UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

QUALCOMM INCORPORATED,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-01281
Patent 8,768,865

PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b), Petitioner, Apple Inc., respectfully asserts the following objections to the evidence proffered with Patent Owner Response to *Inter Partes* Review Petition submitted on May 28, 2019 ("POR"). These objections are being provided within ten business days from the institution of the trial, and are thus timely pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1). The Federal Rules of Evidence (FRE) apply to these proceedings according to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 42.62(a), and these rules form the basis of the objections contained herein.

Ex. Number and Patent Owner's Description	**Objections**
2004: Declaration of John Villasenor; ¶ 27	Hearsay. Fed. R. Evid. 801(c) and 802. To the extent that Petitioner relies on this portion of the exhibit to prove the truth of matters described therein, it is hearsay: *e.g.*, that "A person of ordinary skill in the art would understand that 'fixing' parameters, in the context of the '865 Patent, refers to setting the scope of analysis to enable pattern recognition of additional patterns when there is a pattern in the fixed parameters." *See* Ex. 2004 at ¶ 27. Patent Owner has not offered evidence sufficient to demonstrate that this portion of the exhibit falls within any exception to the rule against hearsay. Relevance. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403. This portion of the exhibit is irrelevant under FRE 401, and thus inadmissible under FRE 402, or inadmissible as unfairly prejudicial, confusing, and/or a waste of time under FRE 403, because it is inadmissible under FRE 801, 802, and 901 as explained above.

Ex. Number and Patent Owner's Description	Objections
2004: Declaration of John Villasenor; ¶ 32	Hearsay. Fed. R. Evid. 801(c) and 802. To the extent that Petitioner relies on this portion of the exhibit to prove the truth of matters described therein, it is hearsay: *e.g.*, that "A person of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the '865 Patent describes 'associating' as a substep of 'fixing,' that 'associating' does not, on its own, accomplish 'fixing.' …. association must be used to set the scope of analysis to enable pattern recognition of additional patterns when 'motion state' ='driving.'" *See* Ex. 2004 at ¶ 32. Patent Owner has not offered evidence sufficient to demonstrate that this portion of the exhibit falls within any exception to the rule against hearsay. Relevance. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403. This portion of the exhibit is irrelevant under FRE 401, and thus inadmissible under FRE 402, or inadmissible as unfairly prejudicial, confusing, and/or a waste of time under FRE 403, because it is inadmissible under FRE 801, 802, and 901 as explained above.

2004: Declaration of John Villasenor; ¶ 37	Hearsay. Fed. R. Evid. 801(c) and 802. To the extent that Petitioner relies on this portion of the exhibit to prove the truth of matters described therein, it is hearsay: *e.g.*, that "A person of ordinary skill in the art would understand the BRI of 'pattern,' as used in the '865 Patent, to be: 'a collection of one or more pairs of varying parameters and corresponding parameter values, as well as the relationship between each pair (where the relationship may be implicit).' …This construction is incomplete because it does not explicitly state that the pattern includes not only parameter values, but the linked parameter." *See* Ex. 2004 at ¶ 37. Patent Owner has not offered evidence sufficient to demonstrate that this portion of the exhibit falls within any exception to the rule against hearsay. Relevance. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403. This portion of the exhibit is irrelevant under FRE 401, and thus inadmissible under FRE 402, or inadmissible as unfairly prejudicial, confusing, and/or a waste of time under FRE 403, because it is inadmissible under FRE 801, 802, and 901 as explained above.

2004: Declaration of John Villasenor; ¶ 40	Hearsay. Fed. R. Evid. 801(c) and 802. To the extent that Petitioner relies on this portion of the exhibit to prove the truth of matters described therein, it is hearsay: *e.g.*, that "A person of ordinary skill in the art would understand that identifying a pattern means identifying all of the elements I discussed above that make up the pattern." *See* Ex. 2004 at ¶ 40. Patent Owner has not offered evidence sufficient to demonstrate that this portion of the exhibit falls within any exception to the rule against hearsay. Relevance. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403. This portion of the exhibit is irrelevant under FRE 401, and thus inadmissible under FRE 402, or inadmissible as unfairly prejudicial, confusing, and/or a waste of time under FRE 403, because it is inadmissible under FRE 801, 802, and 901 as explained above.
2004: Declaration of John Villasenor; ¶ 43	Hearsay. Fed. R. Evid. 801(c) and 802. To the extent that Petitioner relies on this portion of the exhibit to prove the truth of matters described therein, it is hearsay: *e.g.*, that "Petitioner's proposed construction is contrary to the description of "fixing" in the patent." *See* Ex. 2004 at ¶ 43. Patent Owner has not offered evidence sufficient to demonstrate that this portion of the exhibit falls within any exception to the rule against hearsay. Relevance. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403. This portion of the exhibit is irrelevant under FRE 401, and thus inadmissible under FRE 402, or inadmissible as unfairly prejudicial, confusing, and/or a waste of time under FRE 403, because it is inadmissible under FRE 801, 802, and 901 as explained above.

DOCKET ALARM

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.