

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 7,329,970

**PETITIONERS' OPPOSITION TO PATENT OWNER'S MOTION TO
EXCLUDE PETITIONER'S EXHIBIT 1020**

Patent Owner's Motion to Exclude Exhibit 1020 — Petitioner's Second Declaration of Dr. Mark Horenstein — should be denied because the proper and fair remedy for the clerical error identified by Patent Owner is to file a corrected declaration, which Petitioner has already done. Furthermore, Patent Owner's allegation that the correction of Dr. Horenstein's declarations casts doubts on Dr. Horenstein's credibility goes to weight, not admissibility, of his testimony.

The Board has repeatedly resolved disputes over missing attestation paragraphs in declarations by accepting corrected versions of the declarations adding the missing paragraph. This remedy is appropriate because it leaves the substance of the declaration unchanged, and therefore does not prejudice the party opposing the correction. *See, e.g., Array BioPharma Inc. v. Takeda Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, IPR2015-00754, Paper No. 20 at 4-5 (October 21, 2015) (granting Petitioner's Motion to Submit Corrected Exhibits with attestation paragraph and finding that "Patent Owner has [not] argued persuasively that the corrections Petitioner proposes amount to substantive changes or would cause Patent Owner to suffer any prejudice"); *Microsoft Corp. v. Enfish, LLC*, IPR2013-00559-63, Paper No. 13 at 4 (January 23, 2014) ("the rule permitting correction of clerical errors is remedial in nature, and is, therefore, entitled to a liberal construction") (internal citations omitted); *Indoor Skydiving Germany GmbH v. Ifly Holdings LLC*, IPR2015-01272, Paper 11 at 2-3 (Sept. 30, 2015) ("correcting

the original Declaration, for example, by adding ‘I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct’ . . . would not change the substance of the statements set forth in paragraphs 1–47 of the original Declaration. Accordingly, we determine that granting Petitioner’s request would correct a clerical mistake, without prejudice to Patent Owner.”¹

On July 8, 2016, after receiving permission from the Board, Petitioner filed a corrected version of Exhibit 1020 that included an attestation paragraph missing from an earlier version of Exhibit 1020 filed on June 2, 2016. *See* Ex. 1023 (July 6, 2016 Email from Andrew Kellogg, PTAB Supervisory Paralegal). The inclusion of the attestation paragraph in corrected Exhibit 1020 did not amount to a substantive change in part because, as Dr. Horenstein testified, “[o]f course [he] wouldn’t sign a document that [he] didn’t testify before or stand behind.” Ex. 2007 (Deposition Transcript of Mark Horenstein dated June 28, 2016) at 18:8-9. Dr. Horenstein also testified that “[y]es,” he reviewed the declarations he signed on June 1, 2016. *Id.* at 81:11-14. Patent Owner is also not prejudiced by Petitioner’s

¹ Correction of Exhibit 1020 is also appropriate under 35 U.S.C. § 26. *See Array BioPharma Inc. v. Takeda Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, IPR2015-00754, Paper No. 17 at 5 (October 9, 2015) (relying on 35 U.S.C. § 26); *Presidio Components, Inc. v. AVX Corp.*, IPR2015-01332, Paper 13 at 3 (Aug. 21, 2015) (same).

filing of the corrected version of Exhibit 1020 because Patent Owner preserved the record by deposing Dr. Horenstein on the substance of his Second Declaration on June 28, 2016 and submitting a transcript thereof as Exhibit 2007.

Lastly, Patent Owner's Motion should be denied because if the arguments are valid at all, then they go to the weight of Dr. Horenstein's testimony, rather than its admissibility. *Informatica Corp. v. Protegrity Corp.*, CBM 2015-00021, Paper No. 38 at 1 (May 31, 2016) (“[T]he Board, sitting as a non-jury tribunal with administrative expertise, is well-positioned to determine and assign appropriate weight to the evidence presented in this trial, without resorting to formal exclusion that might later be held reversible error.”) (internal citations omitted); *see also Daiichi Sankyo Co., Ltd. v. Alethia Biotherapeutics, Inc.*, IPR2015-00291, Paper No. 75 at 24 (June 14, 2016). Patent Owner is free to present its credibility arguments at the hearing in this matter if it so chooses.²

² Patent Owner's suggestion that the rules require Dr. Horenstein to sign his declarations in ink is directly contradicted by the same rule that Patent Owner cites. IPR2015-01149, Paper No. 25 at 2. 37 C.F.R. 1.4 (d) provides that “[c]orrespondence permitted via the Office electronic filing system may be signed by a **graphic representation of a handwritten signature**.” 37 C.F.R. 1.4(d)(3) (emphasis added); *see also Seoul Semiconductor Co., Ltd. v. Enplas Corp.*, IPR2014-00878, Paper No. 34 at 7-8 (October 15, 2015) (disregarding Patent

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioner respectfully requests that Patent Owner's Motion to Exclude Exhibit 1020 be denied.

Dated: July 13, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel J. Goettle/

Daniel J. Goettle
Registration No. 50,983
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP
2929 Arch Street
Cira Centre, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: 215.568.3100
Facsimile: 215.568.3439
dgoettle@bakerlaw.com

Attorney for Petitioners
MICROSOFT CORPORATION and
MICROSOFT MOBILE, INC.

Owner's argument that Petitioner's expert testimony was not trustworthy or credible in part because the expert's signature was an electronic image of a signature). In any event, Dr. Horenstein signed the corrected version of Exhibit 1020 in ink.

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.