prejudicial to Petitioner (F.R.E. 402, 403).

Respectfully submitted,

February 29, 2016

By: J. Steven Baughman/

J. Steven Baughman (Lead Counsel)

Reg. No. 47,414

Megan F. Raymond

Reg. No. 72,997

ROPES & GRAY LLP

2099 Pennsylvania Avenue NW

Washington, DC 20006

P: 202-508-4606 / F: 202-383-8371

steven.baughman@ropesgray.com

megan.raymond@ropesgray.com

Ching-Lee Fukuda (Backup Counsel)

Reg. No. 44,334

ROPES & GRAY LLP

1211 Avenue of the Americas

New York, NY 10036

P: 212-596-9336 / F: 212-596-9000

ching-lee.fukuda@ropesgray.com

Mailing address for all PTAB correspondence: **ROPES & GRAY LLP**
IPRM – Floor 43, Prudential Tower, 800 Boylston Street, Boston, MA 02199-3600

Attorneys for Petitioner Apple Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the foregoing PETITIONER APPLE INC.'S OBJECTIONS TO PATENT OWNER SMARTFLASH LLC'S EXHIBITS was served on February 29, 2016, to the following Counsel for Patent Owner via e-mail, pursuant to the parties' agreement concerning service:

Michael R. Casey
Wayne M. Helge
DAVIDSON BERQUIST JACKSON & GOWDEY LLP
8300 Greensboro Dr., Suite 500
McLean, VA 22102
Telephone: (571) 765-7700
Facsimile: (571) 765-7200
mcasey@dbjg.com
whelge@davidsonberquist.com
SmartFlash-CBM@dbjg.com

*Attorneys for Patent Owner
Smartflash, LLC*

/s/ Sharon Lee
Sharon Lee

ROPES & GRAY LLP