

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

LG ELECTRONICS, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

CORE WIRELESS LICENSING S.A.R.L.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2015-01984  
Patent 8,434,020 B2

---

**PATENT OWNER'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE  
PETITIONER'S EVIDENCE**

Pursuant to the Scheduling Order dated March 17, 2016 (Paper 8), Patent Owner timely moves to exclude Petitioner's evidence as follows:

**Ex. 1010**

1. Identity of the exhibit and portion to be excluded: Ex. 1010 to be excluded in entirety. Ex. 1010 purports to be an excerpt from a 12/99 issue of Popular Science. *See* Petitioner's Reply at iii.
2. Objection: Fed. R. Evid. 402/403 (relevance), 801 (hearsay), 901 (authentication).
3. Patent Owner filed and served the foregoing objections to Ex. 1010 on October 7, 2016. Petitioner has not served supplemental evidence to remedy these objections.
4. Ex. 1010 is cited to by Dr. Rhyne as evidence that the "Ericsson R380 was known to those of ordinary skill in the art prior to the [*sic*] July 2000." Ex. 1015, ¶¶14, 17. However, Petitioner included no declaration or evidence establishing the authenticity of Ex. 1010. Dr. Rhyne's testimony confirms that he received Ex. 1010 from the attorneys representing LG, and therefore he cannot authenticate Ex. 1010. *See* Ex. 2011 at 11:11-12:7.
5. Dr. Rhyne also relies upon Ex. 1010 for the truth of the statements presented therein, including alleged features and availability of the

Ericsson R380. *See* Ex. 1015, ¶14. Ex. 1010 is hearsay that does not satisfy any exception.

6. Finally, Ex. 1010 lacks disclosure that is relevant to any issue in this proceeding. Specifically, Ex. 1010 fails to establish that the purported Ericsson device (R380) was publicly available or known to a POSITA prior to the critical date, and therefore is irrelevant to any issue in this proceeding.

#### **Ex. 1011**

1. Identity of the exhibit and portion to be excluded: Ex. 1011 to be excluded in entirety. Ex. 1011 purports to be a User's Guide for Ericsson R380s. *See* Petitioner's Reply at iii.
2. Objection: Fed. R. Evid. 402/403 (relevance), 801 (hearsay), 901 (authentication).
3. Patent Owner filed and served the foregoing objections to Ex. 1011 on October 7, 2016. Petitioner has not served supplemental evidence to remedy these objections.
4. Ex. 1011 is cited to by Dr. Rhyne as evidence that the "Ericsson R380 was known to those of ordinary skill in the art prior to the [*sic*] July 2000." Ex. 1015, ¶¶13, 17. However, Petitioner included no declaration

or evidence establishing the authenticity of Ex. 1011. Dr. Rhyne's testimony confirms that he received Ex. 1011 from the attorneys representing LG, and therefore he cannot authenticate Ex. 1011. *See* Ex. 2011 at 12:8-14:8.

5. Petitioner relies upon Ex. 1011 for the truth of the statements presented therein, including the alleged date of publication and features of the Ericsson R380. *See* Ex. 1015, ¶13. Ex. 1011 is hearsay that does not satisfy any exception.
6. Finally, Ex. 1011 lacks disclosure that is relevant to any issue in this proceeding. Specifically, Ex. 1011 fails to establish that the purported Ericsson device (R380) was publicly available or known to a POSITA prior to the critical date, and therefore is irrelevant to any issue in this proceeding.

### **Ex. 1012**

1. Identity of the exhibit and portion to be excluded: Ex. 1012 to be excluded in entirety. Ex. 1012 purports to be a Press release dated 3/18/99 from Open Mobile Alliance. *See* Petitioner's Reply at iii.
2. Objection: Fed. R. Evid. 402/403 (relevance), 801 (hearsay), 901 (authentication).

3. Patent Owner filed and served the foregoing objections to Ex. 1012 on October 7, 2016. Petitioner has not served supplemental evidence to remedy these objections.
4. Ex. 1012 is cited to by Dr. Rhyne as evidence that the “Ericsson R380 was known to those of ordinary skill in the art prior to the [*sic*] July 2000.” Ex. 1015, ¶¶15, 17. However, Petitioner included no declaration or evidence establishing the authenticity of Ex. 1012. Dr. Rhyne’s testimony confirms that he received Ex. 1012 from the attorneys representing LG, and therefore he cannot authenticate Ex. 1012. *See* Ex. 2011 at 14:11-15:10.
5. Petitioner relies upon Ex. 1012 for the truth of the statements presented therein, including alleged features and availability of the Ericsson R380. *See* Ex. 1015, ¶15. Ex. 1012 is hearsay that does not satisfy any exception.
6. Finally, Ex. 1012 lacks disclosure that is relevant to any issue in this proceeding. Specifically, Ex. 1012 fails to establish that the purported Ericsson device (R380) was publicly available or known to a POSITA prior to the critical date, and therefore is irrelevant to any issue in this proceeding.

# 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.