

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

THE MANGROVE PARTNERS MASTER FUND, LTD., and APPLE INC., and  
BLACK SWAMP IP, LLC,  
Petitioners,

v.

VIRNETX INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case No. IPR2015-01047<sup>1</sup>  
U.S. Patent No. 7,490,151

---

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Apple Inc. and Black Swamp IP, LLC, who filed a petitions in IPR2016-00063 and IPR2016-00167, respectively, have been joined as a Petitioner in the instant proceeding.

**Table of Contents**

I. Introduction.....1

II. Argument .....1

    A. Exhibits 1029 and 1031-1033 Are Admissible Under Fed. R. Evid. 807.....1

    B. Exhibits 1034, 1037, 1039-1042 Are Admissible.....8

        1. Exhibits 1037, 1041, and 1042 Are Not Hearsay. ....8

        2. Exhibits 1034, 1037, 1039-1042 Are Admissible Under Fed. R. Evid. 803(16), 803(17), and/or 807. ....9

    C. Exhibits 1010, 1012-1014, and 1044 Are Relevant.....14

III. Conclusion .....15

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Smartflash LLC</i> , CBM2014-00180, Paper 50 (Sep. 25, 2015) .....	14
<i>CA Inc. v. Simplecom Inc.</i> , 780 F. Supp. 2d 169 (E.D. N.Y. 2009) .....	2
<i>Conoco Inc. v. Dept. of Energy</i> , 99 F.3d 387 (Fed. Cir. 1996) .....	8, 11
<i>Doe v. United States</i> , 976 F.2d 1071 (7th Cir. 1992), <i>cert. denied</i> 510 U.S. 812 (1993) .....	1
<i>Ericsson Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC</i> , IPR2014-00527, Paper 41 (May 18, 2015).....	6, 8, 11, 13
<i>IBM Corp. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC</i> , IPR2015-00089, Paper 44 (Apr. 25, 2016).....	1, 7
<i>OddzOnProducts, Inc. v. Just Toys, Inc.</i> , 122 F.3d 1396 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....	13
<i>PGMedia, Inc. v. Network Solutions, Inc.</i> , 51 F. Supp. 2d 389 (S.D.N.Y. 1999) .....	6
<i>Poole v. Textron, Inc.</i> , 192 F.R.D. 494 (D. Md. 2000) .....	5
<i>QSC Audio Prods., LLC v. Crest Audio, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00127, Paper 43 (Apr. 29, 2015).....	10, 12
<i>Ultratec, Inc. v. Sorenson Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , No. 13-CV-346, 2014 WL 4829173 (W.D. Wis. Sept. 29, 2014).....	5
<i>United States v. North</i> , 910 F.2d 843 (D.C. Cir. 1990) <i>cert. denied</i> 500 U.S. 941 (1991).....	1

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 316(b) .....6

**Other Authorities**

37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b) .....6

37 C.F.R. § 42.65 ..... 14

Fed. R. Civ. P. 32(a)(8).....5

Fed. R. Evid. 401 ..... 14

Fed. R. Evid. 402 ..... 14

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

Fed. R. Evid. 803(16).....9

Fed. R. Evid. 803(17)..... 10, 11

Fed. R. Evid. 807 .....*passim*

## I. Introduction

The evidence of record establishes that Exhibits 1010, 1012-1014, 1029, 1031-1034, 1037, 1039-1042 and 1044 are admissible. Patent Owner has failed to show otherwise, and thus, its motion must be denied. *See* Paper 66 (“Mot.”).

## II. Argument

### A. Exhibits 1029 and 1031-1033 Are Admissible Under Fed. R. Evid. 807.

Patent Owner seeks to exclude Exhibits 1029 and 1031-1033 as inadmissible hearsay, Mot. at 3-5, but these exhibits, to the extent they are hearsay, fall within an exception to the hearsay rule. 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. *IBM Corp. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC*, IPR2015-00089, Paper 44 at 55-56 (Apr. 25, 2016) (*citing Doe v. United States*, 976 F.2d 1071, 1076–77 (7th Cir. 1992), *cert. denied* 510 U.S. 812 (1993); *United States v. North*, 910 F.2d 843,

# 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.