

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE, INC.,
Petitioners,

v.

DSS TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case: IPR2015-00369
U.S. Patent No. 6,128,290

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Exhibits 2003-2008, 2011-2014, and 2017 Should Not Be Excluded As Hearsay	1
A. Exhibits 2003-2008, 2011-2014 and 2017 Are Not Hearsay.....	1
B. Exhibits 2003-2008, 2011-2014 Are Admissible Under FRE 703	3
II. Exhibits 2003-2008, 2012-2014, and 2017 Are Relevant.....	4
III. PETITIONER MISCHARACTERIZES THE LAW	6
1. <i>Stewart-Warner Corp. v. City of Pontiac</i>	6
2. <i>Amazon.com Inc. v. AC Technologies S.A.</i>	8
3. <i>SK Innovation Co., Ltd. v. Celgard, LLC</i>	9
IV. CONCLUSION	11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Amazon.com Inc. v. AC Technologies S.A.,
IPR2015-01801, Paper No. 9, pp. 2-3 (P.T.A.B., Jan. 22, 2016) 8

Donnelly Garment Co. v. NLRB,
123 F.2d 215, 224 (8th Cir. 1941)..... 5

Google Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC,
IPR2014-01031, Paper No. 41, p. 10 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 7, 2015) 5

Laird Technologies, Inc. v. GrafTech International Holdings, Inc.,
IPR2014-00025, Final Decision at pg. 44 (P.T.A.B. March 25, 2015) 4

Ltd. v. Celgard, SK Innovation Co., Ltd. v. Celgard, LLC,
IPR2014-00679, Paper 58, p. 49 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 25, 2015) 3

OddzOn Products, Inc. v. Just Toys, Inc.,
122 F. 3d 1396, 1407 (Fed. Cir. 1997) 4

SK Innovation Co., Ltd. v. Celgard, LLC,
IPR2014-00679, Paper 58, p. 49 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 25, 2015)10

Stewart-Warner Corp. v. City of Pontiac,
767 F.2d 1563, 1570 (Fed. Cir. 1985)2, 7, 8, 9

Federal Rules

Fed. R. Evid. 401passim

Fed. R. Evid. 7033, 4, 10

Fed. R. Evid. 8011, 2, 3

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.23, Patent Owner DSS Technology Management, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) hereby opposes Petitioner Apple, Inc.’s (“Petitioner”) Motion to Exclude Evidence.

Petitioner filed a Motion to Exclude on the following grounds:

- I. Exhibits 2003-2008, 2012-2014, and 2017:
 - (1) Hearsay under Federal Rules of Evidence (“FRE”) 801;
 - (2) Irrelevance under FRE 401;
- II. Exhibit 2011:
 - (1) Hearsay under FRE 801.

The Board should deny Petitioner’s Motion to Exclude in its entirety for the reasons that follow.

I. Exhibits 2003-2008, 2011-2014, and 2017 Should Not Be Excluded As Hearsay

A. Exhibits 2003-2008, 2011-2014 and 2017 Are Not Hearsay

Exhibits 2003-2008, 2011-2014, and 2017 are admissible because they are not hearsay. FRE 801(c) defines “hearsay” as a statement that “a party offers in evidence to prove the truth of the matter asserted in the statement.” Fed. R. Evid. 801(c). It is well established, however, that “[i]f the significance of an offered statement lies solely in the fact that it was made, no issue is raised as to the truth of

anything asserted, and the statement is not hearsay.” Fed. R. Evid. 801 Advisory Committee’s Notes on Proposed Rules (citing *Emich Motors Corp. v. General Motors Corp.*, 181 F.2d 70 (7th Cir. 1950)).

In its Motion to Exclude, Petitioner failed to recognize that Exhibits 2003-2008, 2011-2014, and 2017 serve a non-hearsay purpose. Patent Owner offered Exhibits 2003-2008, 2011-2014, and 2017 for what they describe to a person of ordinary skill in the art (“POSITA”), and not for the truth of the matter asserted therein. The law is well established that the Board will not exclude evidence that is proffered to show what a POSITA would have known about the relevant field of art. *See Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. Petitioner*, CBM2012-00010, Final Decision (P.T.A.B. Feb. 24, 2014) (“We further agree with Liberty that the articles that are Exhibits 1025-1034 and 1036 serve a non-hearsay purpose for which they can be admitted—namely to show what one with ordinary skill in the art would have known about technical features and developments in the pertinent art.”). Furthermore, Exhibits 2003-2008, 2011-2014, and 2017 are not hearsay because they provide context for the testimony of an expert witness Mr. Dezmelyk and, therefore, can assist the Board in assessing Mr. Dezmelyk’s credibility.

At least for these reasons, Petitioner’s motion to exclude Exhibits 2003-2008, 2011-2014, and 2017 as hearsay under FRE 801 is improper and should be denied.

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.