

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

AVER INFORMATION INC., AND IPEVO, INC.  
Petitioner

v.

PATHWAY INNOVATIONS AND TECHNOLOGIES, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

CASE: IPR2017-02108  
U.S. PATENT NO. 8,508,751

---

**PATENT OWNER'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE EXPERT EVIDENCE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION .....1

II. ARGUMENT .....3

    A. Madisetti’s Claim Construction Discussion Is Virtually Identical to the Petition. ....4

        1. “a series of frame images” (claims 1, 3, and 18) .....4

        2. “a series of real-time images” (claim 18) .....5

        3. “the output frame images” (claims 13 and 14) .....5

    B. Madisetti’s Opinions on Obviousness Are Virtually Identical to those in the Petition with Little or No Explanation or Analysis. ....5

        1. Madisetti’s Overview of the Prior Art is Verbatim Identical.....5

    C. Madisetti’s Opinions to Support Petitioner’s Opposition Are Also Not Credible.....8

    D. Dr. Madisetti Does Not Qualify as One of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....10

III. CONCLUSION.....10

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases**

*Blackberry Corp. v. Mobilemedia Ideas, LLC*,  
IPR2013-00036 (PTAB 2014).....8

*Corning Inc. v. DSM IP Assets B.V.*,  
IPR2013-00049 (PTAB 2014).....4

*Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharm., Inc.*,  
509 U.S. 579 (1993).....3

*Heart Failure Techs., LLC v. CardioKinetix, Inc.*,  
IPR2013-00184 (PTAB 2013).....1, 10

*InfoBionic, Inc. v. Braemar Manufacturing, LLC*,  
IPR2015-01704 (PTAB 2016).....4

*KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*,  
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....2, 10

*Lewis v. CITGO Petroleum Corp.*,  
561 F.3d 698 (7th Cir. 2009) .....3

*Sloan Valve Co. v. Zurn Ind., Inc.*,  
Civ. No. 10-cv-00204 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 18, 2013) .....10

*ZTE Corp. v. Interdigital Tech. Corp.*,  
IPR2014-00275 (PTAB 2014).....8

**Rules**

Fed. R. Ev. 702.....3

**Regulations**

37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c).....2

37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a)..... 1, 5, 10

## I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner Pathway Innovations & Technologies, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) respectfully moves to exclude the First Declaration (Ex. 1020) and Second Declaration (Ex. 1025) of Dr. Vijay K. Madiseti, in their entireties, submitted by Petitioner in support of its Petition (Paper 3) and Opposition to Patent Owner’s Motion to Amend (Paper 17). Patent Owner further moves to bar Petitioners from using or citing to the above-noted Madiseti Declarations (“Madiseti Decs.”) at any hearing or oral argument in this proceeding.

While the Board is generally reluctant to exclude evidence, the Madiseti Decs. are not credible and contain nothing more than “expertized” attorney argument and fail to provide the required articulated reasoning as to how his supposed opinions were reached. As clearly shown by a side-by-side visual comparison of the First Declaration with the Petition, Dr. Madiseti simply repeats virtually all the same conclusory arguments, word-for-word, of the Petition without any particularized reasoning or explanation. *See* Exhibit A; *see also* Ex. 2001. Accordingly, the First Declaration should be excluded as conclusory and unsupported. 37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a) (“Expert testimony that does not disclose the underlying facts or data on which the opinion is based is entitled to little or no weight.”). *See Heart Failure Techs., LLC v. CardioKinetix, Inc.*, IPR2013-00184, Paper 12 (PTAB 2013) (noting that the petitioner must provide “some articulated reasoning with some rational

underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.”) (*citing KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.* 550 U.S. 398, 418 (2007)).

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c), Patent Owner previously objected to the First Declaration in its Preliminary Response, and then again in its Response. Paper 6 at 17-18; Paper 11 at 18-20. For ease of reference, Patent Owner submits a side-by-side comparison of the First Declaration and the Petition, attached hereto as Exhibit A.

The Second Declaration of Dr. Madisetti is no better. In creating his Second Declaration, Dr. Madisetti testified that he followed a “very similar” process to that of the word-for-word First Declaration. Ex. 2006 at 26:18-23. Moreover, Dr. Madisetti was unable to answer questions regarding his Declarations without having those Declarations in front of him and reading from such, and is incredulously evasive when confronted with simple general questions involving, for example, the definition of capturing. *See, e.g.*, Ex. 2006 at 7:10-12 (“Q. Okay. What does the word ‘capturing’ mean to you? A. It means capturing. Q. Okay. Can you provide a definition of capturing that doesn’t use the word ‘capturing’? [objection lodged.] [A.] I’m quite comfortable with capturing. Q. So you can’t answer that question? [objection lodged.] [A.] No. I felt that capturing captures -- capturing is a good description of the term ‘capturing.’ So it captures a still image.”)

Lastly, Dr. Madisetti does not qualify as one of ordinary skill in the art

# 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.