

Filed on behalf of Textron Innovations Inc.
By: Patrick A. Doody (patrick.doody@pillsburylaw.com)
Bryan P. Collins (bryan.collins@pillsburylaw.com)
Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102
Tel: (703) 770-7900
Fax: (703) 770-7901

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

WAVELOCK ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY CO., LTD.
Petitioner

v.

TEXTRON INNOVATIONS INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2013-00149
Patent 6,455,138

**PATENT OWNER TEXTRON INNOVATIONS
MOTION TO EXCLUDE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §42.64**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. STATEMENT OF REQUESTED RELIEF	1
II. RELEVANT PROCEDURAL HISTORY	1
III. ARGUMENT	5
A. A Reply That Raises A New Issue, a New Grounds of Rejection, And That Belatedly Presents New Evidence Should Be Excluded, Along With Its Exhibits	5
1. Petitioner's Reply	7
2. Exhibit 1018	10
B. The New Ground of Rejection, New Evidence, and Reply Severely Prejudice Patent Owner	12
IV. CONCLUSION.....	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

In re Biedermann, No. 2013-1080, slip op. (Fed. Cir. Oct. 18, 2013)9, 14

Rules and Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b)12
37 C.F.R. §42.2313
37 C.F.R. §42.641
Fed. R. Evid. Rule 4021, 12
Fed. R. Evid. Rule 4031, 12

Other Authorities

Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48767, No. 157
Aug. 14, 2012.....7, 11, 13, 14

Administrative Proceedings

Blackberry Corp. v. Mobilemedia Ideas, IPR2013-000367
Corning Inc. v. DSM IP Assets B.V., IPR2013.0004315
Kyocera Corporation v. Softview, IPR2013-00004,
IPR2013-00257, Paper No. 327, 15
Wavelock v. Textron Innovations, IPR2013-00149, Paper No. 83

I. STATEMENT OF REQUESTED RELIEF

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §42.64 and Patent Owner Textron Innovations (“Textron’s”) Objections to Evidence (“Objections”) served on Petitioner Wavelock Advanced Technology Co., Ltd., (“Wavelock”) and filed with the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB) on December 6, 2013, paper No. 18, (Copy of the Objections is attached as Exhibit 2003). Textron seeks the exclusion of Petitioner’s Reply, the Second Declaration of Robert Iezzi, Ph.D., Exhibit 1018, and the improperly attached exhibits to Dr. Iezzi’s Second Declaration (Exhibits AA-GG). Each of these items raises a new issue, belatedly presents new evidence and presents no reason as to why the evidence was not presented when the petition was filed. The new evidence and Petitioner’s reply also are not related to the grounds of rejection adopted by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB), is prejudicial to Patent Owner, and is outside the scope of these proceedings. Accordingly, these documents should be excluded from this proceeding under the PTABs own rules, as well as at least under Fed. R. Evid. Rule 402 and Fed. R. Evid. Rule 403.

II. RELEVANT PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Each of the challenged claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,455,138 (the “138 patent”) requires first and second thermoplastic layers with a discontinuous layer positioned therebetween, in which the discontinuous layer includes “discrete

islands of metal in an adhesive.” Ex. 1001, at col. 9, ll. 7-9. The Petition filed on February 15, 2013, alleged that the disclosure of Kuwahara’s examples anticipated claim 1. IPR2013-00149, Petition for Inter Partes Review, Paper No. (“Petition”), at 8, 9. The Petition alleged the following: “When this disclosure is illustrated as shown below,¹ it is clear that Kuwahara fully anticipates claim 1.” *Id.* at 9. The Petition included a claim chart and alleged the following: “The vinyl chloride-vinyl acetate copolymer resin is an adhesive between the metalized film surface and the 200 μm thick vinyl chloride film. (Iezzi (Ex. 1017), ¶ 57.) Because the vinyl chloride adhesive is applied directly over the discrete islands of metal, the discrete islands of metal would be in the adhesive.” *Id.* at 12. Paragraph 57 of Dr. Iezzi’s declaration states: “One of ordinary skill in the art would have also understood that since the adhesive (vinyl chloride-vinyl acetate copolymer resin) is applied by a coater to the Sn islands deposited on the PET film, the Sn islands are in the adhesive.” Ex. 1017, ¶ 57; pg. 27. While not relied upon in the Petition, Dr. Iezzi also states: “Since the adhesive is applied on top of the discontinuous metal layer in a liquid state, the adhesive would inherently flow around the island metal

¹The Petition reproduced an alleged illustration of examples 1 and 2 of Kuwahara from Dr. Iezzi’s declaration, Exhibit 1017, at paragraph 52, pg. 25.

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.