

Filed on behalf of ABB, Inc.

By: Richard D. McLeod (Reg. No. 46,921)  
[Rick.mcleod@klarquist.com](mailto:Rick.mcleod@klarquist.com)  
Michael D. Jones (Reg. No. 41,879)  
[michael.jones@klarquist.com](mailto:michael.jones@klarquist.com)  
Klarquist Sparkman LLP  
One World Trade Center, Suite 1600  
121 S.W. Salmon Street  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: (503) 595-5300  
Facsimile: (503) 595-5301

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

ABB, INC.  
Petitioner

v.

ROY-G-BIV CORPORATION  
Patent Owner

---

Trial No. IPR2013-00062 (joined with IPR2013-00282)  
Patent 6,516,236 B1

---

**ABB'S OPPOSITION TO PATENT  
OWNER'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|  | <b>Page</b> |
|--|-------------|
| I. INTRODUCTION .....  | 1           |
| II. DISCUSSION .....   | 1           |
| A. RGB’s Motion Is Improper .....  | 1           |
| B. ABB’s Reply Responded To The Issues Raised By RGB .....   | 2           |
| C. Drs. Papanikolopoulos And Voyles Testimony Is Admissible.....                                       | 7           |
| 1. Drs. Papanikolopolous And Voyles Offer Facts<br>In Addition To Opinions Based On The Cited Art..... | 8           |
| 2. Expert Testimony<br>(Via Declaration) Is Not An “Expert Report” .....                               | 11          |
| 3. Dr. Papanikolopolous Applied The Law Correctly .....  | 12          |
| III. CONCLUSION.....   | 13          |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| <b>Cases</b>   |      |
| <i>Avaya, Inc. v. Network-1 Security Solutions, Inc.</i> ,<br>IPR2013-00071, Paper 75, Dec. 2, 2013..... | 1    |
| <i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> ,<br>383 U.S. 1 (1966) .....   | 11   |
| <i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> ,<br>415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....                                    | 13   |
| <b>Other Authorities</b>   |      |
| MPEP 2143.03 .....   | 9    |
| Office Patent Trial Practice Guide,<br>77 Fed. Reg. 48756, 48767 (Aug. 14, 2012).....                    | 2    |
| <b>Rules</b>   |      |
| Rules of Practice,<br>77 Fed. Reg. at 48633.....   | 2    |

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

ABB timely submits this Opposition to Patent Owner's Motion to Exclude Evidence (Paper #59). RGB moved to exclude: "(1) arguments raised for the first time in ABB's reply ("Reply"); (2) new alleged grounds of un-patentability outside of the scope of the initial Petition and Institution Decision ("I.D."); and (3) the expert testimony of Dr. Papanikolopoulos ("Dr. P.") and portions of Dr. Voyles' declaration..." For at least the reasons set forth below, RGB's motion should be denied in its entirety.

## **II. DISCUSSION**

RGB's motion to exclude makes clear that it either misunderstands the technology, misunderstood ABB's reply, or is seeking to obfuscate the issues.

### **A. RGB's Motion Is Improper**

As they Board has stated, a motion to exclude should be directed at the admissibility of evidence, not the sufficiency of evidence, credibility of witnesses, or whether new arguments may have been raised in a reply. *Avaya, Inc. v. Network-1 Security Solutions, Inc.*, IPR2013-00071, Paper 75, Dec. 2, 2013 ("a motion to strike or motion to exclude is not the proper mechanism for raising the issue of whether a reply or reply evidence is beyond the proper scope permitted

under the rules” -- citing Rules of Practice, 77 Fed. Reg. at 48633 and Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756, 48767 (Aug. 14, 2012)).

Thus, RGB’s Motion is improper on its face, and should be denied.

**B. ABB’s Reply Responded To The Issues Raised By RGB**

ABB has not raised new arguments or new grounds of unpatentability; it responded to the assertions made in RGB’s papers.

RGB did not provide persuasive evidence supporting its interpretation of the claims in its preliminary, primary, or supplemental responses. Rather, RGB appears to have been reduced to the two pronged argument that: 1) the claimed functions and component code include only “executable” functions/code, and 2) the prior art does not teach executable functions associated with one another by executable code. Accordingly, ABB’s reply pointed out that, with respect to the first prong of RGB’s argument:

However, “computer code” encompasses more than executable machine language, rather it includes any form of control flow, including visual programming constructs. (Ex. 1130, ¶¶ 21-22, 39; Ex. 1132, ¶ 55-56; 236 Patent, Fig. 1A, “Visual Basic”).

...

However, the term “function” encompasses more than executable machine language instructions. Rather, “function” broadly encompasses “in-line” functions, constructs in scripting languages, interpreted languages, and also

# 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.