

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Panasonic Corporation of North America *et al.*

Petitioners

v.

Cellspin Soft, Inc.

Patent Owner

CASE: IPR2019-00131

Patent No. 9,258,698

**PETITIONERS' OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE SUBMITTED WITH
PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

Case No. IPR2019-00131

Patent No. 9,258,698

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b), Petitioners hereby object to the following evidence submitted by Patent Owner with its Response filed in IPR2019-131 on July 22, 2019. These objections are timely filed pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1).

Evidence	Objections
Ex. 2011 (Definition of “encryption” from Techopedia)	FRE 401, 402, 403: Exhibit 2011 does not bear a publication date. The only date that appears on the face of the exhibit, July 22, 2019, is several years after the asserted priority date of the Challenged Claims; accordingly, Patent Owner has not established its relevance to any material issues in this proceeding. For the same reasons, any probative value associated with Exhibit 2011 is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues. FRE 901, 902: Exhibit 2011 is not self-authenticating under FRE 902, and Patent Owner has not produced evidence sufficient to support a finding that it is what Patent Owner says it is.
Ex. 2012 (Definition of “cryptographic” from Academic Press Dictionary of Science and Technology)	FRE 401, 402, 403: Exhibit 2012 is undated; accordingly, Patent Owner has not established its relevance to any material issues in this proceeding. For the same reasons, any probative value associated with Exhibit 2012 is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues.
Ex. 2013 (Excerpt from Applied Cryptography: Protocols, Algorithms, and Source Code in C)	FRE 802: To the extent that Patent Owner is attempting to use Exhibit 2013 for the truth of the matters asserted therein, Exhibit 2013 is hearsay, and as no hearsay exception applies, it is inadmissible. FRE 901, 902: Exhibit 2013 is not self-authenticating under FRE 902, and Patent Owner

	has not produced evidence sufficient to support a finding that it is what Patent Owner says it is.
Ex. 2014 (Excerpt from Wireless Communications and Networks)	Patent Owner has previously submitted this excerpt from Wireless Communications and Networks as evidence (Exhibit 2008). Accordingly, Petitioners restate and incorporate herein by reference their objections previously raised in Paper No. 15.
Ex. 2015 (Excerpt from CNSS Glossary)	FRE 401, 402, 403: Exhibit 2015 is dated in 2015, several years after the asserted priority date of the Challenged Claims, and is thus irrelevant. For the same reasons, any probative value associated with Exhibit 2015 is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues.
Ex. 2016 (Excerpt from NIST Glossary)	FRE 401, 402, 403: Exhibit 2016 is dated in 2013, several years after the asserted priority date of the Challenged Claims, and is thus irrelevant. For the same reasons, any probative value associated with Exhibit 2016 is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues. Furthermore, Patent Owner has previously submitted, as evidence, a copy of the NIST Glossary which contains the excerpt in Exhibit 2016. <i>See</i> Exhibit 2005, at 57. Accordingly, any probative value associated with Exhibit 2016 is substantially outweighed by a danger of needlessly presenting cumulative evidence.
Ex. 2017 (Security Analysis of Zigbee)	FRE 401, 402, 403: Exhibit 2017 is dated in 2017, several years after the asserted priority date of the Challenged Claims, and is thus irrelevant. For the same reasons, any probative value associated with Exhibit 2017 is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues. FRE 802: Patent Owner apparently is attempting to use Exhibit 2017 for the truth of the matters asserted therein. <i>See</i> Response at 16. Exhibit 2017 is thus hearsay, and as no hearsay exception

	<p>applies, it is inadmissible.</p> <p>FRE 901, 902: Exhibit 2017 is not self-authenticating under FRE 902, and Patent Owner has not produced evidence sufficient to support a finding that it is what Patent Owner says it is.</p>
<p>Ex. 2018 (Bluetooth Specification v2.1 + EDR)</p>	<p>FRE 401, 402, 403: Patent Owner has previously submitted this version of the Bluetooth specification as evidence (Exhibit 2006). Accordingly, any probative value associated with Exhibit 2018 is substantially outweighed by a danger of needlessly presenting cumulative evidence.</p>
<p>Ex. 2019 (Definition of “authentication” from Techopedia)</p>	<p>FRE 401, 402, 403: Exhibit 2019 is not relevant to this proceeding, as it is not cited in Patent Owner’s Response. Furthermore, Exhibit 2019 does not bear a publication date. The only date that appears on the face of the exhibit, July 22, 2019, is several years after the asserted priority date of the Challenged Claims; accordingly, Patent Owner has not established its relevance to any material issues in this proceeding. For the same reasons, any probative value associated with Exhibit 2019 is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues.</p> <p>FRE 901, 902: Exhibit 2019 is not self-authenticating under FRE 902, and Patent Owner has not produced evidence sufficient to support a finding that it is what Patent Owner says it is.</p>
<p>Ex. 2020 (Definition of “GUI” from Techopedia)</p>	<p>FRE 401, 402, 403: Exhibit 2020 does not bear a publication date. The only date that appears on the face of the exhibit, July 22, 2019, is several years after the asserted priority date of the Challenged Claims; accordingly, Patent Owner has not established its relevance to any material issues in this proceeding. For the same reasons, any probative value associated with Exhibit 2020 is substantially outweighed by a danger of</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.