

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.

Petitioner

v.

MEMORYWEB, LLC

Patent Owner

Patent No. 10,423,658

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2022-00033

PATENT OWNER'S OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), Patent Owner hereby submits objections to evidence served by Petitioner on December 23, 2022 in support of its Reply (Paper 26). The discussion below identifies the evidence Patent Owner objects to and summarizes the objections, including the Federal Rules of Evidence (“FRE”) or other rules that form the basis for the objections.

1. Ex. 1066 - “Scott Meyers & Mike Lee, *Learn Mac OS X Snow Leopard Book (2009) (Excerpts)*”

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1066 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1066 because it is not sufficiently relevant, and any relevance is outweighed by the risks of confusion, substantial danger of unfair prejudice, and/or misleading the fact finder. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 401-403. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1066 under FRE 106 because Ex. 1066 contains only excerpts of the writing; the remaining portions of Ex. 1066 in fairness ought to be considered at the same time as the excerpted portions. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 106. Further, Ex. 1066 does not comply with the Board’s rules governing the form of evidence. 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(d)(1)(ii).

2. Ex. 1067 - “Apress.com ordering page for *Learn Mac OS X Snow Leopard (Sept. 2009) Book (Archive.org: Feb. 1, 2010)*”

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1067 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1067 because it is not sufficiently relevant, and any relevance is

outweighed by the risks of confusion, substantial danger of unfair prejudice, and/or misleading the fact finder. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 401-403. Ex. 1067 is cited nowhere in the Reply. Further, Ex. 1067 does not comply with the Board’s rules governing the form of evidence. 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(d)(1)(ii).

3. Ex. 1068 - “Mac Dev Center – Apple Developer Webpages (Archive.org: Apr. 14, 2010)”

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1068 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1068 because it is not sufficiently relevant, and any relevance is outweighed by the risks of confusion, substantial danger of unfair prejudice, and/or misleading the fact finder. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 401-403. Ex. 1068 is cited nowhere in the Reply. Further, Ex. 1068 does not comply with the Board’s rules governing the form of evidence. 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(d)(1)(ii).

4. Ex. 1069 - “Apple Inc., Mac OS X Technology Overview (Aug. 14, 2009) (Archive.org: Nov. 13, 2010)”

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1069 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1069 because it is not sufficiently relevant, and any relevance is outweighed by the risks of confusion, substantial danger of unfair prejudice, and/or misleading the fact finder. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 401-403. Further, Ex. 1069 does not comply with the Board’s rules governing the form of evidence. 37 C.F.R. §

42.63(d)(1)(ii).

5. Ex. 1070 - “Apple Inc., *Bundle Programming Guide* (July 14, 2009) (Archive.org: May 25, 2010)”

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1070 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1070 because it is not sufficiently relevant, and any relevance is outweighed by the risks of confusion, substantial danger of unfair prejudice, and/or misleading the fact finder. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 401-403. Further, Ex. 1070 does not comply with the Board’s rules governing the form of evidence. 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(d)(1)(ii).

6. Ex. 1071 - “Apple Inc., *Resource Programming Guide* (Jan. 6, 2009) (Archive.org: Jan. 14, 2010)”

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1071 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1071 because it is not sufficiently relevant, and any relevance is outweighed by the risks of confusion, substantial danger of unfair prejudice, and/or misleading the fact finder. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 401-403. Further, Ex. 1071 does not comply with the Board’s rules governing the form of evidence. 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(d)(1)(ii).

7. Ex. 1072 - “Internet Archive Extended URLs and Corresponding Screen Shots”

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1072 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose

and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1072 as not authenticated and not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Petitioner provides no authenticating declaration explaining what Ex. 1072 is, how it was acquired, or how it was made. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1072 as it contains reproductions of purported screenshots in a PDF rather than the original screenshots. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 1002. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1072 because it is not sufficiently relevant, and any relevance is outweighed by the risks of confusion, substantial danger of unfair prejudice, and/or misleading the fact finder. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 401-403. Ex. 1072 is cited nowhere in the Reply. Further, Ex. 1072 does not comply with the Board’s rules governing the form of evidence. 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(d)(1)(ii).

8. Ex. 1073 - “Install Disk Screen Shots”

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1073 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1073 as not authenticated and not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1073 as it contains reproductions of purported screenshots rather than the original screenshots or the original underlying software program that is purportedly depicted. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 1002. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1073 because it is not sufficiently relevant, and any relevance is outweighed by the risks of confusion, substantial danger of unfair prejudice,

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.