

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MOTOROLA SOLUTIONS, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

STA GROUP LLC,

Patent Owner.

IPR2023-01293

U.S. Patent No.: 8,489,134 B2

**PETITIONER’S OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE SUBMITTED
WITH PATENT OWNER’S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), Petitioner objects to the following exhibits filed by Patent Owner (“PO”) with its Patent Owner Preliminary Response (“POPR,” Paper No. 7) based on the following Federal Rules of Evidence (“FRE”). These objections are timely, as they are being made within ten business days of the institution of trial (March 13, 2024). The following chart lists Petitioner’s objections to the admissibility of certain evidence (identified below) that is included within or accompanies the Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response and the basis for those objections.

<u>Exhibit</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Objections</u>
2001	Declaration of Michael Craner	FRE 602/702: Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2001, including at least ¶¶ 31-49 and 51-53, because PO did not introduce sufficient evidence to establish that the witness has personal knowledge of the matters discussed. For example, PO has not established that Mr. Craner is qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education, or other personal knowledge, to offer opinions regarding the meaning that “transcoding” and “automatically configured to select a transcoding,” as used in the claims of the ’134 Patent, would have had to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the alleged invention of the ’134 Patent. FRE 702 and 703: Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2001, including at least ¶¶ 31-49 and 51-53, as improper testimony under FRE 702 and 703. The testimony is based on insufficient facts or data, is not the product of reliable principles and methods, and does not reliably apply the

<u>Exhibit</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Objections</u>
		appropriate principles and methods to the facts of the case. For example, Mr. Craner’s testimony regarding (1) the alleged state of the art at the time of the alleged invention of the ’134 Patent and (2) the alleged meaning that “transcoding” and “automatically configured to select a transcoding,” as used in the claims of the ’134 Patent, would have had to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the alleged invention of the ’134 Patent, is conclusory and not supported by corroborating evidence. Mr. Craner’s testimony fails to identify the facts or data underlying the statements and opinions in his declaration. Moreover, Mr. Craner fails to identify the facts or data underlying Figures A-D created by Mr. Craner and included in his declaration.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: March 27, 2024

/Eliot D. Williams/
Eliot D. Williams (Reg. No. 50,822)
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
700 K Street, N.W
Washington, D.C. 20001-5692
Tel: 202-639-1334
eliot.williams@bakerbotts.com
Attorneys for Petitioner, Motorola Solutions, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e), the undersigned certifies that on March 27, 2024, a complete and entire copy of the **PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE SUBMITTED WITH PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE** was served on Patent Owner via email at the following correspondence addresses:

Jason.Engel.PTAB@klgates.com

Katy.Allor@klgates.com

Nolan.Hubbard@klgates.com

Samuel.Richey@klgates.com

Date: March 27, 2024

/Eliot D. Williams/
Eliot D. Williams (Reg. No. 50,822)
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
700 K Street, N.W
Washington, D.C. 20001-5692
Tel: 202-639-1334
eliot.williams@bakerbotts.com

*Attorneys for Petitioner, Motorola Solutions,
Inc.*