

Case No. IPR2019-00514
Patent No. 5,904,172

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. IPR2019-00514

Patent No. 5,904,172

**PETITIONER'S OPPOSITION TO PATENT OWNER'S
MOTION TO EXCLUDE (PAPER 82)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. LEGAL STANDARD 1

III. ARGUMENT 1

A. Dr. Giachetti’s testimony should not be excluded 1

B. Supporting exhibits re ANM’s opposition to PO motion for additional discovery should not be excluded..... 2

 1. Exs. 1041–42 and 1047 are not inadmissible hearsay 2

 2. Exs. 1041–47 and 1052 are also admissible 3

C. Miscellaneous arguments should be disregarded 3

 1. The Declaration of Mr. Craig Miller should not be excluded..... 3

 2. The Declaration of Dr. Lynde should not be excluded..... 7

 3. ITC Order..... 9

 4. Deposition Transcripts 9

IV. CONCLUSION.....10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Federal Cases

In the Matter of *CERTAIN AIR MATTRESS SYSTEMS,
COMPONENTS THEREOF, AND MEHTODS OF USING THE
SAME*,
No. 337-TA-971, 2020 WL 416443 (U.S.I.T.C. Jan. 22, 2020).....2

Donlin v. Phillips Lighting N. Am. Corp.,
581 F.3d 73 (3rd Cir. 2009)5

Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumia Cambridge Ltd.,
821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)7

LifeWise Master Funding v. Telebank,
374 F.3d 917 (10th Cir. 2004).....6

Sanofi-Aventis U.S. LLC v. Immunex Corp.,
No. IPR2017-01884, Paper 96 (PTAB Feb. 14, 2019)1

Ward v. Dixie Nat. Life Ins. Co.,
595 F.3d 164 (4th Cir. 2010).....8

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner American National Manufacturing, Inc. (“ANM” or “Petitioner”) files this Opposition in response Patent Owner Sleep Number Corp.’s (f/k/a Select Comfort Corp.) (“PO” or “Sleep Number”) Motion to Exclude (Paper 82) (the “MTE”).

PO’s motion should be denied.

II. LEGAL STANDARD

“The party moving to exclude evidence bears the burden of proving that it is entitled to the relief requested—namely, that the material sought to be excluded is inadmissible under the Federal Rules of Evidence (“FRE”).” *Sanofi-Aventis U.S. LLC v. Immunex Corp.*, No. IPR2017-01884, Paper 96 (PTAB Feb. 14, 2019) (citing 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.20(c) and 42.62(a)).

III. ARGUMENT

A. Dr. Giachetti’s testimony should not be excluded

A motion to exclude must “[i]dentify where in the record the evidence sought to be excluded was relied upon.” Practice Guide, § II.K(b). PO’s argument in this section fail to make a proper case for exclusion given PO fails to identify where ANM is relying on the objected-to evidence. In addition, the objected-to portions of Dr. Giachetti’s declaration provide helpful background and context and are thus admissible.

B. Supporting exhibits re ANM's opposition to PO motion for additional discovery should not be excluded

1. Exs. 1041–42 and 1047 are not inadmissible hearsay

Exs. 1041–42 are screenshots from Dun & Bradstreet related to corporate financial information. These exhibits fall squarely within the ambit of FRE 803(17) hearsay exception for market reports and commercial publications.

With respect to Ex. 1046, it is a brief regarding vacatur related to an International Trade Commission. Given that PO has been trumpeting that ITC case here (e.g., Ex. 2015 and 2016 (ITC papers)), it is relevant that the ITC vacated its positions related to the '172 patent at issue here. See Ex. 1079 (In the Matter of *CERTAIN AIR MATTRESS SYSTEMS, COMPONENTS THEREOF, AND MEHTODS OF USING THE SAME*, No. 337-TA-971, 2020 WL 416443 (U.S.I.T.C. Jan. 22, 2020)).

With respect to Ex. 1047, PO objects to ¶¶ 3–4 and 8–9 of Mr. Miller's declaration without elaborating why these statements are believed to be inadmissible hearsay. A review those paragraphs reveal the testimony generally relates to PO itself. This testimony is not inadmissible hearsay because any underlying statements are used against a party opponent (*see* FRE 801(d)(2)) or an exception applies (*see* FRE 804(b)(3) or 807). Other testimony (Ex. 1047, ¶ 9) is not hearsay because Mr. Miller is providing factual information (e.g., how much he was paid) of which he had personal knowledge.

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.