

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 IPR2016-01377
Patent 6,197,696

Before the Honorable JUSTIN T. ARBES, MICHAEL J. FITZPATRICK, and
JENNIFER MEYER CHAGNON, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

**PATENT OWNER'S SECOND SET OF
OBJECTIONS TO PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), the undersigned, on behalf of and acting in a representative capacity for Patent Owner Godo Kaisha IP Bridge 1 (“Patent Owner”), hereby submits the following objections to Petitioner Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company, Ltd.’s (“Petitioner”) Exhibits as indicated below, and any reference thereto/reliance thereon, without limitation. Patent Owner’s objections below apply the Federal Rules of Evidence (“F.R.E.”) as required by 37 C.F.R § 42.62.

These objections address evidentiary deficiencies in the evidence submitted by Petitioner in its Petition.

The following objections apply to the Exhibits indicated below as they are actually presented by Petitioner, in the context of the Petition and not in the context of any other substantive argument on the merits of the instituted grounds in this proceeding. Patent Owner expressly objects to any other purported use of these Exhibits, including as substantive evidence in this proceeding, which would be improper under the applicable rules, and Patent Owner expressly asserts, reserves and does not waive any other objections that would be applicable in such a context.

I. Objections to Exhibit 1050 and Any Reference to/Reliance Thereon

Evidence objected to: Exhibit 1050 to the Petition, titled “Declaration of Dr. Bruce W. Smith, Ph.D. in Support of Petitioner’s Reply”

Grounds for objection: F.R.E. 401-402 (Relevance); F.R.E. 403 (Excluding Relevant Evidence for Prejudice, Confusion, Waste of Time, or Other Reasons); F.R.E. 702 (“Testimony by Expert Witnesses”); F.R.E. 703 (“Bases of an Expert’s Opinion Testimony”); and 37 C.F.R. § 42.61 (“Admissibility”).

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1050 under F.R.E. 702 and 703, and 37 C.F.R. § 42.61. The declarant of Exhibit 1050, Bruce W. Smith, Ph.D., fails to provide sufficient underlying facts or data upon which the statements contained therein could legitimately be based, in violation of F.R.E. 702. Dr. Smith has also

not “reliably applied the principles and methods to the facts of the case,” and his opinions in Exhibit 1050 are not “the product of reliable principles and methods,” in violation of F.R.E. 702. Furthermore, there is no indication that Dr. Smith based his opinions on facts or data upon which an expert in the relevant field would reasonably rely in violation of F.R.E. 703.

Patent Owner further objects to Exhibit 1050 under F.R.E. 401 and 402 (relevance) and F.R.E. 403 (probative value outweighed by prejudice, confusing of issues, wasting time).

II. Objections to Exhibits 1031, 1032, 1033, and Any Reference to/Reliance Thereon

Evidence objected to: Exhibits 1031, 1032, and 1033, titled, “James D. Plummer et al., ‘Silicon VLSI Technology: Fundamentals, Practice, and Modeling’ (2000),” “C.Y. Chang & S. M. Sze, ‘ULSI Technology’ (1996),” and “S. Wolf & R.N. Tauber, ‘Silicon Processing for the VLSI Era: Volume 1: Process Technology’ (1986),” respectively.

Grounds for objection: F.R.E. 901 (“Authenticating or Identifying Evidence”); F.R.E. 106 (“Remainder of or Related Writings or Recorded Statements”); F.R.E. 801, 802 (Impermissible Hearsay); 37 C.F.R. § 42.61 (“Admissibility”).

Petitioner fails to provide any evidence of authenticity of Exhibits 1031, 1032, and 1033, or any evidence of the date on which any of these exhibits were published or made available, in violation of, *inter alia*, F.R.E. 901.

Further, Exhibits 1031, 1032, and 1033 appear to be incomplete excerpts of documents. To the extent the Reply or any other submission of Petitioner purports to refer to or rely on any of the exhibits, Patent Owner objects to such reference to or reliance on an isolated portion as incomplete (F.R.E. 403, 106).

Also, to the extent Petitioner and Dr. Smith rely on Exhibits 1031, 1032, and 1033 for the purpose of proving the truth of the matter asserted without demonstrating that any hearsay exception applies, this violates Rules 801 and 802. *See, e.g.*, Reply at 4.

III. Objections to Exhibits 1045, 1046, 1047, and Any Reference to/Reliance Thereon

Evidence objected to: Exhibits 1045, 1046, and 1047, titled, “J.M. Moran & D. Maydan, ‘High Resolution, Steep Profile Resist Patterns,’ J. Vac. Sci. & Tech., vol. 16, no. 6 (Nov./Dec. 1979),” “M.M. O’Toole et al., ‘Linewidth Control in Projection Lithography Using a Multilayer Resist Process,’ IEEE Transactions on Electron Devices, vol. ED-28, no. 11 (Nov. 1981),” and “E. Bassous et al., ‘A Three-Layer Resist System for Deep U.V. and RIE Microlithography on

Nonplanar Surfaces,' J. Electrochem. Soc.: Solid-State Sci. & Tech. (Feb. 1983),” respectively.

Grounds for objection: F.R.E. 901 (“Authenticating or Identifying Evidence”); F.R.E. 801, 802 (Impermissible Hearsay); 37 C.F.R. § 42.61 (“Admissibility”).

Petitioner fails to provide any evidence of authenticity of Exhibits 1045, 1046, and 1047, or any evidence of the date on which any of these exhibits were published or made available, in violation of, *inter alia*, F.R.E. 901.

Also, to the extent Petitioner and Dr. Smith rely on Exhibits 1045, 1046, and 1047 for the purpose of proving the truth of the matter asserted without demonstrating that any hearsay exception applies, this violates Rules 801 and 802. *See, e.g.*, Reply at 7.

Dated: July 28, 2017

Respectfully submitted,
By: /s/ James L. Davis, Jr.
James L. Davis, Jr.

Andrew N. Thomases (Lead counsel)
Reg. No. 40,841
ROPES & GRAY, LLP
1900 University Ave., 6th Floor
East Palo Alto, CA 94303
(650) 617-4000
andrew.thomases@ropesgray.com

Jordan M. Rossen (Back-up counsel)
Reg. No. 74,064
ROPES & GRAY LLP
2099 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington D.C. 20006-6807
P: 202-508-4759/F: 617-235-9492
jordan.rossen@ropesgray.com

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.