

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SHARP CORPORATION, SHARP ELECTRONICS CORPORATION, and  
SHARP ELECTRONICS MANUFACTURING  
COMPANY OF AMERICA, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

SURPASS TECH INNOVATION LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2015-00021  
Patent No. 7,202,843 B2

---

**PETITIONER'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE**

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c) and the Scheduling Order attached to the Board's April 9, 2015 Order (Paper No. 16), as modified by the parties' Joint Stipulation to Modify the Scheduling Order (Paper No. 23), Sharp Corporation, Sharp Electronics Corporation, and Sharp Electronics Manufacturing Company of America, Inc. (collectively, "Sharp" or "Petitioner") hereby move to exclude certain evidence submitted and relied upon by Patent Owner Surpass Tech Innovation LLC. ("Surpass" or "Patent Owner"). Petitioner identifies the specific evidence to be excluded below by Exhibit number, and where appropriate, by paragraph number. Petitioner also identifies the basis for exclusion. Petitioner has timely objected to these exhibits.

## **II. ARGUMENT**

The admissibility of exhibits submitted in a PTAB proceeding is governed by the Federal Rules of Evidence ("F.R.E."). 37 C.F.R. § 42.62(a) ("the Federal Rules of Evidence shall apply to a proceeding"); Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. at 48,758 ("Admissibility of evidence is generally governed by the Federal Rules of Evidence"). Patent Owner, as the proponent, carries the burden of establishing the admissibility of the challenged evidence.

### **A. Paragraphs 14, 18-23 and 28-30 of Mr. Bohannon’s Declaration Are Improper and Untimely Claim Amendments**

Paragraphs 14, 18-23 and 28-30 of Mr. Bohannon’s Declaration (Ex. 2005) should be excluded from the record as an improper and untimely attempt to amend the claims in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 316(d) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.121. Petitioner has raised this issue in its timely filed Objections (*see* Paper No. 21, Paragraph 2 of Specific Objections), as well as in Petitioner’s Reply (*see* Paper No. 24, Petitioner’s Reply at 12-13).<sup>1</sup>

In its Response, Patent Owner asserted for the first time that the concept of “overdriving” should be added to Claim 4, even though Claim 4 does not recite this element.<sup>2</sup> Specifically, Patent Owner argued that “claim 4’s phrase ‘applying the data impulses to the liquid crystal device of one of the pixels ... to control a transmission rate of the liquid crystal device of the pixel’” should be construed as

---

<sup>1</sup> Petitioner objected to Paragraphs 25, 27 and 32-35 on the same ground. However, Surpass has not cited or otherwise relied upon these Paragraphs. Thus, these Paragraphs are not admissible. *See CBS Interactive Inc. v. Helferich Patent Licensing, LLC*, IPR2013-00033, Paper 118 at 2-3 (PTAB Oct. 23, 2013).

<sup>2</sup> Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response did not offer any claim constructions, and the Board’s decision instituting trial found no need to construe any the claims. (Paper No. 10, 5).

“applying two or more *overdriven* data impulses in order to control a transmission rate of the liquid crystal device, or overdriving.” (See Paper No. 20, Response at 25-26) (emphasis added).

While Patent Owner offers this new argument under the guise of claim construction, it is actually an improper and untimely claim amendment. In this regard, Claim 4 does not refer to overdriving; rather, this concept is only referred to in Claim 1. Patent Owner’s attempt to shoe horn this limitation into Claim 4 is nothing more than an improper attempt to bypass the Rules governing claim amendments in IPR proceedings. The relevant Rules and Scheduling Order in this proceeding required Patent Owner to, among other things, confer with the Board and Petitioner regarding the proposed amendment by May 28, 2015. (37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a); *see also* Paper No. 16, 2-3 (“[I]f Patent Owner determines that it will file a motion to amend, Patent Owner must arrange a conference call no later than two weeks prior to DUE DATE 1 with the Board and opposing counsel to discuss the proposed motion to amend.”)). Patent Owner would have then been required to file a motion to amend (separate from Patent Owner’s Response) that complied with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a)-(b). In such a motion to amend, Patent Owner would have had to show a “patentable distinction over the prior art of record and also prior art known to the patent owner.” *Idle Free Systems, Inc. v. Bergstrom, Inc.*, IPR2012-00027, Paper 26 at 7 (PTAB June 11, 2013).

Patent Owner failed to take any of these required steps, and instead sought to introduce the claim amendment through Mr. Bohannon's declaration testimony. This simply is not the proper procedure for amending claims, and as such, Paragraphs 14, 18-23 and 28-30 of Mr. Bohannon's Declaration (Ex. 2005) should be excluded from the record under 35 U.S.C. § 316(d), 37 C.F.R. § 42.121. *See also Idle Free Systems*, IPR2012-00027, Paper 26 at 7.

**B. Paragraphs 14, 18-23 and 28-30 of Mr. Bohannon's Declaration Are Irrelevant**

In addition to including improper claim amendments, Paragraphs 14, 18-23 and 28-30 of Mr. Bohannon's Declaration (Ex. 2005) should also be excluded from the record under F.R.E. 402, 701, 702 and 703 because they are irrelevant to any issue in this proceeding. Petitioner has raised this issue in its timely filed Objections (*see* Paper No. 21, Paragraph 3 of Specific Objections), as well as in Petitioner's Reply (*see* Paper No. 24, Petitioner's Reply at 14-25).<sup>3</sup>

As discussed above, these paragraphs relate solely to the legally irrelevant "overdriving" technique. However, none of the claims-at-issue in this proceeding refers to the "overdriving" technique. Significantly, Mr. Bohannon admitted during the cross-examination that the support for his discussion of the

---

<sup>3</sup> Petitioner objected to Paragraphs 25, 27 and 32-35 on the same grounds.

However, as discussed in Footnote 1, these Paragraphs are inadmissible.

# 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.