

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 OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE  
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1)**

*Patent Owner Objections to Evidence*  
*IPR2016-01470*  
*U.S. Patent No. 8,611,404*

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), Patent Owner TQ Delta, LLC (“Patent Owner”) hereby files and serves the following objections to evidence that Petitioner Dish Network, LLC (“Dish”) served on Patent Owner with its Petition on July 21, 2016, 2017. A chart listing Patent Owner’s objections and its bases for the objections is provided below.

<b>Exhibit(s)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
Exs. 1023-1049, 1051-1052	<b>Relevance:</b> None of these exhibits are relevant under FRE 402, given that none of them were specifically cited or discussed in the Petition or Hoarty declaration. Petitioner cannot block-designate into evidence exhibits without any showing in the Petition or declaration as to their relevance.
Ex. 1019 (internet article purporting to be from Electronic Products Magazine Digital Edition)  Exs.1035-36, 1052 (internet articles purporting to be from EE Times)	<b>Authenticity:</b> Petitioner has not provided any evidence that these exhibits are authentic under FRE 901. The exhibits do not fall within any of the self-authenticating exceptions of FRE 902; they are not newspapers or periodicals. <i>See, e.g., Adobe Sys. v. Christenson</i> , 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16977, *26 (D. Nev. Feb. 7, 2011) (“Courts do not treat printouts from internet websites as self-authenticating or admit them without foundation or authentication.”); <i>In re Homestore.com., Inc. v. Securities Litigation</i> , 347 F.Supp.2d 769, 782-783 (C.D. Cal. 2004 (“Printouts from a web site do not bear the indicia of reliability demanded for other self-authenticating documents under Fed.R.Evid. 902. To be

*Patent Owner Objections to Evidence*

*IPR2016-01470*

*U.S. Patent No. 8,611,404*

	<p>authenticated, some statement or affidavit from someone with knowledge is required; for example, Homestore's web master or someone else with personal knowledge would be sufficient.”)</p> <p><b>Hearsay:</b> The exhibits are hearsay under FRE 801-802. They do not fall within any of the exceptions of FRE 803; they are not statements in a learned treatise or periodicals. <i>See, e.g., Combs v. Washington</i>, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 121320 (W.D. Wash. June 11, 2014) (“Internet articles are independently inadmissible hearsay under Rule 801(c).”); <i>Stewart v. Wachowski</i>, 574 F. Supp. 2d 1074, 1105 (C.D. Cal. 2005) (same).</p>
Exs. 1021-1030 (ADSL Forum technical reports)	<p><b>Authenticity:</b> Petitioner has not provided any evidence that these exhibits are authentic under FRE 901. The exhibits do not fall within any of the self-authenticating exceptions of FRE 902.</p> <p><b>Hearsay:</b> The exhibits are hearsay under FRE 801-802. They do not fall within any of the exceptions of FRE 803.</p>
Exs. 1031, 1039 (PowerPoint presentations)  Ex. 1038 (document titled “Mixed Signal Circuits and Systems”)	<p><b>Authenticity:</b> Petitioner has not provided any evidence that these exhibits are authentic under FRE 901. The exhibits do not fall within any of the self-authenticating exceptions of FRE 902.</p> <p><b>Hearsay:</b> The exhibits are hearsay under FRE 801-802. They do not fall within any of the exceptions of FRE 803.</p>

Patent Owner Objections to Evidence

IPR2016-01470

U.S. Patent No. 8,611,404

<p>Ex. 1033 (website printout from kitz.co.uk)</p> <p>Exs. 1041-42, 1046, 1051 (miscellaneous website printouts)</p>	<p><b>Authenticity:</b> Petitioner has not provided any evidence that this exhibit is authentic under FRE 901. The exhibit does not fall within any of the self-authenticating exceptions of FRE 902. <i>See, e.g., Adobe Sys. v. Christenson</i>, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16977, *26 (D. Nev. Feb. 7, 2011) (“Courts do not treat printouts from internet websites as self-authenticating or admit them without foundation or authentication.”); <i>In re Homestore.com., Inc. v. Securities Litigation</i>, 347 F.Supp.2d 769, 782-783 (C.D. Cal. 2004 (“Printouts from a web site do not bear the indicia of reliability demanded for other self-authenticating documents under Fed.R.Evid. 902. To be authenticated, some statement or affidavit from someone with knowledge is required; for example, Homestore's web master or someone else with personal knowledge would be sufficient.”))</p> <p><b>Hearsay:</b> The exhibit is hearsay under FRE 801-802. It does not fall within any of the exceptions of FRE 803. <i>See United States v. Jackson</i>, 208 F.3d 633, 637 (7th Cir. 2000) (web postings from the Internet were inadmissible hearsay); <i>St. Clair v. Johnny's Oyster &amp; Shrimp, Inc.</i>, 76 F. Supp. 2d 773, 775 (S.D. Texas 1999) (“Any evidence procured off the Internet is adequate for almost nothing, even under the most liberal interpretations of the hearsay exception rules.”).</p>
<p>Ex. 1043 (document purporting to be ETSI TS 102 250-2 V2.5.1 Technical Specification)</p>	<p><b>Authenticity:</b> Petitioner has not provided any evidence that these exhibits are authentic under FRE 901. The exhibits do</p>

*Patent Owner Objections to Evidence*  
*IPR2016-01470*  
*U.S. Patent No. 8,611,404*

<p>Ex. 1047 (document purporting to be a white paper)</p>	<p>not fall within any of the self-authenticating exceptions of FRE 902.</p> <p><b>Hearsay:</b> The exhibits are hearsay under FRE 801-802. They do not fall within any of the exceptions of FRE 803. <i>See United States v. Jackson</i>, 208 F.3d 633, 637 (7th Cir. 2000) (web postings from the Internet were inadmissible hearsay); <i>St. Clair v. Johnny's Oyster &amp; Shrimp, Inc.</i>, 76 F. Supp. 2d 773, 775 (S.D. Texas 1999) (“Any evidence procured off the Internet is adequate for almost nothing, even under the most liberal interpretations of the hearsay exception rules.”).</p>
---	--

Dated: February 24, 2017

/Peter J. McAndrews/

Peter J. McAndrews

Registration No. 38,547

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY,  
LTD.

500 West Madison St., Suite 3400

Chicago, IL 60661

Telephone: (312) 775-8000

# 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.