

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

VIRNETX INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2015-00871
U.S. Patent No. 8,560,705

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

Table of Contents

I. Introduction.....1

II. Argument1

 A. Patent Owner’s Motion is Facially Deficient.....1

 B. Exhibits 1022, 1023, 1043, and 1057-1059 Are Admissible.....1

 C. Exhibits 1060 and 1063-1065 Are Admissible8

 D. Exhibits 1003, 1004, 1007, 1015-1017, 1024-1035, 1037-1041, 1044-1048, and 1067-1069 Are Admissible13

 E. Exhibit 1005 Is Admissible in Its Entirety.....15

III. Conclusion15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Smartflash LLC</i> , CBM2014-00180, Paper 50 (Sep. 25, 2015)	13, 14
<i>Conoco Inc. v. Dep't of Energy</i> , 99 F.3d 387 (Fed. Cir. 1996), <i>as amended on reh'g in part</i> (Jan. 2, 1997)	7
<i>Davis v. Alaska</i> , 415 U.S. 308 (1974).....	3
<i>Doe v. United States</i> , 976 F.2d 1071 (7th Cir. 1992), <i>cert. denied</i> 510 U.S. 812 (1993)	1
<i>In re Epstein</i> , 32 F.3d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	7
<i>Ericsson Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC</i> , IPR2014-00527, Paper 41 (May 18, 2015).....	12
<i>Google Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC</i> , IPR2014-01034, Paper 41 (Dec. 7, 2015).....	15
<i>IBM Corp. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC</i> , IPR2015-00089, Paper 44 (Apr. 25, 2016).....	6, 13
<i>The Mangrove Partners Master Fund, Ltd., v. VirnetX Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01047, Paper 52 (Apr. 15, 2016).....	3
<i>PGMedia, Inc. v. Network Solutions, Inc.</i> , 51 F. Supp. 2d 389 (S.D.N.Y. 1999)	12
<i>Poole v. Textron, Inc.</i> , 192 F.R.D. 494 (D. Md. 2000)	11
<i>Samsung Electronics America, Inc. v. Smarthflash LLC</i> , CBM2014-00193, Paper 45 (Mar. 30, 2016).....	15

Ultratec, Inc. v. Sorenson Commc'ns, Inc.,
No. 13-CV-346, 2014 WL 4829173 (W.D. Wis. Sept. 29, 2014).....11

United States v. North,
910 F.2d 843 (D.C. Cir. 1990) *cert. denied* 500 U.S. 941 (1991).....1

VirnetX, Inc. v. Apple Inc.,
10-cv-00417 (E.D. Tex.).....4

VirnetX, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.,
07-cv-00080 (E.D. Tx.).....5

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b)(2). Second.....8

37 C.F.R. § 42.51(b)(2).....3, 7

37 C.F.R. § 42.53(f)(5)14

37 C.F.R. § 42.6514

Fed. R. Evid. 801(c)(2)8

Fed. R. Evid. 807*passim*

FRE 401 and 402.....13

I. Introduction

The evidence of record establishes that Exhibits 1001-1007, 1017, 1019, 1022-1041, 1044-1049, 1051-1054, 1057-1060, 1063-1065, 1067, 1069, and 1071 are admissible. Patent Owner has failed to show otherwise, and thus, its motion must be denied. *See* Paper 30 (“Mot.”).

II. Argument

A. Exhibits 1022, 1023, 1043, and 1057-1059 Are Admissible

Patent Owner moves to exclude Exhibits 1022, 1023, 1043, and 1057-1059 as inadmissible hearsay. Mot. at 2-6. That motion should be denied, as these exhibits qualify for the residual exception to hearsay. Fed. R. Evid. 807.

Under Federal Rule of Evidence 807, a “statement is not excluded by the rule against hearsay” if: “(1) the statement has equivalent circumstantial guarantees of trustworthiness; (2) it is offered as evidence of a material fact; (3) it is more probative on the point for which it is offered than any other evidence that the proponent can obtain through reasonable efforts; and (4) admitting it will best serve the purposes of these rules and the interests of justice.” Fed. R. Evid. 807(a). The testimony’s proponent must also give (5) “reasonable notice of the intent to offer the statement and its particulars.” Fed. R. Evid. 807(b). Courts are accorded wide discretion in applying this exception. *Doe v. United States*, 976 F.2d 1071, 1076–77 (7th Cir. 1992), *cert. denied* 510 U.S. 812 (1993); *United States v. North*,

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.