

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

RUIZ FOOD PRODUCTS, INC.
Petitioner,

v.

MACROPOINT LLC,
Patent Owner.

Patent 9,429,659

Case No. IPR2017-02018

**PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS TO PATENT OWNER'S EVIDENCE
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1)**

Mail Stop "Patent Board"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Petitioner, Ruiz Food Products, Inc., objects to the admissibility of the following evidence/exhibits served by Patent Owner Macropoint, LLC on June 7, 2018 pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1). These objections are being timely filed within 5 business days after service of the exhibits by Petitioner.

Exhibit 2004 – “ELD MANDATE: UPDATES, VIOLATION INFORMATION AND DEVICE INTRODUCTION PRICING & REVIEWS DRIVERS NEED TO KNOW,” <https://unitedworldtransportation.com/eld-mandate-updates-violation-information-device-introduction-pricing-reviews-drivers-need-know/>

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2004 as not properly authenticated under Federal Rule of Evidence (FRE) 901 because Petitioner has not presented any evidence by someone with personal knowledge that the document is authentic or that the document is self-authenticating under FRE 902.

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2004 as inadmissible hearsay under FRE 801 and 802 that does not fall under any exceptions, including those of FRE 803, 804, 805, or 807.

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2004 under FRE 1002 (Requirement of the Original).

Exhibit 2006 – “Small Hardware Device Provides GPS Fleet Tracking Capabilities,” Fleet Financials, October 14, 2010, <https://www.fleetfinancials.com/72619/small-hardware-device-provides-gps-fleet-tracking-capabilities>

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2006 as not properly authenticated under FRE 901 because Petitioner has not presented any evidence by someone with personal knowledge that the document is authentic or that the document is self-authenticating under FRE 902.

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2006 as inadmissible hearsay under FRE 801 and 802 that does not fall under any exceptions, including those of FRE 803, 804, 805, or 807.

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2006 under FRE 1002 (Requirement of the Original).

Exhibit 2007 – “A Look at the Geotab GO Device: Past, Present, and Future,” Malene Johansen & Vincent Zhu, June 22, 2015, <https://www.geotab.com/blog/geotab-go-device-past-present-future/>

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2007 as not properly authenticated under FRE 901 because Petitioner has not presented any evidence by someone with personal knowledge that the document is authentic or that the document is self-authenticating under FRE 902.

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2007 as inadmissible hearsay under FRE 801 and 802 that does not fall under any exceptions, including those of FRE 803, 804, 805, or 807.

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2007 under FRE 1002 (Requirement of the Original).

Exhibit 2008 – “Announcing Geotab GO5 Premium Vehicle Tracking Device,” April 5, 2011, <https://www.geotab.com/press-release/u-blox/>

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2008 as not properly authenticated under FRE 901 because Petitioner has not presented any evidence by someone with personal knowledge that the document is authentic or that the document is self-authenticating under FRE 902.

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2008 as inadmissible hearsay under FRE 801 and 802 that does not fall under any exceptions, including those of FRE 803, 804, 805, or 807.

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2008 under FRE 1002 (Requirement of the Original).

Exhibit 2010 – “The Future of Electronic On-board Recording Devices in the U.S.,” Michael Goldberg, July 3, 2011, <https://www.frg-law.com/blog/the-future-of-electronic-on-board-recording-devices-in-the-u-s/>

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2010 as not properly authenticated under FRE 901 because Petitioner has not presented any evidence by someone with personal

knowledge that the document is authentic or that the document is self-authenticating under FRE 902.

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2010 as inadmissible hearsay under FRE 801 and 802 that does not fall under any exceptions, including those of FRE 803, 804, 805, or 807.

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2010 under FRE 1002 (Requirement of the Original).

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.