

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TAIWAN SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING COMPANY, LTD.,
Petitioner

v.

GODO KAISHA IP BRIDGE 1,

Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-01246¹

PETITIONER'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO EXCLUDE

¹ Case IPR2016-01247 has been consolidated with this proceeding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Preliminary Statement1

II. Standard1

**III. Exhibit 1014 Is Admissible, and Exhibits 2061 Through 2076
Should Be Excluded.....1**

A. Patent Owner’s objection to Exhibit 1014 is irrelevant1

B. Patent Owner’s objection to Exhibit 1014 is untimely3

C. The Board should strike or exclude Patent Owner’s Exhibits
2061-2076 submitted in support of its Motion to Exclude *Ueda*
as irrelevant, improper.....4

**IV. Exhibits 1032, 1034–1035, 1042–1043, 1055 and 1057–1058 are
Relevant and Admissible.....5**

**V. Exhibits 1003, 1005–1009, 1011–1014, 1016, 1018, 1025–1055 and
1058, Submitted in Support of the Instituted Grounds But Not
Alleged As Invalidating Prior Art, Are Relevant and Admissible.....6**

VI. Exhibits 1025–1055 and 1057–1058 Are Timely and Proper8

**VII. The Board Should Deny Patent Owner’s Backdoor Motion to
Strike Petitioner’s Reply10**

VIII. Conclusion11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Federal Cases

Cross Med. Prod., Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.,
424 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2005)2

EMI Grp. N. Am., Inc. v. Cypress Semiconductor Corp.,
268 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2001)7

Genzyme Therapeutic Prod. Ltd. P’ship v. Biomarin Pharm. Inc.,
825 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2016)7

Lucent Techs., Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.,
537 F. Supp. 2d 1095 (S.D. Cal. 2008)2

Nat’l Steel Car, Ltd. v. Canadian Pac. Ry., Ltd.,
357 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2004)2

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103(c)1, 2, 3, 4

35 U.S.C. § 102(e)2

Rules

Fed. R. Evid. 4014, 6, 7

Fed. R. Evid. 4024, 6, 7

Fed. R. Evid. 4034, 6, 7

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.201, 5

37 C.F.R. § 42.644, 5, 10, 11

37 C.F.R. § 42.1235

IPR2016-01246, IPR2016-01247
Patent 7,126,174 B2

Other Authorities

<i>ABB, Inc. v. Roy-G-Biv Corp.</i> , IPR2013-00063, Paper 71 (P.T.A.B. May 16, 2014)	11
<i>Corning Inc. v. DSM IP Assets B.V.</i> , IPR2013-00047, Paper 84 (P.T.A.B. May 1, 2014)	11
<i>Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.</i> , CBM2012- 00002, Paper 66 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 23, 2014)	1
<i>Toshiba Corp. v. Optical Devices, LLC</i> , IPR2014-01447, Paper 34 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 9, 2016)	9, 10

I. Preliminary Statement

Patent Owner seeks to exclude virtually all of Petitioner's exhibits despite their obvious relevance and admissibility, and despite the lack of any legal basis for its motion. Such efforts run contrary to the Board's rules, and granting any of Patent Owner's requested relief would contradict the Board's interest in having a complete record.

II. Standard

As the movant, Patent Owner bears the burden of proving the challenged exhibits are inadmissible. 37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c); *Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.*, CBM2012-00002, Paper 66, at 59 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 23, 2014). Patent Owner failed to meet that burden for any objection.

III. Exhibit 1014 Is Admissible, and Exhibits 2061 Through 2076 Should Be Excluded

The Board should disregard Patent Owner's allegation that Exhibit 1014 ("*Ueda*") does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), *see* Paper 32, at 1–6, because the objection is irrelevant and untimely.

A. Patent Owner's objection to Exhibit 1014 is irrelevant

Patent Owner's theory that 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) justifies exclusion of Exhibit 1014 is both misguided and irrelevant to Petitioner's use of Exhibit 1014.

Petitioner does not rely on *Ueda* as an invalidating reference under 35 U.S.C.

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.