

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

INTUITIVE SURGICAL, INC.  
Petitioner

v.

ETHICON LLC  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2018-01247  
Patent 8,479,969

---

**PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), Petitioner, Intuitive Surgical, Inc. (“Petitioner”), hereby submits its notice of objections to certain evidence that Patent Owner, Ethicon LLC (“Patent Owner”), submitted with its Patent Owner Response dated April 19, 2019, in connection with IPR2018-01247. These objections are being submitted within ten business days of service of the Response.

Petitioner objects to Exhibit No. 2006 (Declaration of Dr. Shorya Awtar) and Exhibit 2007 (Declaration of Dr. Elliott Fegelman). The bases for objecting to these Exhibits include the following Federal Rules of Evidence:

FRE 801-805: Hearsay. Petitioner objects to the Exhibits as inadmissible hearsay to the extent Patent Owner intends to offer these Exhibits for the truth of the matters asserted.

FRE 401, 402, & 403: Relevant Evidence and Excluding Relevant Evidence for Prejudice, Confusion, Waste of Time, or Other Reasons. These Exhibits contain irrelevant information, and to the extent these Exhibits are deemed to be relevant, Petitioner objects to these Exhibits because they contain conclusory and unsupported opinions and the probative value of the statements are outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice or confusion of the issues.

FRE 702 & 703: Testimony by Expert Witnesses and Bases of an Expert’s Opinion Testimony. Petitioner objects to the Exhibits because the

opinions are not based on sufficient facts or data and the experts have not reliably applied accepted principals and methods to the facts at issue.

Petitioner objects to Exhibit No. 2007 (Excerpts from Technology Tutorial filed in Ethicon LLC, et al. v. Intuitive Surgical, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 17-871 (LPS)(CJB) (District of Delaware)). The bases for objecting to this Exhibit include the following Federal Rules of Evidence:

FRE 801, 802 & 803: Hearsay. Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2007 as inadmissible hearsay to the extent Patent Owner intends to offer this Exhibit for the truth of the matters asserted, including the attorneys' arguments regarding alleged facts to which they have no first-hand knowledge.

FRE 401 & 402: General Admissibility of Relevant Evidence. Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2007 as irrelevant to the extent it concerns a proceeding involving patents not at issue here. Furthermore, Exhibit 2007 has not been shown to be a recognized authority for any of the subject matter contained therein.

FRE 106 & 403: Remainder of or Related Writings or Recorded Statements and Excluding Relevant Evidence for Prejudice, Confusion, Waste of Time, or Other Reasons. To the extent Exhibit 2007 is deemed to be relevant, Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2007 because it: (1) concerns a

litigation involving unrelated patents; (2) appears to contain excerpts of documents that are not part of this record; and (3) is itself a partial document. Thus, the probative value of Exhibit 2007 (if any), would be substantially outweighed by the dangers of unfair prejudice, wasting time, and confusing the issues.

Petitioner objects to Exhibit No. 2009 (Mucksavage et al., “*Differences in Grip Forces Among Various Robotic Instruments and da Vinci Surgical Platforms*”)

FRE 801-805: Hearsay. Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2009 as inadmissible hearsay to the extent Patent Owner intends to offer this Exhibit for the truth of the matters asserted. There is no declarant with personal knowledge of the experiments described in the Exhibit.

FRE 401, 402, & 403: Relevant Evidence and Excluding Relevant Evidence for Prejudice, Confusion, Waste of Time, or Other Reasons. Exhibit 2006 is a published patent application by Petitioner having no apparent relevance to the issues presented in this proceeding, and its content does not appear probative to the issues presented in Patent Owner’s Response.

Petitioner objects to Exhibit Nos. 2014 and 2019 (International WIPO Publication Nos. WO 2015/153642 and US Patent Application Publication No. 2012/0209314). The bases for objecting to these Exhibits include the following Federal Rules of Evidence:

FRE 801-805: Hearsay. Petitioner objects to these Exhibits as inadmissible hearsay to the extent Patent Owner intends to offer these Exhibits for the truth of the matters asserted.

FRE 401, 402, & 403: Relevant Evidence and Excluding Relevant Evidence for Prejudice, Confusion, Waste of Time, or Other Reasons. These Exhibits are patents and published applications by Petitioner having little to no relevance to any issue presented by the petition or otherwise present in this proceeding. To the extent that these Exhibits are relevant at all, any probative value of the articles is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice or confusion of the issues.

Dated: April 25, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven R. Katz/

Steven R. Katz, Reg. No. 43,706

Fish & Richardson P.C.

One Marina Park Drive

Boston, MA 02210

Tel: 617-521-7803

Email: [katz@fr.com](mailto:katz@fr.com)

*Attorney for Petitioner*

# 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.