UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AMERICAN NATIONAL MANUFACTURING INC., Petitioner,

v.

SLEEP NUMBER CORPORATION f/k/a SELECT COMFORT CORPORATION, Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2019-00500

Patent No. 9,737,154

PETITIONER'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE



Case No. IPR2019-00500 Patent No. 9,737,154

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| I. | INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF RELIEF | 1 |
|---------------------|---|---|
| II. | Exhibit 2027 – Declaration of John Abraham | 1 |
| A | Legal Standard for Admissibility of Expert Opinions | 1 |
| B R | Dr. Abraham's Declaration Falls Short of the Reliability and Disclosure equired for Admission | 2 |
| III. | Exhibit 2029 – Declaration of George Edwards | 3 |
| IV. | Exhibit 2030 – Declaration of Carl Degen | 6 |
| A ot | Let Expert Evidence Regarding Commercial Success Requires Controlling for ther Factors that May Explain Sales | |
| В | . Mr. Degen Did Not Control for Factors Related to Commercial Success | 7 |
| V. | Exhibit 2033 – Declaration of Elizabeth Patton10 | 0 |
| VI. Baxt | Exhibit 2034 – Trial Transcript from Select Comfort Corporation v. John ter, et al., Case No. 12-CV-02899-DWF-SER ("the Baxter Case") | 2 |
| VII. | • Ex. 2035 – Dires LLC Emails | 3 |
| VIII | I. Ex. 2036 – Dires LLC Emails | 3 |
| IX. Infri | Exhibits 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, and 2049 – PO's District Court ingement Contentions | 4 |
| X. | Exhibit 2050 – Optimus Emails | 5 |



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | Page(s) |
|---|---------|
| Federal Cases | |
| Anderson v. United States, 417 U.S. 211 (1974) | 12 |
| Apple Inc. v. INVT SPE LLC, IPR2018-01476, 2020 WL 1808193 (Apr. 8, 2020) | 4 |
| Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elec. Co. Ltd., 839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016) | 8 |
| Cable Elec. Products, Inc. v. Genmark, Inc., 770 F.2d 1015 (Fed. Cir. 1985) | 7 |
| Elder v. Tanner, 205 F.R.D. 190 (E.D. Tex. 2001) | 3, 5 |
| Exeter Bancorporation v. Kemper Securities Group, Inc., 58 F.3d 1306 (8th Cir.1995) | 14 |
| Geo. M. Martin Co. v. Alliance Machine Systems Intern. LLC, 618 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010) | 7 |
| Invitrogen Corp. v. Clontech Labs., Inc., 429 F.3d 1052 (Fed. Cir. 2005) | 3 |
| McManaway v. KBR, Inc., 852 F.3d 444 (5th Cir. 2017) | 7 |
| Rembrandt Vision Tech., L.P. v. Johnson & Johnson Vision Care, Inc., | _ |
| 725 F.3d 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2013) | 6 |
| Ritchie v. Vast Resources, Inc., 563 F.3d 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2009) | 8 |
| Sheehan v. Daily Racing Form, Inc., 104 F.3d 940 (7th Cir. 1997) | 3 |



Case No. IPR2019-00500 Patent No. 9,737,154

| Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers, Local Union No. 182 v. New York State Teamsters Council Health & Hosp. Fund., 909 F. Supp. 102 (N.D.N.Y. 1995) | 12 |
|---|----|
| TNS Media Research, LLC v. Tivo Research and Analytics, Inc., 629 F. App'x 916 (Fed. Cir. 2015) | 8 |
| United States v. Velarde–Gomez, 224 F.3d 1062 (9th Cir.2000) | 14 |
| Other Authorities | |
| 3D-Matrix, Ltd. v. Menicon Co., Ltd., No. IPR2014-00398, 2014 WL 3851279 (PTAB Aug. 1, 2014) | 2 |



I. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF RELIEF

Pursuant to the Board's rules, Petitioner American National Manufacturing Inc. ("ANM") moves to exclude the following exhibits submitted by Patent Owner ("PO") in support of its Patent Owner Response (Papers 45-46; "POR") and Patent Owner Surreply (Paper 85; "POS"): Ex. 2027, 2029, 2030, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, and 2050 under the Federal Rules of Evidence ("FRE") for the reasons set forth below.

II. Exhibit 2027 – Declaration of John Abraham

PO relies on the declaration of John Abraham to assert nexus for secondary indicia of nonobviousness, namely, commercial success and copying. POR at 59-60, 63-67; POS at 22-24. ANM duly objected to the admission of his declaration under FRE 702 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a), as Abraham failed to adequately disclose the basis for his opinions and due to the unreliability of his methods. Petitioner's *Objections to Patent Owner's Evidence*, Paper 51 ("OBE") at 5-9. Thus, the evidence should be excluded.

A. Legal Standard for Admissibility of Expert Opinions

FRE 702 permits expert witness testimony if: "(a) the expert's scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge will help the trier of fact to understand the evidence or determine a fact in issue; (b) the testimony is based on sufficient facts or data; (c) the testimony is the product of reliable principles and methods; and (d)



DOCKET

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.

