

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.

---

Case IPR2016-01264  
U.S. Patent No. 6,538,324

---

**PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS TO  
PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBITS 2045 AND 2046**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), Petitioner objects to the following

Patent Owner exhibits filed on June 21, 2017:

2045	Redacted version of Invalidity Expert Report of Chris Mack without attachments
2046	Declaration of Rumiko Whitehead

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2045 for lack of authentication under FRE 901, for being irrelevant under FRE 401-403, for failing to provide a complete copy under FRE 106, and as inadmissible hearsay under FRE 802 to the extent Patent Owner relies on this exhibit for the truth of the statements set forth therein.

In Exhibit 2046, a paralegal of Patent Owner’s counsel stated “Exhibit 2045 is a redacted copy of the Invalidity Expert Report of Chris Mack (without attachments), dated January 30, 2017, obtained from litigation counsel in *Godo Kaisha IP Bridge 1 v. Broadcom Limited et al.*, USDC EDTEX 2:16-cv-00134-JRG-RSP. Litigation counsel specifically confirmed that this copy of the Invalidity Expert Report of Chris Mack was correct.” Ex. 2046 at ¶ 4. The paralegal did not further identify any particular “litigation counsel,” nor did she explain how or why the heavily-redacted Exhibit 2045 was confirmed to be “correct.” Petitioner objects to Paragraph 4 in the paralegal’s declaration (Ex. 2046) as inadmissible hearsay under FRE 802. Patent Owner has provided no other evidence to support whether Ex. 2045 is an authentic copy. FRE 901.

Exhibit 2045 is also irrelevant because whether an expert in the related litigation provided an invalidity opinion does not alter Patent Owner's duty of candor to disclose the known, material prior-art references that it omitted from its Motion to Amend. Patent Owner offers Exhibit 2045 to prove the "immateriality of Exhibits 1025-1031," but without access to the redacted portions of this exhibit, it is impossible to ascertain whether the redacted information addressed, referred, or otherwise related to any of Exhibits 1025-1031. Because redacted Exhibit 2045 fails to provide sufficient information to support whether the expert in the district court considered any of Exhibits 1025-1031 in his invalidity opinions, Petitioner objects to this exhibit as irrelevant and incomplete. FRE 401-403, 106.

Petitioner further objects to this exhibit as irrelevant because the redacted expert report was prepared in a district court litigation that applied a different claim construction standard than the current proceeding. FRE 401-403. Petitioner also objects to this exhibit as unfairly prejudicial because Patent Owner relies on expert testimony that has been redacted from the exhibit. FRE 403.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 28, 2017

By: /Stephen E. Kabakoff/  
Stephen E. Kabakoff  
Reg. No. 51,276

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

This is to certify under 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e) that, on this 28 day of June 2017,  
I caused counsel of record for the Patent Owner (as listed below) to be  
electronically served a true and correct copy of the foregoing **PETITIONER'S**  
**OBJECTIONS TO PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBITS 2045 AND 2046:**

Michael J. Fink (Reg. No. 31,827)  
mfink@gbpatent.com

Neil F. Greenblum (Reg. No. 28,394)  
ngreenblum@gbpatent.com

Arnold Turk (Reg. No. 33,094)  
aturk@gbpatent.com

Dated: June 28, 2017

By: /Lauren K. Young/  
Lauren K. Young  
Litigation Legal Assistant  
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.