

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

LG ELECTRONICS, INC., TOSHIBA CORP.,  
VIZIO, INC., HULU, LLC,  
CISCO SYSTEMS, INC., AVAYA INC.,  
VERIZON SERVICES CORP., and VERIZON BUSINESS NETWORK  
SERVICES INC.,  
Petitioners,

v.

STRAIGHT PATH IP GROUP, INC.  
(FORMERLY KNOWN AS INNOVATIVE COMMUNICATIONS  
TECHNOLOGIES, INC.)  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2015-00209<sup>1</sup>  
Patent 6,108,704 C1

---

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

---

<sup>1</sup> IPR2015-01398 and IPR2015-01406 have been joined with this proceeding.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. BACKGROUND .....	1
III. ARGUMENT.....	3
A. None of the challenged Exhibits should be excluded because the Board, with its administrative expertise, is in a position to determine and assign the appropriate weight to give to the evidence.....	3
B. The Dictionary Definitions (Exhibits 2021, 2031, 2034, 2035, and 2036) are relevant under Federal Rule of Evidence 401 and admissible under Federal Rules of Evidence 402 and 403. ....	4
C. Dr. Houh’s Testimony (Exhibit 2039) is admissible under the Federal Rules of Evidence.....	6
D. The Microsoft “Modifying WINS” Publication (Exhibits 2028 and 2033) is relevant and admissible under Federal Rules of Evidence 703 and 807. ....	7
1. Exhibits 2028 and 2033 are admissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 703 because they were properly relied upon by an expert.....	7
2. Petitioner has not met its burden for its irrelevance, authentication, and hearsay objections. ....	9
IV. CONCLUSION.....	11

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>505 Games, Inc. v. Babbage Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00954, Paper No. 17 (PTAB Aug. 22, 2014).....	2
<i>Advanced Magnetic Closures, Inc. v. Rome Fastener Corp.</i> , 607 F.3d 817 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	1, 3
<i>Donnelly Garment Co. v. NLRB</i> , 123 F.2d 215 (8th Cir. 1941) .....	3
<i>Gnosis S.p.A. v. S. Alabama Med. Sci. Found.</i> , IPR2013-00118, Paper No. 64 (PTAB June 20, 2014)... ..	3
<i>Google Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC</i> , IPR2014-01031, Paper No. 41 (PTAB Dec. 7, 2015).....	5
<i>Lexington Ins. Co. v. W. Penn. Hosp.</i> , 423 F.3d 318 (3rd Cir. 2005) .....	9
<i>LG Chem., LTD., v. Celgard, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00693, Paper No. 76 (PTAB Oct. 5, 2015).....	8
<i>Liberty Mutual Insurance Co. v. Progressive Casualty Insurance Co.</i> , CBM2012-00002, Paper No. 66 (PTAB Jan. 23, 2014).....	4
<i>People v. Valdez</i> , 201 Cal. App. 4th 1429 (Cal. Ct. App. 2011).....	9
<i>Sipnet EU S.R.O. v. Straight Path IP Group Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00246, Paper No. 62 (PTAB Oct. 9, 2014).....	6
<i>Sony Computer Entertainment America LLC v. Game Controller Technology LLC</i> , IPR2014-00634, Paper No. 32 (PTAB Apr. 14, 2015).....	3,4
<i>Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.</i> , 90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996) .....	5

**Other Authorities**

37 C.F.R § 42.20(c)..... 1

F.R.E. 401 .....4, 9

F.R.E. 402 and 403..... 4

F.R.E. 703 ..... 7

F.R.E. 801(d)..... 6

F.R.E. 807 ..... 7

F.R.E. 901 ..... 9

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Board should deny Petitioner’s Motion to Exclude Straight Path’s Exhibits 2021, 2028, 2031, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, and 2039 in this IPR of U.S. Patent No. 6,108,704 for at least the following reasons:

(1) The entire basis for Petitioner’s motion – its argument that the Exhibits are inadmissible under the Federal Rules of Evidence—is insufficient because “[t]he Federal Rules of Evidence do not generally apply when [as here] the judge is acting as a fact-finder because a judge can presumably exclude improper inferences.”<sup>2</sup>

(2) The exhibits are properly before the Board under the Federal Rules of Evidence.

## II. BACKGROUND

As the movant, Petitioner has the burden of proof to establish that it is entitled to the requested relief. 37 C.F.R § 42.20(c). The Exhibits Petitioner seeks to exclude are the following:

- **Exhibits 2021, 2031, 2034, 2035, and 2036**, which are dictionary definitions supporting Straight Path’s proposed claim constructions.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Advanced Magnetic Closures, Inc. v. Rome Fastener Corp.*, 607 F.3d 817, 831 (Fed. Cir. 2010).

# 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.