

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

SMARTFLASH LLC,

Patent Owner.

Case CBM2015-00124

Patent 7,942,317 B2

PATENT OWNER'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Statement of Precise Relief Requested.....	1
II.	Patent Owner Smartflash Timely Objected to Petitioner’s Exhibits.....	1
III.	Argument	1
A.	Exhibits 1002 and 1034 are Irrelevant, Inadmissible Other Evidence of the Content of a Writing, and Cumulative.....	1
B.	Exhibits 1003, 1004, 1005, 1006, 1009, 1010, 1011, 1012, 1013, 1014, 1015, 1016, 1019, 1021, 1022, 1023, 1024, 1025, 1026, 1029, 1030, 1031, 1032, and 1033 are Not Alleged to be Invalidating Prior Art and thus are Irrelevant.....	4
C.	Exhibit 1017 Lacks Foundation, is Unreliable, and Relies on Irrelevant Exhibits	7
D.	Exhibit 1028 is Irrelevant and Hearsay	12
IV.	Conclusion	12

I. Statement of Precise Relief Requested

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.62 and 42.64(c), Patent Owner Smartflash LLC moves to exclude Exhibits 1002, 1003, 1004, 1005, 1006, 1009, 1010, 1011, 1012, 1013, 1014, 1015, 1016, 1017, 1019, 1021, 1022, 1023, 1024, 1025, 1026, 1028, 1029, 1030, 1031, 1032, 1033, and 1034.

II. Patent Owner Smartflash Timely Objected to Petitioner's Exhibits

Patent Owner Smartflash LLC timely objected to CBM2015-00124 Exhibits 1002, 1003, 1004, 1005, 1006, 1009, 1010, 1011, 1012, 1013, 1014, 1015, 1016, 1017, 1019, 1021, 1022, 1023, 1024, 1025, 1026, 1028, 1029, 1030, 1031, 1032, 1033, and 1034 by filing Patent Owner's Objections to Admissibility of Evidence.

Paper 9.

III. Argument

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c), the Federal Rules of Evidence apply in Covered Business Method Review ("CBM") proceedings.

A. Exhibits 1002 and 1034 are Irrelevant, Inadmissible Other Evidence of the Content of a Writing, and Cumulative

Patent Owner moves to exclude Exhibits 1002 (Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint) and 1034 (February 16, 2015 trial testimony excerpt in *Smartflash LLC v Apple Inc.*, Case No. 6:13 cv 447 (E.D. Tex.)) on grounds that they are inadmissible under FRE 402 because they fail the test for relevance set forth in

FRE 401; inadmissible other evidence of the content of a writing under FRE 1004; and, even if relevant, are unnecessary cumulative evidence under FRE 403.

Petitioner cites to Exhibits 1002 and 1034 as support for the ‘317 Patent being “financial in nature” and thus CBM review eligible. Petition at 24-27. Specifically, the Petition cites Exhibit 1002 to show Patent Owner’s characterization of the ‘317 Patent as “generally cover[ing] a portable data carrier for storing data and managing access to the data via payment information and/or use status rules” and “also generally cover[ing] a computer network ... that serves data and manages access to data by, for example, validating payment information.” Petition at 25-26 (citing Ex. 1002 ¶ 17). The Petition cites to Exhibit 1034 to show the inventor’s trial testimony describing the inventions as “particular devices and methods for combining payment functionality, secure downloading, storage, and rules for the use of content” *Id.* at 26 (citing Ex. 1034 at 59:12-15).

Patent Owner’s descriptions of the ‘317 Patent in Exhibits 1002 and 1034 are not relevant to any of the issues here.

In a related CBM on patents in the same family, CBM2015-00016, the Board declined to exclude the same and similar exhibits because “[Patent Owner’s] characterization of the ... patent in prior proceedings is relevant to the credibility of its characterization of the ... patent in this proceeding.” CBM2015-00016, Paper 56 at 24. The Board’s reasoning that a Patent Owner’s characterization of

the patent, or the Patent Owner’s credibility in doing so, is relevant to the analysis of whether a patent qualifies for CBM review under § 18(a) of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (“AIA”) is contrary to Federal Circuit authority. As noted by the Federal Circuit, “§ 18(d)(1) [of the AIA] directs us to examine *the claims* when deciding whether a patent is a CBM patent.” *Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.*, 815 F.3d 1331, 1340 (Fed. Cir. March 1, 2016) (emphasis original). The *claims* are delineated in the ‘317 Patent, which is in evidence as Exhibit 1001. That is all the Board needs for its analysis. Moreover, there are no credibility issues here that render Exhibits 1002 and 1034 relevant. There is nothing about Patent Owner’s characterization of the ‘317 Patent in this proceeding – that claim 8 “does not recite a ‘financial product or service’” in the way Congress intended (Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response, Paper 5 at 39-44) – that is contradicted by Exhibits 1002 and 1034 such that the credibility of Patent Owner’s characterization is at issue. As such Exhibits 1002 and 1034 are irrelevant and inadmissible.

Further, Petitioner’s expert, John P. J. Kelly, Exhibit 1017, (“Kelly Declaration”) does not cite to Exhibits 1002 or 1034. The Board’s November 10, 2015 *Decision – Institution of Covered Business Method Patent Review 37 C.F.R. § 42.208* (“PTAB Decision”), Paper 7, does not cite Exhibits 1002 and 1034. Exhibits 1002 and 1034 therefore do not appear to make a fact of consequence in determining this action more or less probable than it would be without Exhibits

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.