

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 IPR2017-01218
Patent No. 8,983,134

PAPER NO. 17

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

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §42.64(b)(1), Petitioners Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (collectively, “Samsung”) objects to the admissibility of the following evidence submitted by Patent Owner on January 8, 2018. As used herein, “FRE” refers to the Federal Rules of Evidence.

Samsung objects to the following evidence:

1) Exhibit 2002 (Webster’s Dictionary excerpt)

Samsung objects to Exhibit 2002 under FRE 901 because authenticating information has not been provided.

2) Exhibit 2007 (Declaration of Dr. Bovik from IPR2017-00353 case)

Samsung objects to Exhibit 2007, originally submitted in IPR2017-00353, under FRE 402 (relevance) and FRE 802 (hearsay), particularly to the extent Patent Owner does not make Dr. Bovik available in this proceeding for deposition. *See* 37 C.F.R. §42.51(b)(1).

3) Exhibit 2008 (Random House Dictionary excerpt)

Samsung objects to Exhibit 2008 under FRE 901 because authenticating information has not been provided.

4) Exhibit 2009 (American Heritage Dictionary excerpt)

Samsung objects to Exhibit 2009 under FRE 901 because authenticating information has not been provided.

5) Exhibit 2012 (Deposition transcript of Dr. Bovik from IPR2017-00353 case)

Samsung objects to Exhibit 2012, originally submitted in IPR2017-00353, under FRE 402 (relevance) and FRE 802 (hearsay), particularly to the extent Patent Owner does not make Dr. Bovik available in this proceeding for deposition. *See* 37 C.F.R. §42.51(b)(1).

6) Paper No. 15, pages 12-13 (Diagrams)

Samsung objects to the “diagrams” alleged to “illustrate the lock-on tracking method” and descriptions of those diagrams (Paper No. 15, pp. 12-13) under FRE 403 (confusing and unfairly prejudicial), FRE 802 (hearsay), and FRE 901 (not authenticated) because they do not come from the ’134 Patent (or any other patent), are unsupported by any expert declaration or opinion, and are entirely speculative and confusing.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ John Kappos

John Kappos (Reg. No. 37,861)

Lead Counsel for Petitioner

O’MELVENY & MYERS LLP

610 Newport Center Drive, 17th Floor

Newport Beach, CA 92660

jkappos@omm.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e) and § 42.105 that on January 16, 2018, a true and correct copy of **PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS TO PATENT OWNER'S EVIDENCE** was served via express mail on the Patent Owner at the following correspondence address of record:

Gregory Nelson
FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP
222 Lakeview Avenue, Suite 700
West Palm Beach, FL 33401

Gregory Nelson
FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP
997 Lennox Drive, Bld. 3
Lawrenceville, NJ 08648

Copies were also sent to Patent Owner's litigation counsel via electronic mail:

S. Calvin Capshaw
CAPSHAW DERIEUX, LLP
114 E. Commerce Ave.
Gladewater, TX 75647
ccapshaw@capshawlaw.com

Michael N. Zachary
ANDREWS KURTH KENYON LLP
1801 Page Mill Road, Suite 210
Palo Alto, CA 94304
MichaelZachary@AndrewsKurthKenyon.com

Christopher J. Coulson
Mark Chapman
Rose Cordero Prey
ANDREWS KURTH KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, NY 10004
ChrisCoulson@AndrewsKurthKenyon.com
MarkChapman@AndrewsKurthKenyon.com
RosePrey@AndrewsKurthKenyon.com

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ John Kappos

John Kappos (Reg. No. 37,861)

O'Melveny & Myers LLP

610 Newport Center Drive, 17th Floor

Newport Beach, CA 92660

Telephone: (949) 760-9600

Attorney for Petitioner