

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Apple Inc.,
Petitioner

v.

California Institute of Technology
Patent Owner

IPR2017-00297¹

U.S. Patent No. 7,916,781

PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE

¹ Case IPR2017-00423 has been consolidated with this proceeding.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64, Petitioner Apple Inc. ("Petitioner") serves the following objections to evidence served with the Patent Owner's Response of California Institute of Technology ("Patent Owner").

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2004, Declaration of Dr. Michael Mitzenmacher, as not relevant (FRE 401). Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2004 on the ground that its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading the fact finder, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence (FRE 403). Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2004 as inadmissible hearsay (FRE 801, 802). Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2004 as lacking authentication (FRE 901, 902). Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2004 as improper expert testimony by a lay witness and/or as unreliable and lacking a sufficient basis (FRE 701, 702).

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2005, *Curriculum Vitae* of Dr. Michael Mitzenmacher as not relevant (FRE 401). Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2005 on the on the ground that its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading the fact finder, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence (FRE 403). Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2005 as inadmissible hearsay (FRE 801,

802). Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2005 as lacking authentication (FRE 901, 902).

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2006, Kienle et al., "A synthesizable IP Core for DVB-S2 LDPC Code Decoding," IEEE, 2005 as not relevant (FRE 401).

Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2006 on the ground that its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading the fact finder, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence (FRE 403). Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2006 as inadmissible hearsay (FRE 801, 802). Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2006 as lacking authentication (FRE 901, 902).

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2007, Gomes et al., "Factorizable modulo M parallel architecture for DVB-S2 LDPC decoding," Proceedings of the 6th Conference on Telecommunications, CONFTELE, 2007 as not relevant (FRE 401). Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2007 on the ground that its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading the fact finder, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence (FRE 403). Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2007 as inadmissible hearsay (FRE 801, 802). Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2007 as lacking authentication (FRE 901, 902).

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2008, Liva et al., "Design of LDPC Codes: A petitioner objects to exhibit Survey and New Results," *Journal of Communications Software and Systems*, 2(3):191-211, 2006 as not relevant (FRE 401). Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2008 on the ground that its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading the fact finder, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence (FRE 403). Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2008 as inadmissible hearsay (FRE 801, 802). Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2008 as lacking authentication (FRE 901, 902).

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2009, Digital Video Broadcasting (DVB) User guidelines for the second generation systems for Broadcasting, Interactive Services, News Gathering and other broadband satellite applications (DVB-S2), ETSI TR 102 376, V11111 (2005-02), as not relevant (FRE 401). Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2009 on the ground that its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading the fact finder, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence (FRE 403). Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2009 as inadmissible hearsay (FRE 801, 802). Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2008 as lacking authentication (FRE 901, 902).

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2010, Kim et al., "Development of Rate-Compatible Structured LDPC CODEC Algorithms and Hardware IP," Project Final Report, School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, December 2006, as not relevant (FRE 401). Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2010 on the ground that its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading the fact finder, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence (FRE 403). Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2010 as inadmissible hearsay (FRE 801, 802). Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2010 as lacking authentication (FRE 901, 902). Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2010 as incomplete (FRE 106).

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2011, Richardson et al., "Efficient Encoding of Low-Density Parity-Check Codes," March 6, 2001, as not relevant (FRE 401). Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2011 on the ground that its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading the fact finder, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence (FRE 403). Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2011 as inadmissible hearsay (FRE 801, 802). Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2011 as lacking authentication (FRE 901, 902).

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.