UNITED STAT	ES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE	PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD
M	CROSOFT CORPORATION, Petitioner
	v.
BRA	DIUM TECHNOLOGIES LLC, Patent Owner
	CASE IPR2016-00449 Patent 8,924,506

### PATENT OWNER BRADIUM TECHNOLOGIES LLC'S **OPPOSITION TO PETITIONER'S** MOTION TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Exhibits 2051–2053 (Kenwood Car Navigation System Brochures) Should Not Be Excluded		
II.	Exhibit 2021 (Press Release Describing Frost & Sullivan Award) Should Not Be Excluded		.6
•		Press Releases (Exhibits 2030, 2032, 2039, 2045–48, 2063) Should Be Excluded	.6
	A.	Exhibits 2030 and 2032 (Press Releases Concerning Kenwood System) Should Not Be Excluded	.7
	B.	Exhibit 2039 Should Not Be Excluded	.7
	C.	Exhibits 2045–2047 Should Not Be Excluded	.8
	D.	Exhibit 2048 (Directions Magazine Press Release Titled "3DVU's Mobile Navigation Best Seller on Sprint's Shop) Should Not Be Excluded	.9
	E.	Exhibit 2063 Should Not Be Excluded	.9
IV.	Exhib	oit 2044 (TechNode Article) Should Not Be Exluded1	.0
V.	Exhibits 2035 and 2036 (C.E. Unterberg Towbin Reports) Should Not Be Excluded		.0
VI.	Exhibit 2049 (VC Cafe Article) Should Not Be Excluded		2
VII.	Exhibit 2059 (Microsoft Website) Should Not Be Excluded		.2
VIII.	Exhibits 2016–2017 (Microsoft R&D Spending) Should Not be Excluded .13		.3
IX.	Exhibit 2018 (Frost & Sullivan Website) Should Not Be Excluded13		
X	Conclusion 14		



### **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

#### Cases

Petition for Inter Partes Review by Toyota Motors North America, Inc. IPR2014-00280, Paper 17 (P.T.A.B. July 2, 2014)	5
KW Plastics v. US. Can Co., 130 F. Supp. 2d 1297 (M.D. Ala. 2001)	4
Mueller v. Abdnor, 972 F.2d 931 (8th Cir. 1992)	5
United States v. Koch, 625 F.3d 470 (8th Cir. 2010)	5
Other Authorities	
F.R.E. 801 Advisory Committee Note, 1972 Proposed Rule, Note to Subdivision (c)	4
Rules	
37 C.F.R. § 42.62(a)	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c)	1
F.R.E. 801(c)	
F.R.E. 801(d)(2)	
F.R.E. 801(d)(2)	
F.R.E. 803(3)	
F.R.E. 803(6)	
Treatises	
2 JOHN W. STRONG ET AL., MCCORMICK ON EVIDENCE, § 249 at 101 (4th ed. 1992)	5
6 JOHN H. WIGMORE, EVIDENCE, § 1770 at 259 (James H. Chadbourn rev. ed. 1976)	



Pursuant to the Board's Scheduling Order dated July 27, 2016 (Paper 10) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c), Patent Owner Bradium Technologies LLC ("Bradium") responds to Petitioner's Motion to Exclude Evidence (Paper 42), which seeks to exclude twenty of Patent Owner's Exhibits, Nos. 2016–18, 2021, 2030, 2032, 2035–36, 2039, 2044–49, 2051–53, 2059, and 2063.<sup>1</sup>

The Board should deny Microsoft's motion. Microsoft's hearsay objection fails because these exhibits are either Microsoft's own statements or are used by Bradium for non-hearsay purposes. Microsoft's objection to the completeness of the translations of Exhibits 2051–53 also fails, because Mr. Levanon relies on the English-language portions of the exhibits and the graphics and logos included in the exhibits. Also, the relevant and necessary portions of the exhibits were translated, and the accuracy of that translation is undisputed.

## I. EXHIBITS 2051–2053 (KENWOOD CAR NAVIGATION SYSTEM BROCHURES) SHOULD NOT BE EXCLUDED

Exhibits 2051–2053 are Kenwood car navigation system brochures

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In this motion, "F.R.E." refers to the Federal Rules of Evidence, which generally apply to this proceeding. 37 C.F.R. § 42.62(a).



į
•
У

The Board should not exclude Exhibits 2051–53, Kenwood (DENSO) car navigation system brochures, on either hearsay or completeness grounds, as Microsoft contends.

Microsoft's hearsay objection fails for several reasons. First, the documents are business documents, were created by Kenwood, and provided to Mr. Levanon. *See* F.R.E. 803(6) (business records exception to hearsay). Though as explained below the documents are not used for the truth of what they state, even if they were so used, the documents would be admissible.

Second, Bradium does not rely on the brochures for the truth of what they state, for example that any particular 3DVU technology was present in the



# 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.

