

Paper \_\_\_\_\_

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION and MICROSOFT MOBILE, INC.,  
Petitioners

v.

GLOBAL TOUCH SOLUTIONS, LLC  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2015-01149  
Patent No. 7,329,970 B2

---

**PATENT OWNER'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE**

## **I. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED**

Patent Owner Global Touch Solutions, LLC (“PO” herein) moves to exclude the Second Declaration of Mark Horenstein, Exhibit 1020. PO timely objected to this “Declaration” on June 8, 2016 – see Patent Owner’s Objection to Evidence, Notice 21. Petitioners rely extensively on Exhibit 1020 in Petitioners’ Reply to Patent Owner’s Response to the Petition. *See, e.g.*, pages 3,5, and 13 (where a new argument is presented in Horenstein’s Declaration that is neither responsive to an argument presented by PO nor based on information discovered after Horenstein’s First Declaration, and is thus untimely).

The Second Declaration of Horenstein should be excluded. It lacks any sort of representation that the statements presented are true or even believed to be true, and cross-examination reflected the Declarant’s belief that such guarantees of trustworthiness and believability are “boilerplate” that he pays no attention to. Transcript of the Deposition of Horenstein, Exhibit 2007. Indeed, the witness testified that the “execution” of Exhibit 1020 lacks an original signature, a requirement of the Rules applicable herein, including 37 C.F.R. §1.68, and corresponding evidentiary requirements of the Federal Rules. The document that is Exhibit 1020 is nothing more than hearsay, and inadmissible.

Exclusion is respectfully requested.

## II. ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE REQUESTED RELIEF

PO submits that the governing law on the question of the inadmissible character of Petitioners' Exhibit 1020 is beyond dispute. Testimony that is not compelled, and the "Second Declaration of Horenstein" that is Exhibit 1020 was not compelled, must be submitted in the form of an affidavit. 37 C.F.R. §42.53(a).

Testimony that is not submitted in compliance with this Rule is inadmissible.

*Lowe's Home Centers, LLC v. Reddy*, 2016 WL 1275315 \*8 (PTAB) and *Coalition for Affordable Drugs IX, LLC v. Bristol Myers Squibb, Co.*, 2016 WL 1082935 fn.4 ("Uncompelled direct testimony "must be submitted in the form of an affidavit" otherwise it is not admissible") citing 37 C.F.R. §42.53(a), 42.61(a).

Further, Exhibit 1020 lacks an original signature. The witness testified as to the true nature of the execution of Exhibit 1020 during his deposition, indicating he did not sign the document, but instead caused an electronic reproduction of a graphic image to attach to it. Exhibit 2007, 10:20 – 25. 37 C.F.R. § 1.4 (d) requires all documents that have to be signed to reflect the person's "original handwritten signature personally signed...by that person". While not controlling in an IPR, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b) includes a parallel provision for expert reports, which are not dissimilar from the type of expert Declaration submitted in this IPR. The requirement for an original signature is present for the

same type of credibility and reliability issues met by an original signature and jurat, both missing in the Second Declaration of Mark Horenstein, Exhibit 1020. Clearly, the Second Declaration of Horenstein, Exhibit 1020, does not meet the requirements of the Rules. Having timely objected to the Exhibit during the deposition, exclusion on this basis is requested as well.

In this regard, PO notes that none of the Declarations submitted by Petitioners in the series of IPRs between PO and Petitioners (IPRs 2015-01147, 2015-01148, 2015-01149, 2015-01150, and 2015-01151) bear an original signature or a jurat or statement certifying their reliability. While not all of those Declarations were in fact objected to, none are competent to be considered, for the reasons discussed above. Simply because an Exhibit is not objected to does not mean this Board must accept it as admissible. The Board has discretion to decline to consider any document not admissible. Patent Owner urges the Board to decline to consider such clearly inadmissible documents as the Horenstein Declarations and the Second Horenstein Declarations in each of the identified IPRs.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 6, 2016

/s/ Steven B. Kelber  
Steven B. Kelber  
Reg. No: 30,073  
The Kelber Law Group  
1875 Eye Street, N.W., Fifth Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
E-Mail: [steve@kelberlawgroup.com](mailto:steve@kelberlawgroup.com)  
Tel: (240) 506-6702

Nathan Cristler  
Reg. No: 61,736  
Cristler IP, PLLC  
1801 21<sup>st</sup> Road North  
Arlington, Virginia 22209  
E-Mail: [ncristler@crislerip.com](mailto:ncristler@crislerip.com)  
Tel: (512) 576-5166

Counsel for Patent Owner

# 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.