

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD. AND SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS
AMERICA, INC.
Petitioners,

v.

MANUFACTURING RESOURCES INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 9,173,322

Title: CONSTRICTED CONVECTION COOLING SYSTEM FOR AN
ELECTRONIC DISPLAY

Inter Partes Review No. IPR 2023-00220

**PETITIONERS' OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE FILED WITH PATENT
OWNER'S SUR-REPLY**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), Petitioners Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (“Samsung”) hereby objects to Patent Owner Manufacturing Resources International, Inc.’s (“Patent Owner”) exhibits submitted with Patent Owner’s Sur-Reply (Paper 41). Samsung’s objections are timely under 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1) because they are being filed and served within five business days of the filing of Patent Owner’s Sur-Reply. Samsung’s objections provide notice to Patent Owner that Samsung may move to exclude these exhibits under 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c).

Samsung objects to Exhibits 2055 and 2056 as untimely and/or an unauthorized attempt to submit new evidence into this proceeding. 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b). Exhibits 2055 and 2056 are new evidence other than a deposition transcript of the cross-examination of the reply witness. *See* § 42.23(b) (“A sur-reply... may not be accompanied by new evidence other than deposition transcripts of the cross-examination of any reply witness”); *see also* Consolidated Trial Practice Guide (Nov. 2019) at 73-74 (“The sur-reply may not be accompanied by new evidence other than deposition transcripts of the cross-examination of any reply witness.”).

Samsung also objects to Exhibits 2055 and 2056 as not relevant under FRE 401 and 402. For example, Patent Owner merely relies on Exhibit 2055 to show that it has sought review of the Final Initial Determination in the related ITC

proceedings. Samsung further objects to these exhibits under FRE 403 because any probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence.

Date: February 6, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Sanjeet K. Dutta/

Sanjeet K. Dutta (Reg. No. 46,145)
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
601 Marshall Street
Redwood City, California 94063
Email: sdutta@goodwinlaw.com
Tel.: +1 (650) 752-3100
Fax: +1 (650) 853-1038

Counsel for Petitioners

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.6(e) the undersigned hereby certifies that Petitioners' Objections to Evidence Filed with Patent Owner's Sur-Reply was served on counsel for Patent Owner upon the following addresses as listed in Patent Owner's Mandatory Notices:

John C. Alemanni – jalemanni@kilpatricktownsend.com

Carl Sanders – csanders@kilpatricktownsend.com

Michael T. Morlock – mmorlock@kilpatricktownsend.com

Courtney Dabbieri – cdabbieri@kilpatricktownsend.com

Respectfully submitted,
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP

Date: February 6, 2024

By: /Sanjeet K. Dutta/
Sanjeet K. Dutta (Reg. No. 46,145)
Goodwin Procter LLP
601 Marshall Street
Redwood City, CA 94063
Email: sdutta@goodwinlaw.com
Tel: (650) 752-3100
Fax: (650) 853-1038

Counsel for Petitioners