

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COSTCO WHOLESALE CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

ROBERT BOSCH LLC,
Patent Owner.

CASE NO. IPR2016-00040
U.S. Patent No. 7,484,264

**PATENT OWNER'S OPPOSITION TO PETITIONER'S MOTION TO
STRIKE TESTIMONY OF WILFRIED MERKEL**

Table of Authorities

Cases

Clay v. Johns–Manville Sales Corp.,
722 F.2d 1289 (6th Cir. 1983) 1

Lloyd v. Am. Export Lines, Inc.,
580 F.2d 1179 (3d Cir. 1978) 1

Robert Bosch LLC v. Pylon Mfg. Corp.,
659 F.3d 1142 (Fed. Cir. 2011) 3

Supermarket of Marlinton, Inc. v. Meadow Gold Diaries, Inc.,
71 F.3d 119 (4th Cir. 1995) 1

Administrative Proceedings

HTC Corp. v. NFC Technology, LLC,
IPR2014-01198, Paper No. 41 (PTAB Nov. 6, 2015)..... 5

Square, Inc. v. REM Holdings 3, LLC,
IPR2014-00312, Paper No. 37 (PTAB Dec. 2014) 5

Rules

Fed. R. Civ. P. 30 5

Fed. R. Civ. P. 31 5

Fed. R. Evid. 104 2

Fed. R. Evid. 804 1

Fed. R. Evid. 807 3

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.124
37 C.F.R. § 42.513, 4
37 C.F.R. § 42.524
37 C.F.R. § 42.535

Other Materials

Black’s Law Dictionary (9th ed. 2009).....5

Costco seeks to exclude from evidence what it calls the “hearsay testimony” of a non-party inventor, given under oath in federal court subject to cross-examination, because Mr. Merkel’s failing health prevents him from sitting for live deposition in the United States. Costco’s motion rests on two faulty assumptions: that Mr. Merkel’s 2010 testimony standing alone is inadmissible under the Federal Rules of Evidence, and that the PTO’s rules create an absolute right to oral cross-examination in the United States.

Mr. Merkel’s trial testimony is admissible under Rule 804(b)(1). When a witness is unavailable, his prior testimony “given as a witness at a trial” is admissible if “offered against a party . . . whose predecessor in interest had . . . an opportunity and similar motive to develop it by direct, cross-, or redirect examination.” A “predecessor in interest” is “a party having a like motive to cross-examine about the same matters as the present party would have” and who “was accorded an adequate opportunity for such examination.” *Lloyd v. Am. Export Lines, Inc.*, 580 F.2d 1179, 1187 (3d Cir. 1978); see *Supermarket of Marlinton, Inc. v. Meadow Gold Diaries, Inc.*, 71 F.3d 119, 128 (4th Cir. 1995); *Clay v. Johns–Manville Sales Corp.*, 722 F.2d 1289, 1295 (6th Cir. 1983).

Mr. Merkel’s declaration—which was served as supplemental evidence to overcome Costco’s initial hearsay objection—establishes his unavailability. Fed. R. Evid. 804(a)(5) (“cannot be present . . . because of . . . a then-existing infirmity,

[or] physical illness . . .”). Mr. Merkel has declared under penalty of perjury that, “for reasons of cardiac health, [he has] been advised that [he] should not travel and should minimize [his] activities.”¹ Ex. 1106 at 7. Costco does not dispute this.

Mr. Merkel’s prior testimony was “given as a witness at a trial,” (Ex. 2005 at 1), and is being offered against Costco, whose “predecessor in interest had . . . an opportunity and similar motive to develop it.” In the trial, defendant Pylon was asserting the obviousness of Bosch wiper patents, including two at issue here, U.S. Patent Nos. 6,292,974 and 6,944,905, (*id.* at 22), relying on some of the same prior art as Costco has asserted in IPRs 2016-00034 and 38–41, (*id.* at 162:25–163:2). The Merkel testimony is offered to prove that: (i) no commercially viable beam blades existed before 2002, when Bosch satisfied the long-felt need for them, (*id.* at 346:16–348:2); (ii) Bosch’s first commercial beam blade (Aerotwin) and later product (Icon) practice the challenged claims, (*id.* at 353:22–354:1); (iii) these blades included a flexible spoiler with diverging legs mounted on top of the blade, as well as plastic end caps, (*id.* at 359:12–360:4); and (iv) beam blades are sensitive to changes caused by adding structures, (*id.* at 388:23–391:8). This testimony was relevant in the Pylon trial for the same reasons as here—because it is probative regarding objective evidence of non-obviousness and the knowledge in

¹ The Board is not bound by the rules of evidence when evaluating the sufficiency of Mr. Merkel’s declaration *vis-a-vis* unavailability. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 104(a).

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.