

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2017-00700  
Patent 7,421,032

---

**PATENT OWNER'S THIRD NOTICE OF OBJECTION TO EVIDENCE**

## I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), Patent Owner California Institute of Technology (“Caltech”), submits the following objections to Petitioner Apple Inc.’s (“Petitioner”) 1044-1049, 1053, 1055, 1057-1061, 1065, 1067, 1068, 1071, and 1072. As required by 37 C.F.R. § 42.62, Patent Owner’s objections below apply the Federal Rules of Evidence (“F.R.E.”).

## II. OBJECTIONS

Caltech objects to Ex. 1044, “Tanner Graph for Code Described by Fig. 2 of U.S. Patent No. 7,116,710”; Ex. 1045, “Block Diagram of Accumulator”; Ex. 1046, “Tanner Graph for Code Described by Divsalar”; Ex. 1047, “Tanner Graph for Code Described by Luby98 Code 14”; Ex. 1048, “Tanner Graph for Code Described by Ping”; Ex. 1049, “Tanner Graph for Code Described by MacKay Profile 93y”; Ex. 1053, “Confidential IRAsimu.cpp with metadata”; Ex. 1055, “Confidential Excerpts from the Deposition of Dr. Hui Jin (Case No. 16-cv-3714)”; Ex. 1057, “Tanner Graph for Code Described by Divsalar (q=5)”; Ex. 1058, “Tanner Graph for IRA Code”; Ex. 1059, “Systematic Version of Divsalar Figure 3”; Ex. 1060, “Divsalar Figure 3 and Frey Figure 1”; Ex. 1061, “D.Divsalar, S. Dolinar, J. Thorpe, and C. Jones, ‘Constructing LDPC Codes from Simple Loop-Free Encoding Modules,’ *IEEE International Conference on Communications*, Seoul, South Korea, pp. 658-662, August, 2005”; Ex. 1065,

“Declaration of Dr. Brendan Frey”; Ex. 1068, “Simulation of Regular and Irregular Divsalar Codes”; Ex. 1071, “Block Diagram of Implementation of Code Described in Ping”; and Ex. 1072, “Block Diagram of Implementation of Code Described in Ping”.

Grounds for Objection: F.R.E. 401 (Test for Relevant Evidence); F.R.E. 402 (General Admissibility of Relevant Evidence); F.R.E. 403 (Excluding Relevant Evidence for Prejudice, Confusion, Waste of Time, or Other Reasons).

Exhibits 1044-1047 and 1057-1061 are not cited in the petition that initiated this proceeding or Petitioner’s reply. As such, these exhibits are not relevant to the instituted ground of review or any other aspect of this proceeding as they have no tendency to make a fact more or less probable than it would be without the evidence. Further, to the extent any of those exhibits are deemed relevant admission of the exhibit would be unduly prejudicial, misleading, and a waste of time.

In addition, Exhibits 1044-1049, 1057-1061, 1065, 1068, 1071, and 1072 are new evidence not disclosed to Patent Owner until after the filing of its Patent Owner response. To the extent those exhibits were cited in Patent Owner’s reply they were cited in support of arguments that were not made in the petition and are therefore improper to raise for the first time in Petitioner’s reply. The exhibits that were not cited in Petitioner’s reply also appear to be in support of new arguments.

As such, these exhibits are not relevant to the instituted ground of review. Further, to the extent any of those exhibits are deemed relevant admission of the exhibit would be unduly prejudicial, misleading, and a waste of time, as the prejudice to Patent Owner for being surprised and unable to respond to Petitioner's new evidence outweighs the relevance of this evidence.

Caltech objects to Exhibits 1053 and 1055 as lacking relevance. Although these exhibits are cited in Petitioner's reply, Petitioner only cites them "for the reasons set forth in its Reply in [IPR2017-00210]." However, the Reply in IPR2017-00210 does not cite to or rely on the corresponding versions of Exhibits 1053 and 1055. As such, these exhibits are not relevant to the instituted ground of review or any other aspect of this proceeding as they have no tendency to make a fact more or less probable than it would be without the evidence. Further, to the extent any of those exhibits are deemed relevant admission of the exhibit would be unduly prejudicial, misleading, and a waste of time.

Caltech further objects to Exhibit 1068 and the portions of Exhibit 1065 that rely on Exhibit 1068 for failure to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 42.65.

Caltech further objects to Exhibit 1067 ("California Institute of Technology v. Hughes Communications Inc., No. 2:13-cv-07245-MRP-JEM, 2015 WL 11089495 (C.D. Cal. May 5, 2015)") under F.R.E. 106 ("Remainder of or Related Writings or Recorded Statements"). If Exhibit 1067 is deemed admissible then

Case IPR2017-00700  
Patent 7,421,032

other writings or recorded statements in fairness ought to be considered at the same time.

### III. CONCLUSION

Exhibits 1044-1049, 1053, 1055, 1057-1061, 1065, 1067, 1068, 1071, and 1072 were filed and served on February 21, 2018. These objections are made within five business days of service.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 28, 2018

/ Michael T. Rosato /  
Michael T. Rosato, Lead Counsel  
Reg. No. 52,182

# 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.