

Filed on behalf of TQ Delta, LLC  
By: Peter J. McAndrews  
McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.  
500 W. Madison St., 34<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, IL 60661  
Tel: 312-775-8000  
Fax: 312-775-8100  
E-mail: pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

DISH NETWORK, L.L.C.,  
Petitioner,  
v.

TQ DELTA, LLC,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2016-01470  
Patent No. 8,611,404

---

**PATENT OWNER'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO  
EXCLUDE INADMISSIBLE EVIDENCE**

Petitioner has no legal or practical basis to have its dozens of un-used, un-authenticated, and unreliable exhibits admitted into evidence. Indeed, each of Petitioner's arguments has the law woefully backwards.

(1) Petitioner's assertion that it can rely solely on attorney argument to authenticate an Internet publication is contrary to law. For example, Petitioner claims that Exhibits 1019, 1035, 1036, and 1052 should each be considered a periodical and self-authenticating because "it was published by either Electronic Products Magazine or EE Times, both of which are reputable publications." But according to whom? Petitioner offers only attorney argument that either document was actually published by either of these entities, or that either entity is reputable. Even if one assumes that the logos and copyright notices indicate that the documents were published by those entities, that does not automatically make them periodicals absent actual evidence that the websites or publications are themselves reputable periodicals relied upon by persons of ordinary skill. Anyone can put a logo and copyright notice on a website and give it an official sounding name.

(2) Petitioner's belief that it is only relying on these documents for what they "describe," thus making them non-hearsay, is backwards. That is exactly the definition of hearsay—reliance for the "truth of the matter asserted." Petitioner cites to cases for the inapplicable proposition that asserted *prior art references* are

not hearsay because they are only relied upon for their disclosure—i.e., it only matters whether statements in the prior art *exist* and not whether they are *true*. See Pet. Opp. at 2. But that is not how Petitioner is using these exhibits. The challenged exhibits are not being relied upon as prior art, i.e., merely for their disclosure, but rather to affirmatively prove up whether or not something Petitioner says about DSL modems is true.

For example, Petitioner is relying on Exhibit 1019 for the *truth* that the “Motorola CopperGold chip set described in Bowie . . . implements ADSL technology” and Exhibit 1052 for the *truth* that “video streaming was available in the early 1990s.” (Pet. Opp. at 1.) These are affirmative statements that Petitioner was trying to prove as fact, to prove what something *else* in a prior art reference (e.g., Bowie’s reference to Motorola CopperGold chips) allegedly means. If the statements in the exhibits are false, then it renders Petitioner’s conclusions false.

Similarly, with respect to the remaining exhibits, Petitioner alleges that they are relied upon to “describe ADSL technology generally” (Exhibits 1021, 1022, 1029-1031, 1033, 1036, 1038, 1042, 1043), allegedly “accurately characterize the state of the art at the relevant time” (Ex. 1035, 1023-1028, 1040, 1041, 1045, 1047, 1048, 1051), or “corroborate that Bell Telephone developed a video phone in 1964” (Ex. 1002). Each of these also is a black-letter example of relying on an

exhibit for the truth of what it says—that they *in fact* describe actual features of ADSL technology or “*accurately*” (in Petitioner’s own words) characterize the art. As an example, if one of Petitioner’s Internet forum exhibits were to state (incorrectly) that DSL was capable of transmission speeds of 1 trillion Mbps, that would not “accurately” characterize the prior art or “describe ADSL technology.” In other words, to serve the purpose for which Petitioner claims it is relying upon them, the statements in the exhibits must be true. As such, they are hearsay.

(3) Even if the Exhibits could overcome the authenticity and hearsay problems of (1) and (2), Petitioner has still not shown how most of them are relevant. Neither Petitioner nor its expert ever even referenced at least 22 of the exhibits—Petitioner’s apparent theory that it can have an expert just list a multitude of documents as “background” and have them admitted just in case it *might* use them or cite to them is contrary to the letter and spirit of the Federal Rules of Evidence. So too, is Petitioner’s attempt to flip the burden on Patent Owner to provide evidence that the exhibits are *not* relevant or *not* reliable. Petitioner does not dispute that it bears the burden of showing that each exhibit it submits is admissible, including that it is relevant to a specific issue in this IPR. *Banks v. Vilsack*, 958 F. Supp. 2d 78, 82 (D.D.C. 2013) (“The proponent of the evidence bears the burden of establishing that the evidence is relevant.”); *United*

*States v. 275.81 Acres of Land*, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 34416, at \*22 (W.D. Pa. Mar. 13, 2013) (“The burden of establishing the admissibility and relevance of evidence rests on the proponent.”); *AAMCO Transmissions, Inc. v. Baker*, 591 F. Supp. 2d 788, 793 (E.D. Pa. 2008) (“the proponent of the evidence [] has the burden of establishing its admissibility”). Vaguely having its expert claim that the documents go to “background” is far from sufficient to carry Petitioner’s burden. How exactly are they relevant to background? What portions of the documents? What products or features described in the documents? Petitioner never explains.

(4) Petitioner’s back-up argument that any and all documents listed in an expert declaration automatically overcome hearsay and authenticity deficiencies and become *admissible as exhibits on the record* is also not sustainable. Numerous legal decisions hold the opposite. *See, e.g., Finchum v. Ford Motor Co.*, 57 F.3d 526, 532 (7th Cir. 1995) (fact that expert relied on exhibit “does not automatically mean that the information itself is independently admissible in evidence . . . the [Plaintiff] could not have introduced the exhibit into evidence because of the hearsay rule”); *Boim v. Holy Land Found. for Relief & Dev.*, 549 F.3d 685, 703 (7th Cir. 2008) (“a judge must take care that the expert is not being used as a vehicle for circumventing the rule against hearsay”); *United States v. Rodriguez*, 125 F. Supp. 3d 1216, 1252 (D.N.M. 2015) (“The expert may not,

# 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.