

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTUITIVE SURGICAL, INC.

Petitioner

v.

ETHICON LLC

Patent Owner

Case IPR2018-01254

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 Preliminary Response dated October 17, 2018, in connection with IPR2018-01254. These objections are being submitted within ten business days of the Institution Decision.

Petitioner objects to Exhibit No. 2001 (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 and PTAB decision:

FRE 801, 802 & 803: Hearsay. Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2001 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 2001 as irrelevant to the extent it concerns a proceeding involving patents not at issue here. Furthermore, Exhibit 2001 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 2001 is deemed to be relevant, Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2001 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 2001 (if any), would be substantially outweighed by the dangers of unfair prejudice, wasting time, and confusing the issues.

St. Jude Medical, Cardiology Division, Inc. v. The Board of Regents of the University of Michigan, Case No. IPR2013-00041, slip op. at 2-3 (PTAB Jan. 27, 2014) (Paper 65) (explaining that demonstrative exhibits are not evidence and that demonstrative exhibits are not an opportunity for additional briefing). Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2001 because it is a set of demonstrative slides that contain excerpts from documents that are not cited and not part of this record as well as additional attorney arguments that are not included in Patent Owner's Preliminary Response. Thus, Exhibit 2001 is not evidence, but rather an improper attempt to submit additional attorney arguments along with incomplete and unidentified documentary evidence.

Dated: January 30, 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

Attorney for Petitioner

