#### UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

#### **BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

#### PEAG LLC (d/b/a JLab Audio), AUDIO PARTNERSHIP LLC and AUDIO PARTNERSHIP PLC (d/b/a Cambridge Audio), Petitioner,

v.

VARTA MICROBATTERY GMBH, Patent Owner.

> Case No. IPR2020-01212 U.S. Patent No. 9,153,835 B2

#### PATENT OWNER'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c)

DOCKET A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION1		
II.	MR. GARDNER'S SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION (EXHIBIT 1041) SHOULD BE EXCLUDED		.2
	А.	New Opinions Concerning Motivation to Combine Kaun With Kobayashi's Separator—Dendrites	.2
	В.	New Opinions Concerning Additional Motivations to Modify Kaun With Kobayashi	.5
	C.	New Opinions Concerning Reasonable Expectation of Success— Kaun's Center Fastener	.6
	D.	New Opinions Concerning Reasonable Expectation of Success— Kobayashi's Electrode Assembly	.7
III.	CON	ONCLUSION9	

### IPR2020-01212 U.S. Patent No. 9,153,835 B2

#### **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

#### Cases

BancFirst ex rel. Estate of M.J.H. v. Ford Motor Co., 422 F. App'x 663 (10th Cir. 2011)
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015)1
Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd., 821 F. 3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)2, 6
JTEKT Corporation v. GKN Automotive, Ltd., IPR2016-00046, Paper 27 (PTAB Jan. 23, 2017)6
Resideo Technologies, Inc. v. Ubiquitous Connectivity, LP, IPR2019-01335, 2021 WL 262372 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 26, 2021)9
Sumitomo Electric Industry, Ltd. v. United Technologies Corporation, IPR2017-00966, Paper 29 (PTAB Sep. 12, 2018)
<i>Toyota Motor Corporation v. American Vehicular Sciences LLC,</i> IPR2013-00424, Paper 50 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 12, 2015)4
Other Authorities
P.T.A.B. Consolidated Trial Practice Guide (Nov. 2019)
Rules
37 C.F.R. § 42.23
37 C.F.R. § 42.61
37 C.F.R. § 42.62
37 C.F.R. § 42.64
Fed. R. Evid. 401
Fed. R. Evid. 402 1, 2, 7, 9
Fed. R. Evid. 403 1, 2, 9

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner's Supplemental Declaration of William H. Gardner (Ex. 1041, "Gardner's Supplemental Declaration") presents new opinions and theories that were not provided in the Petition. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.23(b), 42.61, 42.62, and 42.64(c) and Federal Rules of Evidence 401–403, Patent Owner respectfully moves to exclude Sections III–VI of Mr. Gardner's Supplemental Declaration.

Mr. Gardner's Supplemental Declaration is not a reply declaration. He did not cite or even indicate that he reviewed the Declaration of Patent Owner's expert, Dr. Peckerar, (Ex. 2043). *See* Ex. 1041, ¶ 4; Ex. 2051, 31:5–32:5. Mr. Gardner's Supplemental Declaration attempts to fill gaps in Petitioner's obviousness grounds set forth in the Petition. He provides new opinions and theories that a POSA would have been motivated to combine Kaun (Ex. 1005) and Kobayashi (Ex. 1006) and would have expected success in making the combination. This new evidence could have been presented in his original declaration and should be excluded. *See Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC*, 805 F.3d 1064, 1081 (Fed. Cir. 2015) ("[A] party may move to exclude evidence, whether as improper under the response-only regulation, under the Trial Practice Guide's advice, or on other grounds.").

# II. MR. GARDNER'S SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION (EXHIBIT 1041) SHOULD BE EXCLUDED

Mr. Gardner's Supplemental Declaration was submitted in reply to Patent Owner's Response. Petitioner relied on the Supplemental Declaration to support new arguments that should have been made in the Petition, not for the first time in Petitioner's Reply. See 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b); P.T.A.B. Consolidated Trial Practice Guide, at 74–5 (Nov. 2019), ("Trial Practice Guide"); Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd., 821 F. 3d 1359, 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2016). Those portions of the Reply and supporting Supplemental Declaration (Sections III–VI) are not relevant to the instituted grounds of review. FED. R. EVID. 401, 402. The belatedly presented evidence and arguments should also be excluded as unfairly prejudicial, see FED. R. EVID. 403, at least because the undue delay prevented Patent Owner from fully responding to them prior to the institution decision and significantly truncated the amount of time available to Patent Owner to address the belated evidence and arguments in its Sur-Reply.

#### A. New Opinions Concerning Motivation to Combine Kaun With Kobayashi's Separator—Dendrites

The Petition (supported by Mr. Gardner's original Declaration, Ex. 1003) argued that a POSA would have understood the z-shaped separator in Kaun's battery design to have overlapping edges. Pet. (Paper 1) at 34–37; Ex. 1003, ¶¶ 135–138. Petitioner argued that a POSA would have been motivated to

# DOCKET A L A R M



# 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.