

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

QUALCOMM INCORPORATED,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-01282
U.S. Patent No. 8,768,865

**PATENT OWNER'S OBJECTIONS TO PETITION EVIDENCE
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.64**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b), Patent Owner Qualcomm Incorporated, respectfully asserts the following objections to the evidence proffered with Petitioner's Petition for *Inter Partes* Review submitted on June 29, 2018 ("Petition"). 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 Petitioner's Description	Objections
<p>1005: Wang et al, "A Framework of Energy Efficient Mobile Sensing for Automatic User State Recognition", Proceedings of the 7th international conference on Mobile systems, applications, and services, pp. 179-192, Kraków, Poland — June 22 - 25, 2009 ("Wang")</p>	<p><u>Authentication</u>. Fed. R. Evid. 901(a). Petitioner has not produced evidence sufficient to support a finding that this exhibit is what Petitioner purports it to be: <i>e.g.</i>, an ACM conference article published in 2009. Petition at 5-6.</p> <p><u>Hearsay</u>. Fed. R. Evid. 801(c) and 802. To the extent that Petitioner relies on this exhibit to prove the truth of matters described therein, it is hearsay: <i>e.g.</i>, that Ex. 1005 provides a copyright notice indicating a 2009 publication date and that "recognizing a second pattern based on the first pattern (step 410) had also been known and implemented, for example, at least in prior-art systems that detect a state transition." See Petition at 10. Petitioner has not offered evidence sufficient to demonstrate that this exhibit falls within any exception to the rule against hearsay.</p> <p><u>Relevance</u>. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403. This 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,</p>

Ex. Number and Petitioner's Description	Objections
	because it is inadmissible under FRE 801, 802, and 901 as explained above.
<p>1010: Webpage of "Nokia N95 8GB - Full phone specifications" (Archive.org version dated 05/26/2009, http://web.archive.org/web/20090526054459/http://www.gsmarena.com:80/nokia_n95_8gb-2088.php) ("Nokia N95")</p>	<p><u>Hearsay</u>. Fed. R. Evid. 801(c) and 802. To the extent that Petitioner relies on this exhibit to prove the truth of matters described therein, it is hearsay: <i>e.g.</i>, that the Nokia N95 included 'CPU Dual ARM 11 332 MHz processor; 3D Graphics HW Accelerator.'</p> <p><u>Relevance</u>. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403. This 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 and 802 as explained above.</p>
<p>1016: Declaration of Mr. Scott Delman for Wang/APPLE-1005</p>	<p><u>Hearsay</u>. Fed. R. Evid. 801(c) and 802. The statements in Mr. Delman's declaration are hearsay because the declaration does not establish that Mr. Delman's statements are based on personal knowledge, and does not sufficiently establish that the business records exception of FRE 803(6) or any other exception would apply, and expressly indicates that at least some such statements are based on second-hand hearsay statements from others. <i>See, e.g.</i>, Ex. 1016 at ¶ 1 ("I make this declaration based on my personal knowledge, information contained in the business records of ACM, <u>or</u> confirmation with other responsible ACM personnel with such knowledge.")</p> <p>Thus, to the extent that Petitioner relies on this exhibit to prove the truth of matters described therein, it is hearsay: <i>e.g.</i>, "that the earliest <u>online</u> publication date for [Ex. 1005] was June 23, 2009." Ex. 1016 at ¶ 2; Petition at 6 (citing Ex. 1010). Petitioner has not offered evidence sufficient to demonstrate that this</p>

Ex. Number and Petitioner's Description	Objections
	<p>exhibit falls within any exception to the rule against hearsay.</p> <p><u>Relevance.</u> Fed. R. Evid. 401-403. This 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 and 802 as explained above.</p>
<p>1017: Cohn, D., Caruana, R., & McCallum, A. <i>Semi-supervised clustering with user feedback in Constrained Clustering: Advances in Algorithms, Theory, and Applications</i>, 4(1), 17-32 (2009). (“Cohn”)</p>	<p><u>Authentication.</u> Fed. R. Evid. 901(a). Petitioner has not produced evidence sufficient to support a finding that this exhibit is what Petitioner purports it to be: <i>e.g.</i>, an excerpt of a book published in 2009. Petition at 3, 66.</p> <p><u>Hearsay.</u> Fed. R. Evid. 801(c) and 802. To the extent that Petitioner relies on this exhibit to prove the truth of matters described therein, it is hearsay: <i>e.g.</i>, that Ex. 1017 was published in 2009 and “involving user input or feedback in identifying an irrelevant pattern is a well-known implementation among a finite number of identified, predictable solutions in pattern recognition (i.e., identifying the irrelevant pattern either automatically or manually) and have been known to improve recognition accuracy and save computational resource and improve computational efficiency.” Petition at 3, 61. Petitioner has not offered evidence sufficient to demonstrate that this exhibit falls within any exception to the rule against hearsay.</p> <p><u>Relevance.</u> Fed. R. Evid. 401-403. This 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.</p>

Ex. Number and Petitioner's Description	Objections
<p>1018: Ruzzelli, A., Nicolas, C. Schoofs, A., O'Hare, G. Real-time recognition and profiling of appliances through a single electricity sensor, Proc. 7th Annual IEEE Conference on Sensor Mesh (SECON), Boston. MA 2010. ("Ruzzelli")</p>	<p><u>Authentication.</u> Fed. R. Evid. 901(a). Petitioner has not produced evidence sufficient to support a finding that this exhibit is what Petitioner purports it to be: <i>e.g.</i>, an IEEE conference paper published in 2010. Petition at 3, 46, 66. Similarly, Petitioner has not produced evidence sufficient to authenticate the purported "ResearchGate" or "Research Repository UCD" documents at pages 10/11 and 11/11, respectively, of Ex. 1018.</p> <p><u>Hearsay.</u> Fed. R. Evid. 801(c) and 802. To the extent that Petitioner relies on this exhibit to prove the truth of matters described therein, it is hearsay: <i>e.g.</i>, that Ex. 1018 was published in 2010 and that "storing patterns in a database is a well-known, commonly adopted practice in the art to implement pattern recognition." Petition at 3, 51-52; <i>see also</i> Petition at 61. Similarly, to the extent Petitioner relies on the purported "ResearchGate" or "Research Repository UCD" documents at pages 10/11 and 11/11, respectively, of Ex. 1018 to prove the truth of the matters asserted, it is also hearsay: <i>e.g.</i>, that Ex. 1018 was dated "July 2010" or published in "2010-06". Petitioner has not offered evidence sufficient to demonstrate that this exhibit falls within any exception to the rule against hearsay.</p> <p><u>Relevance.</u> Fed. R. Evid. 401-403. This 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.</p>
<p>1019: Cilla, R., Particio, M., Garcia, J., Berlanga, A., and Molina, J. Recognizing Human Activities from Sensors</p>	<p><u>Authentication.</u> Fed. R. Evid. 901(a). Petitioner has not produced evidence sufficient to support a finding that this exhibit is what Petitioner purports it to be: <i>e.g.</i>, an <i>Algorithms 2009</i> article. Petition at 3.</p>

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.