

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company Limited  
Petitioner,

v.

Godo Kaisha IP Bridge 1  
Patent Owner.

---

*Inter Partes* Review No. IPR2016-01249  
U.S. Patent No. 6,538,324

---

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

II. ARGUMENT .....1

    A. Patent Owner Was Served with Exhibit 1037 in a Related Litigation  
    and Cannot Deny Exhibit 1037 Is Authentic. ....1

    B. Exhibit 1037 Is Admissible Under Fed. R. Evid. 901(b)(4) Because  
    Its Authenticity Is Apparent on Its Face. ....2

    C. Additional Evidence Proves the Authenticity of Exhibit 1037 .....4

    D. The Board Should Disregard Patent Owner’s Hearsay Objection  
    Because TSMC Did Not Offer Exhibit 1037 to Prove the Truth of  
    Any Statements in that Exhibit. ....6

III. CONCLUSION .....7

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases**

*Link v. Mercedes-Benz of N. Am., Inc.*, 788 F.2d 918, 927 (3rd Cir. 1986) .....3  
*McQueeney v. Wilmington Trust Co.*, 779 F.2d 916, 927 (3d Cir. 1985).....2  
*United States v. Dhinsa*, 243 F.3d 635, 658 (2d Cir. 2001) .....2  
*United States v. Figueroa*, 818 F.2d 1020, 1026-1027 (1st Cir. 1987) .....6

**Rules**

Fed. R. Evid. 1004(c) .....2  
Fed. R. Evid. 801(c)(2) .....6  
Fed. R. Evid. 901(a) .....2  
Fed. R. Evid. 901(b)(4) ..... 2, 3, 5, 6  
Patent Rule 3-3 Invalidation Contentions.....3, 4

## I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner denies the authenticity of a copy of the invalidity contentions it received in litigation, Exhibit 1037, even though Patent Owner refused to explain why this exhibit is different from the one it received. *See* Ex. 1040. Patent Owner did not even submit its own copy of the invalidity contentions to identify any differences. Exhibit 1037 is authentic on its face, and the other evidence TSMC submitted confirms its authenticity.

The Board should also reject Patent Owner's hearsay objection because TSMC did not submit Exhibit 1037 to prove the truth of the contents of the document, but rather to show Patent Owner was aware of certain information it failed to bring to the Board's attention when filing its Contingent Motion to Amend the Claims. *See* Paper 20.

## II. ARGUMENT

### A. Patent Owner Was Served with Exhibit 1037 in a Related Litigation and Cannot Deny Exhibit 1037 Is Authentic.

Exhibit 1037 is a document Patent Owner was served with during a related litigation it brought in the Eastern District of Texas. *See* Ex. 1039A. Patent Owner can determine whether the document is the same as the copy it received rather than burden the Board with this unnecessary exercise. On June 2, 2017, TSMC asked Patent Owner to do so or withdraw its objection for lack of authenticity. Ex. 1040. Patent Owner refused, but never identified any reason to justify its authenticity

objection to Exhibit 1037. *Id.* Its motion to exclude still does not justify its objection to authenticity

TSMC asks the Board to presume Exhibit 1037 is authentic unless Patent Owner can identify a specific reason why it is not (which it cannot do). *Cf.* Fed. R. Evid. 1004(c).

**B. Exhibit 1037 Is Admissible Under Fed. R. Evid. 901(b)(4) Because Its Authenticity Is Apparent on Its Face.**

Fed. R. Evid. 901(a) requires parties to provide “evidence sufficient to support a finding that the item is what the proponent claims,” a low threshold. *McQueeney v. Wilmington Trust Co.*, 779 F.2d 916, 927 (3d Cir. 1985) (“The burden of proof for authentication is slight”). “If in the court’s judgment it seems reasonably probable that the evidence is what it purports to be, the command of Rule 901(a) is satisfied.” *United States v. Dhinsa*, 243 F.3d 635, 658 (2d Cir. 2001) (internal quotation marks omitted); *see* Fed. R. Evid. 901(a).

Under Fed. R. Evid. 901(b)(4), the requirements for proving authenticity are met if the “appearance, contents, substance, internal patterns, or other distinctive characteristics of the item, taken together with all the circumstances,” indicate the document is what it purports to be. The evidence may come from the documents themselves, including the “official appearance of the documents.” *Link v. Mercedes-Benz of N. Am., Inc.*, 788 F.2d 918, 927 (3d Cir. 1986) (internal quotation omitted); *see also* Fed. R. Evid. 901(b)(4).

# 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.