

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD. and
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

IMAGE PROCESSING TECHNOLOGIES LLC,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2017-00336
U.S. Patent No. 6,959,293 B2

PAPER NO. 17

**PATENT OWNER'S OBJECTIONS TO
PETITIONER'S EVIDENCE**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), Patent Owner, Image Processing Technologies LLC (“IPT”) objects to the admissibility of the following exhibits filed by Petitioners.

In this paper, a reference to “FRE” means the Federal Rules of Evidence and “’293 patent” means U.S. Patent No. 6,959,293.

IPT’s objections are as follows:

Exhibit 1002 ¶¶ 19–26 (Hart Declaration)

Patent Owner objects to these paragraphs of Exhibit 1002 under FRE 402 (relevance) and FRE 403 (confusing, waste of time).

Exhibit 1002 ¶¶ 48–67, 74, 108–179 (Hart Declaration)

Patent Owner objects to these paragraphs of Exhibit 1002 under FRE 802 (hearsay). Patent Owner also objects to these paragraphs of Exhibit 1002 under FRE 402 (relevance) and FRE 403 (confusing, waste of time) at least because the paragraphs are not relevant to any issue in this IPR because the grounds for which they were submitted have not been instituted.

Exhibit 1005 (WO 99/036893 – Pirim)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1005 under FRE 802 (hearsay). Patent Owners also object to Exhibit 1005 under FRE 402 (relevance) and FRE 403 (unfairly prejudicial, confusing, waste of time, cumulative), at least because the

exhibit was already considered by the patent examiner during the prosecution of the '293 patent.

Exhibit 1006 (Rogers)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1006 under FRE 802 (hearsay). Patent Owner also objects to Exhibit 1006 under FRE 402 (relevance) and FRE 403 (unfairly prejudicial, confusing, waste of time) at least because (i) the document is not relevant to any issue in this IPR proceeding because the disclosure is not prior art and/or Petitioner has not met its burden to show the exhibit to be prior art, and (ii) the grounds on which it was submitted have not been instituted.

Exhibit 1007 (U.S. 5,546,125 – Tomitaka)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1007 under FRE 802 (hearsay). Patent Owner also objects to Exhibit 1007 under FRE 402 (relevance) and FRE 403 (unfairly prejudicial, confusing, waste of time) at least because the grounds on which it was submitted have not been instituted.

Exhibit 1008 (Gilbert)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1008 under FRE 802 (hearsay). Patent Owner also objects to Exhibit 1008 under FRE 402 (relevance) and FRE 403 (unfairly prejudicial, confusing, waste of time) at least because (i) the document is not relevant to any issue in this IPR proceeding because the disclosure is not prior

art and/or Petitioner has not met its burden to show the exhibit to be prior art, and
(ii) the grounds on which it was submitted have not been instituted.

Exhibit 1009 (Beck Declaration)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1009 under FRE 802 (hearsay). Patent Owner also objects to Exhibit 1009 under FRE 402 (relevance) and FRE 403 (unfairly prejudicial, confusing, waste of time) at least because the grounds for which it was submitted have not been instituted.

Exhibit 1010 (Trier)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1010 under FRE 901 because authenticating information has not been provided. Patent Owner also objects to Exhibit 1010 under FRE 402 (relevance) and FRE 403 (unfairly prejudicial, confusing, waste of time) at least because the document is not discussed in the Declaration of Dr. Hart (Exhibit 1002) nor cited to or discussed in the Petition.

Exhibit 1011 (Glauberman)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1011 under FRE 901 because authenticating information has not been provided. Patent Owner also objects to Exhibit 1011 under FRE 402 (relevance) and FRE 403 (unfairly prejudicial, confusing, waste of time) at least because the document is not discussed in the Declaration of Dr. Hart (Exhibit 1002) nor cited to or discussed in the Petition.

Exhibit 1012 (Grenier Declaration)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1012 under FRE 802 (hearsay). Patent Owner also objects to Exhibit 1012 under FRE 402 (relevance) and FRE 403 (unfairly prejudicial, confusing, waste of time) at least because the grounds for which it was submitted have not been instituted.

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.