

Filed on behalf of: Meta Platforms, Inc.

Filed: May 25, 2023

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

META PLATFORMS, INC.
Petitioner,

v.

ANGEL TECHNOLOGIES GROUP LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2023-00057
U.S. Patent No. 8,954,432

PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS TO PATENT OWNER'S EVIDENCE

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), Petitioner Meta Platforms, Inc. ("Petitioner") submits the following objections to evidence submitted by Patent Owner Angel Technologies Group LLC ("Patent Owner"). Petitioner's objections apply equally to Patent Owner's reliance on this evidence in any subsequently filed documents or further proceedings in this matter. These objections are timely, having been filed and served within ten business days of the institution of the trial. Notwithstanding these objections, Petitioner expressly reserves the right to rely on any evidence submitted by Patent Owner, including on the ground that such evidence constitutes a party admission.

Objections

Exhibit 2005

Petitioner objects to this exhibit as improper lay testimony under FRE 701, to the extent it offers testimony in the form of an opinion that is based on scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge within the scope of FRE 702. Petitioner further objects to this exhibit for lack of foundation and lack of personal knowledge under FRE 602, and as inadmissible hearsay under FRE 801 and 802 not falling under any exceptions, including those of FRE 803, 804, 805, or 807.

Exhibits 2006-2011

Petitioner objects to these exhibits as not properly authenticated under FRE 901 because Patent Owner has not presented sufficient evidence to show that

they are authentic or self-authenticating under FRE 902. Petitioner further objects to these exhibits under FRE 106 (completeness), as these exhibits are incomplete and only include select portions of larger documents or collections of documents that should be considered in connection with these exhibits. To the extent Patent Owner relies on these documents for the truth of the matter asserted, Petitioner objects to these exhibits as inadmissible hearsay under FRE 801 and 802 not falling under any exceptions, including those of FRE 803, 804, 805, or 807.

Exhibit 2012

Petitioner objects to this exhibit as not properly authenticated under FRE 901 because Patent Owner has not presented sufficient evidence to show that it is authentic or self-authenticating under FRE 902. Petitioner further objects to this exhibit under FRE 106 (completeness), as this exhibit is incomplete and only includes select portions of larger documents or collections of documents that should be considered in connection with this exhibit. Petitioner also objects to this exhibit under FRE 401-402 (relevance). To the extent Patent Owner relies on this document for the truth of the matter asserted, Petitioner objects to this exhibit as inadmissible hearsay under FRE 801 and 802 not falling under any exceptions, including those of FRE 803, 804, 805, or 807.

Exhibits 2013-2014

Petitioner objects to these exhibits as not properly authenticated under FRE 901 because Patent Owner has not presented sufficient evidence to show that they are authentic or self-authenticating under FRE 902. Petitioner further objects to these exhibits under FRE 106 (completeness), as these exhibits are incomplete and only include select portions of larger documents or collections of documents that should be considered in connection with these exhibits. To the extent Patent Owner relies on these documents for the truth of the matter asserted, Petitioner objects to these exhibits as inadmissible hearsay under FRE 801 and 802 not falling under any exceptions, including those of FRE 803, 804, 805, or 807.

Exhibit 2015

Petitioner objects to this exhibit as not properly authenticated under FRE 901 because Patent Owner has not presented sufficient evidence to show that it is authentic or self-authenticating under FRE 902. To the extent Patent Owner relies on this document for the truth of the matter asserted, Petitioner objects to this exhibit as inadmissible hearsay under FRE 801 and 802 not falling under any exceptions, including those of FRE 803, 804, 805, or 807.

Exhibits 2016 & 2018

Petitioner objects to these exhibits as improper lay testimony under FRE 701, to the extent they offer testimony in the form of an opinion that is based on scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge within the scope of FRE 702. Petitioner

further objects to these exhibits for lack of foundation and lack of personal knowledge under FRE 602, and as inadmissible hearsay under FRE 801 and 802 not falling under any exceptions, including those of FRE 803, 804, 805, or 807.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 25, 2023

By: / Lisa K. Nguyen /

Lisa K. Nguyen (Reg. No. 58,018)
lisa.nguyen@allenoverly.com
Allen & Overy LLP
550 High Street
Palo Alto, CA 94301
Telephone: (650) 388-1724

*Counsel for Petitioner
Meta Platforms, Inc.*

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.