Paper No. _____ Filed: May 27, 2016

Filed on behalf of: VirnetX Inc.

By:

Joseph E. Palys Naveen Modi

Paul Hastings LLP
875 15th Street NW
Washington, DC 20005
Paul Hastings LLP
875 15th Street NW
Washington, DC 20005

Telephone: (202) 551-1996 Telephone: (202) 551-1990 Facsimile: (202) 551-0496 Facsimile: (202) 551-0490

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

THE MANGROVE PARTNERS MASTER FUND, LTD. and APPLE INC., Petitioner

v.

VIRNETX INC. Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-01046¹ Patent No. 6,502,135

PATENT OWNER'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE

¹ Apple Inc., who filed a petition in IPR2016-00062, has been joined as a Petitioner in the instant proceeding.



Table of Contents

I.	Precise Relief Requested		
II.	Legal Standard		
III.	Exhibits 1005, 1010, 1014, 1020, 1025, 1029, 1031-1033, 1037, and 1039-1042 Should be Excluded from the Record		
	A.	Exhibits 1025 and 1037 Constitute Inadmissible Hearsay	2
	B.	Exhibits 1029 and 1031-1033 Constitute Inadmissible Hearsay	3
	C.	Exhibit 1039 Constitutes Inadmissible Hearsay	7
	D.	Exhibits 1005, 1010, 1014, 1020, and 1040-1042 Lack Relevance	7
IV.	Conclusion		8



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)
Cases
Conoco Inc. v. Dep't of Energy,
99 F.3d 387 (Fed. Cir. 1996)
Actifio, Inc., v. Delphix Corp.,
IPR2015-00108, Paper No. 56 (Apr. 29, 2016)7
Federal Regulations
Federal Rule of Evidence 401
Federal Rule of Evidence 402
Federal Rule of Evidence 403
Federal Rule of Evidence 801
Federal Rule of Evidence 802
Federal Rule of Evidence 807
37 C.F.R. 42.62(a)1
Other
Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48758



I. Precise Relief Requested

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64, Patent Owner VirnetX Inc. ("Patent Owner") moves to exclude certain exhibits submitted by The Mangrove Partners Master Fund, Ltd. and Apple Inc. ("Petitioners"). This motion is timely filed in accordance with the Board's Scheduling Order (Paper No. 12). In particular, Patent Owner requests that Exhibits 1005, 1010, 1014, 1020, 1025, 1029, 1031-1033, 1037, and 1039-1042 be excluded from the record.

II. Legal Standard

The Federal Rules of Evidence apply to *inter partes* review proceedings. 37 C.F.R. § 42.62(a); Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48758. Under Federal Rule of Evidence 402, "irrelevant evidence is not admissible." Fed. R. Evid. 402. Also, unless an exception applies, an out of court statement offered for the truth of the matter asserted is inadmissible. Fed. R. Evid. 801, 802.

III. Exhibits 1005, 1010, 1014, 1020, 1025, 1029, 1031-1033, 1037, and 1039-1042 Should be Excluded from the Record

The Board should exclude Exhibits 1005, 1010, 1014, 1020, 1025, 1029, 1031-1033, 1037, and 1039-1042 because one or more of these exhibits includes evidence that is inadmissible hearsay or the evidence in these exhibits is irrelevant to the instant proceeding. Patent Owner timely objected to these exhibits stating the precise grounds under which these exhibits are inadmissible. Paper Nos. 14, 36, 54.



A. Exhibits 1025 and 1037 Constitute Inadmissible Hearsay

Exhibits 1025 and 1037 should be excluded as inadmissible hearsay. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-802. Patent Owner previously objected to these exhibits on this ground. Paper No. 14 at 1; Paper No. 54 at 1. Petitioners have failed to rebut Patent Owner's objections. As such, these exhibits should be excluded.

Specifically, absent an applicable exception, the rule against hearsay operates to prohibit out-of-court statements from being offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted. Fed. R. Evid. 801-802. Here, Petitioners submitted out-ofcourt statements, i.e., statements that were not made for purposes of the present proceeding, in an attempt to establish the meaning of disputed claim terms. See Paper No. 1 at 11; see also Paper 51 at 9. Because Petitioners rely on the alleged truth of the above out-of-court statements to attempt to establish the meaning of disputed claim terms, these out-of-court statements constitute hearsay and are inadmissible. The rules permit the introduction of former testimony, but only if the declarant is unavailable. Fed. R. Evid 804(b)(1); cf. Conoco Inc. v. Dep't of Energy, 99 F.3d 387, 393 (Fed. Cir. 1996) (concluding that the residual exception does not apply to evidence that nearly falls into a specific exception). Thus, the rules recognize that former statements carry credibility risks that must be guarded against.



DOCKET

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.

