

IPR2016-01208
Patent 7,746,916 B2

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE, INC., HTC CORPORATION, HTC AMERICA, INC., MICROSOFT CORPORATION, MICROSOFT MOBILE OY, MICROSOFT MOBILE, INC., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., and ZTE (USA) INC.,

Petitioner,
v.

EVOLVED WIRELESS, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-01208¹
Patent 7,746,916 B2

Before CHRISTOPHER L. CRUMBLEY, PATRICK M. BOUCHER, and
TERRENCE W. McMILLIN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PATENT OWNER EVOLVED WIRELESS, LLC'S
FIRST SET OF OBJECTIONS TO PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS
37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1)

¹ IPR2016-01277 has been consolidated with this proceeding.

IPR2016-01208
Patent 7,746,916 B2

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), Evolved Wireless, LLC (“Patent Owner” or “Evolved Wireless”) objects to Petitioner’s Exhibits 1003, 1017, 1020 1031, and 1032. Patent Owner further objects to any reference to or reliance on the foregoing, including but not limited to citations in the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (“Petition”). Patent Owner’s objections below apply the Federal Rules of Evidence (“F.R.E.”) as required by 37 C.F.R § 42.62.

I. Exhibit 1003

Patent Owner objects to Petitioner’s Exhibit 1003 (Declaration of Jonathan Wells). Evolved Wireless further objects to any reference to or reliance on Exhibit 1003, including but not limited to citations in the Petition.

Patent Owner’s objections are based on the following grounds: F.R.E. 702 (“Testimony by Expert Witnesses”); F.R.E. 403 (“Excluding Relevant Evidence for Prejudice, Confusion, Waste of Time, or Other Reasons”).

The witness providing the declaration attached as Exhibit 1003 provides insufficient underlying facts or data upon which the opinions contained in Exhibit 1003 could legitimately be based, in violation of F.R.E. 702. Accordingly, permitting any reliance on this purported expert testimony in the Response or other submissions of Patent Owner would be misleading and unfairly prejudicial to Petitioners under F.R.E. 403.

II. Exhibit 1017

Evolved Wireless objects to Petitioner’s Exhibit 1017 (“N. Abramson, THE ALOHA SYSTEM—Another alternative for computer communications”). Evolved Wireless further objects to any reference to or reliance on Exhibit 1017, including but not limited to citations in the Petition.

Evolved Wireless’s objections are based on the following grounds: 37 C.F.R. § 42.61 (“Admissibility”); F.R.E. 901 (“Authenticating or Identifying Evidence”); F.R.E. 403 (“Excluding Relevant Evidence for Prejudice, Confusion, Waste of Time, or Other Reasons”); F.R.E. 801, 802 (“Hearsay”).

Petitioner has not provided any evidence or declaration to authenticate this document, in violation of F.R.E. 901. Petitioner cites to pages of and statements in Exhibit 1017 as evidence of the ALOHA protocol, thus improperly attempting to offer these statements from Exhibit 1017 to prove the truth of the matter asserted, which is inadmissible hearsay to which Petitioner has not demonstrated any exception. F.R.E. 801, 802. Accordingly, the statements are inadmissible and permitting any reliance on Exhibit 1017 for this purpose in the Petition or other submission of Petitioner would be misleading and unfairly prejudicial to Evolved Wireless under F.R.E. 403.

III. Exhibit 1020

Evolved Wireless objects to Petitioner's Exhibit 1020 ("D.C. Chu, Polyphase codes with good periodic correlation properties"). Evolved Wireless further objects to any reference to or reliance on Exhibit 1020, including but not limited to citations in the Petition.

Evolved Wireless's objections are based on the following grounds: 37 C.F.R. § 42.61 ("Admissibility"); F.R.E. 901 ("Authenticating or Identifying Evidence"); F.R.E. 403 ("Excluding Relevant Evidence for Prejudice, Confusion, Waste of Time, or Other Reasons"); F.R.E. 801, 802 ("Hearsay").

Petitioner has not provided any evidence or declaration to authenticate this document, in violation of F.R.E. 901. Petitioner cites to pages of and statements in Exhibit 1020 as proof of the development of CAZAC sequences, thus improperly attempting to offer these statements from Exhibit 1020 to prove the truth of the matter asserted, which is inadmissible hearsay to which Petitioner has not demonstrated any exception. F.R.E. 801, 802. Accordingly, the statements are inadmissible and permitting any reliance on Exhibit 1020 for this purpose in the Petition or other submission of Petitioner would be misleading and unfairly prejudicial to Evolved Wireless under F.R.E. 403.

IV. Exhibit 1031

Evolved Wireless objects to Petitioner's Exhibit 1031 ("Motorola, Inc. 2004 Annual Report to Stockholders"). Evolved Wireless further objects to any reference to or reliance on Exhibit 1031, including but not limited to citations in the Petition.

Evolved Wireless's objections are based on the following grounds: 37 C.F.R. § 42.61 ("Admissibility"); F.R.E. 901 ("Authenticating or Identifying Evidence"); F.R.E. 403 ("Excluding Relevant Evidence for Prejudice, Confusion, Waste of Time, or Other Reasons"); F.R.E. 801, 802 ("Hearsay").

Petitioner has not provided any evidence or declaration to authenticate this document, in violation of F.R.E. 901. Petitioner cites to pages of and statements in Exhibit 1031 as proof that Motorola "touts the global reach of their handset business, and emphasizes its sales to the largest national cellular carrier around the work [sic]," thus improperly attempting to offer these statements from Exhibit 1031 to prove the truth of the matter asserted, which is inadmissible hearsay to which Petitioner has not demonstrated any exception. F.R.E. 801, 802.

Accordingly, the statements are inadmissible and permitting any reliance on Exhibit 1031 for this purpose in the Petition or other submission of Petitioner would be misleading and unfairly prejudicial to Evolved Wireless under F.R.E. 403.

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.