

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY, AGFA CORPORATION, ESKO SOFTWARE
BVBA, and HEIDELBERG, USA

Petitioners,

v.

CTP INNOVATIONS, LLC

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2014-00789

Patent 6,738,155

**PETITIONERS' OPPOSITION TO PATENT OWNER'S FIRST MOTION
TO EXCLUDE (PAPER 18) AND PATENT OWNER'S UNAUTHORIZED
SECOND MOTION TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE (PAPER 25)**

Petitioners' Opposition to First and Second Motions to Exclude

I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner feigns prejudice in its unauthorized **Second** Motion to Exclude; however, any alleged “prejudice” is entirely of Patent Owner’s own making. For months now, Patent Owner has buried its head in the sand and ignored Petitioners’ supplemental evidence, served on April 16th. This evidence, now of record, was responsive to Patent Owner’s First Motion to Exclude and the contemporaneous objections explicitly recited therein. Petitioners’ supplemental evidence rendered these objections (baseless as they were) moot. That is, despite Petitioners offering dates for the depositions of Messrs. Jahn and Suetens during Patent Owner’s discovery period, Patent Owner has refused to take the deposition of these declarants. (Ex. 1027.) Instead, Patent Owner clings to untenable and incorrect evidentiary theories in a back-door attempt to secure further briefing on the merits.

Petitioners have filed the declarations of Messrs. Jahn and Suetens (Exs. 1023 and 1024, respectively) as appropriate Reply exhibits in response to Patent Owner’s untimely first motion to exclude (Paper 18) as well as the duplicate argument regarding Apogee raised in Patent Owner’s Response (*see* Paper 19 at 46). Still, Patent Owner refused the offered depositions of Messrs. Jahn and Suetens without explanation.

Petitioners' Opposition to First and Second Motions to Exclude

Now, without authorization, and vastly exceeding the cumulative 15-page total for motions to exclude evidence, Patent Owner files an unauthorized Second Motion to Exclude the declarations that it has heretofore ignored. Because Patent Owner's arguments plainly go to the weight of what is proper evidence of record, its motion to exclude should be denied.

II. EXHIBITS 1023 AND 1024 ARE PROPER SUPPLEMENTAL EVIDENCE AS WELL AS PROPER REPLY EXHIBITS

In its opening papers, Petitioners provided the declaration of Johan Suetens establishing that Apogee was distributed to the public via Agfa sales personnel in the normal course of business shortly after a press briefing held on March 17, 1998, but no later than May 28, 1998. (Ex. 1022 at ¶¶ 8, 11.) On April 2, 2015, Patent Owner simultaneously objected to Mr. Suetens declaration and the Apogee exhibit (Exhibits 1022 and 1007, respectively) under 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), and prematurely moved to exclude the same on authentication grounds for allegedly failing to establish public accessibility of Apogee. (*See* Paper 18.)

Now, as if to signal impropriety on the part of Petitioners, Patent Owner incredibly alleges that “Petitioners chose to treat the First Motion to Exclude as objections to Apogee and Mr. Suetens' Declaration” (Paper 25 at 1, emphasis added), but Patent Owner similarly relies upon its First Motion as “timely stat[ing] its objections to Exh. 1007 and 1022.” (Paper 25 at 2.) It is Patent Owner, not

Petitioners' Opposition to First and Second Motions to Exclude

Petitioners, that engages in a “Trojan-horse” attempt to attack the sufficiency of Petitioners' evidence under the guise of multiple motions to exclude.

In response to Patent Owner's April 2nd objections, as Rule 42.64(b)(2) allows, Petitioners served the Declaration of Mr. Jahn and the Supplemental Declaration of Mr. Suetens as supplemental evidence on April 16, 2015 (Exs. 1023 and 1024), which rendered Patent Owner's first motion to exclude moot. On April 22, 2015, almost two months before the due date for motions for observations regarding cross-examination of a witness (June 11, 2015), Petitioners offered Mr. Jahn for deposition between May 12 and May 15, and Mr. Suetens for deposition on May 6. (Ex. 1026.) After repeated attempts to coordinate the depositions of Messrs. Jahn and Suetens, CTP informed Petitioners on May 1, 2015 that they believed they could not depose Messrs. Jahn and Suetens until their declarations were filed in these proceedings. (Ex. 1027.) Accordingly, in an effort to progress discovery that was otherwise being stymied by CTP, Petitioners filed its Reply in IPR2014-00791 on May 8, 2015 (almost a month before the June 1 due date), and attached the declarations of Messrs. Jahn and Suetens. Still, CTP refused to take the deposition of these declarants and continued to ignore this evidence.

Despite CTP affirmatively burying its head in the sand, the declarations of Messrs. Jahn and Suetens (Exs. 1023 and 1024) remain both proper supplemental evidence and proper Reply evidence. First, Exhibits 1023 and 1024 are

Petitioners' Opposition to First and Second Motions to Exclude

supplemental evidence and not, as Patent Owner alleges, supplemental information. As explained by the Board:

The difference is that supplemental *evidence*—served in response to an evidentiary objection and filed in response to a motion to exclude—is offered solely to support admissibility of the originally filed evidence and to defeat a motion to exclude that evidence, and not to support any argument on the merits (*i.e.*, regarding the patentability or unpatentability of a claim). Supplemental *information*, on the other hand, is evidence a party intends to support an argument on the merits.

See, e.g., Handi-Quilter, Inc. v. Bernina Int'l AG, IPR2013-00364, Paper 30 at 2 (PTAB June 12, 2014).

Here, the Declaration of Mr. Jahn and the Supplemental Declaration of Mr. Suetens are offered solely to support the admissibility of Apogee (Ex. 1007), are not offered to further support “any argument on the merits (*i.e.*, regarding the patentability or unpatentability of a claim)” in view of Apogee and, therefore, are proper supplemental evidence. Tellingly, CTP characterizes its objection to Apogee as purely evidentiary based on alleged “authentication issues with regard to the Apogee reference – namely, that it was disseminated or otherwise made publicly available.” (Ex. 2018 at 5.) The Declaration of Mr. Jahn and the Supplemental Declaration of Mr. Suetens are offered solely in response to this evidentiary objection.

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.