

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Juniper Networks, Inc., Ruckus Wireless, Inc., Brocade Communication
Systems, Inc. and Netgear, Inc.,

Petitioners

v.

Chrimar Systems, Inc.,

Patent Owner

Inter Partes Review No. 2016-01389¹
U.S. Patent No. 8,155,012

**PETITIONERS' FIRST SET OF OBJECTIONS TO PATENT OWNER'S
EVIDENCE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. 42.64**

¹ Ruckus Wireless, Inc., Brocade Communication Systems, Inc., and Netgear, Inc. ("Ruckus et al.") filed a petition in (now terminated) IPR2017-00790, and Ruckus et al. has been joined to the instant proceeding.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), Petitioners Juniper Networks, Inc., Ruckus Wireless, Inc., Brocade Communication Systems, Inc., and Netgear, Inc. (collectively “Petitioners”) hereby submit the following objections to Patent Owner Chrimar Systems, Inc.’s (“Patent Owner”) Exhibits 2038, 2040-2049, and any reference to/reliance on the foregoing, in Patent Owner’s Response in the above-captioned *inter partes* review (“Response”). As required by 37 C.F.R. § 42.62, Petitioners’ objections below apply the Federal Rules of Evidence (“F.R.E.”).

Petitioners’ objections are timely under 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1) because they are being filed and served within five (5) business days of the filing of Patent Owner’s Response on April 4, 2017. Petitioners’ objections provide notice to Patent Owner that Petitioners may move to exclude these exhibits under 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c).

I. OBJECTIONS TO EXHIBIT 2038 AND ANY REFERENCE TO/RELIANCE THEREON

Evidence objected to: Exhibit 2038 (“Declaration of Vijay Madiseti”), and any reference to or reliance thereon.

Grounds for objection: Petitioners object to Exhibit 2038, and Patent Owner’s reference to or reliance thereon in this proceeding, under F.R.E. 401, 402 (“Relevance”); F.R.E. 403 (“Unfair Prejudice”); F.R.E. 602 (“Need for Personal Knowledge”); F.R.E. 702, 703 (“Expert Testimony”); 37 C.F.R. 42.65

(“Underlying Facts or Data for Expert Testimony”); F.R.E. 801, 802 (“Hearsay”); and F.R.E. 805 (“Hearsay within Hearsay”).

For example, Petitioners object to paragraphs 45, 56, 93, 157, and 191 of Exhibit 2038 as being inadmissible under F.R.E. 702, 703 (“Expert Testimony”), and 37 C.F.R. 42.65 (“Underlying Facts or Data for Expert Testimony”), because underlying facts or data on which the opinions in these paragraphs are purportedly based are either not disclosed or insufficient. Petitioners further object to this testimony as inadmissible under F.R.E. 602 because there is not sufficient evidence to support that the declarant has personal knowledge of those matters. To the extent Dr. Madisetti’s knowledge is based on what others told him, Petitioners further object to Exhibit 2038 as inadmissible hearsay under F.R.E. 801, 802, and 805, and object to this exhibit as it does not support Patent Owner’s characterization of the truth of the matter. Petitioners further object to this exhibit as not relevant under F.R.E. 401 and therefore inadmissible under F.R.E. 402. Even if relevant, Petitioners object to this exhibit under F.R.E. 403 because its probative value is substantially outweighed by a danger of unfair prejudice and confusing the issues.

II. OBJECTIONS TO EXHIBIT 2048 AND ANY REFERENCE TO/RELIANCE THEREON

Evidence objected to: Exhibit 2048 (“Declaration of Clyde Camp”), and any reference to or reliance thereon.

Grounds for objection: Petitioners object to Exhibit 2048, and Patent Owner’s reference to or reliance thereon in this proceeding, under F.R.E. 401, 402 (“Relevance”); F.R.E. 403 (“Unfair Prejudice”); F.R.E. 602 (“Need for Personal Knowledge”); F.R.E. 801, 802 (“Hearsay”); and F.R.E. 805 (“Hearsay within Hearsay”).

For example, Paragraphs 4-11 of Exhibit 2048 include statements that are inadmissible under F.R.E. 602 because there is not sufficient evidence to support that the declarant has personal knowledge of those matters. To the extent Mr. Camp’s knowledge is based on what others told him, Petitioners further object to Exhibit 2048 as inadmissible hearsay under F.R.E. 801, 802, and 805, and object to this exhibit as it does not support Patent Owner’s characterization of the truth of the matter. Petitioners further object to this exhibit as not relevant under F.R.E. 401 and therefore inadmissible under F.R.E. 402. Even if relevant, Petitioners object to this exhibit under F.R.E. 403 because its probative value is substantially outweighed by a danger of unfair prejudice and confusing the issues.

III. OBJECTIONS TO EXHIBITS 2040-2046, AND ANY REFERENCE TO/RELIANCE THEREON

Evidence objected to: Exhibits 2040-2046, and any reference to or reliance thereon.

Grounds for objection: F.R.E. 901 (“Authenticating or Identifying Evidence”); F.R.E. 801, 802 (“Hearsay”); F.R.E. 805 (“Hearsay within Hearsay”); F.R.E. 401, 402 (“Relevance”); and F.R.E. 403 (“Unfair Prejudice”).

Patent Owner fails to provide the authentication required by F.R.E. 901 for Exhibits 2040-2046. As set forth in § II, above, Patent Owner has not provided the testimony of any witness with personal knowledge of Exhibits 2040-2046. Patent Owner thus improperly cites to Exhibits 2040-2046 without providing any authenticating evidence to support a finding that the items are what Patent Owner claims they are, in violation of F.R.E. 901.

Moreover, Patent Owner has submitted Exhibits 2040-2046 in support of its, and Mr. Camp’s, statements regarding when, and by whom, Exhibits 2040, 2043, 2044, and 2046, were presented at 802.3af Committee meetings, and when Exhibits 2040-2046 were posted on the 802.3af Committee’s public website. *See, e.g.*, Exhibit 2048, ¶¶5-11; Response at pp. 22-26. Patent Owner has further submitted Exhibits 2040-2046 in support of its, and Dr. Madisetti’s, statements regarding supposed skepticism by certain individuals. *See, e.g.*, Exhibit 2038,

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.