UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

UMICORE AG & CO. KG

Petitioner

V.

BASF CORPORATION

Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-01124 Patent 8,404,203

OBJECTIONS TO PATENT OWNER'S EVIDENCE CITED IN ITS FORMAL RESPONSE



Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), Petitioner Umicore AG & Co. KG ("Umicore" or "Petitioner") hereby objects to the exhibits cited and relied upon in Patent Owner's February 12, 2016 response and the associated Declaration of Dr. Michael Tsapatsis on the following grounds. For each objected to exhibit, the pertinent Federal Rule of Evidence ("FRE") or other rule that gives rise to the objection is provided, along with a brief summary of the basis of the objection.

I. Exhibits 2018 to 2035

1. Ex. 2018 – Declaration of Dr. Michael Tsapatsis. Petitioner objects to the following paragraphs of Ex. 2018:

Paragraph	Objection
¶ 28	FRE 402. This paragraph is irrelevant. The paragraph
	discusses purported research activities of BASF. The
	record is entirely bereft of any foundational evidence,
	including who conducted the referenced work, whether
	that person or persons had ordinary skill in the art, and
	the purpose of the work, among other things. Further,
	even if supported by adequate foundational evidence, the
	purported activities of BASF are irrelevant to claim scope
	and the express disclosure of the prior art references at
	issue.



FRE 602. The statements and opinions in this paragraph are inadmissible because they are not based on the witness's own personal knowledge.

FRE 702. The statements and opinions set forth in this paragraph are not based on sufficient facts or data.

FRE 802. This paragraph improperly cites the out of court statements of Dr. Moini in Ex. 2003 to establish the truth of the matter asserted.

947-49

FRE 402. The paragraphs reference published papers purportedly discussing catalytic materials of BASF. The record is entirely bereft of necessary foundational evidence, including the purported characteristics of the material being tested, who conducted the referenced work, whether that person or persons had ordinary skill in the art, and the purpose of the work, among other things. Even if true, the purported activities of BASF are irrelevant to claim scope and the express disclosure of the prior art references at issue.

FRE 602. The statements and opinions in these paragraphs are not based on the witness's own personal



	[
	knowledge.
	FRE 702. The statements and opinions set forth in these
	paragraphs are not based on sufficient facts or data, and
	are not the result of the application of accepted and
	reliable principles and methods to the facts of the case.
	FRE 802. This paragraph improperly cites out of court
	statements in Exs. 2002, 2004, and 2010 to establish the
	truth of the matter asserted.
¶¶ 54-55	FRE 602. The statements and opinions in these
	paragraphs are inadmissible because they are not based
	on the witness's own personal knowledge.
	FRE 702. The statements and opinions set forth in these
	paragraphs are not based on sufficient facts or data, and
	are not the result of the application of reliable scientific
	principles and methods.
¶ 61	FRE 402. This paragraph cites a paper published in
	2015, and thus is irrelevant for purposes of establishing
	the state of the art and the beliefs of those of ordinary
	skill as of the '662 and '203 patent's effective filing
	dates.



	FRE 702. The statements and opinions set forth in this
	paragraph are not based on sufficient facts or data.
¶¶ 62-63	FRE 602. The statements and opinions in this paragraph
	are inadmissible because they are not based on the
	witness's own personal knowledge.
	FRE 702. The statements and opinions set forth in these
	paragraph are not based on sufficient facts or data, and
	are not the result of the application of reliable scientific
	principles and methods.
¶¶ 64-71	FRE 602. The statements and opinions in these
	paragraphs are inadmissible because they are not based
	on the witness's own personal knowledge.
	FRE 802. These paragraphs improperly cite out of court
	statements in Ex. 2002, 2012, 2022, and 2024 to establish
	the truth of the matter asserted.
¶¶ 73-75	FRE 602. The statements and opinions in these
	paragraphs are inadmissible because they are not based
	on the witness's own personal knowledge.
	FRE 802. These paragraphs improperly cite out of court
	statements in Ex. 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2032 to establish



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.

