

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HANSHOW AMERICA INC. and HANSHOW TECHNOLOGY CO., LTD.
Petitioners,

v.

SES-IMAGOTAG GMBH,
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-00208
U.S. Patent No. 11,010,709

**PATENT OWNER'S OBJECTIONS TO PETITIONERS'
EVIDENCE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1)**

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §42.64(b)(1), Patent Owner SES-Imagotag GmbH objects to Exhibits 1014-1016 submitted by Petitioners Hanshow America, Inc. and Hanshow Technology Co., Ltd. with their Reply (Paper 31) filed December 2, 2024. The objections are based on 37 C.F.R. Part 42 and the relevant portions of the Federal Rules of Evidence (“F.R.E.”) that apply to *inter partes* review proceedings under 37 C.F.R. §42.62. The objections have been timely filed and served within five business days of the service of evidence to which the objections are directed.

II. OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE

A. Exhibit 1014

Patent Owner hereby objects to Exhibit 1014 as presenting new evidence that is outside the scope permitted under 37 C.F.R. §42.23(b).

Patent Owner further objects to Exhibit 1014 as incomplete for being partially presented in a language other than English without an accompanying translation. *See* 37 C.F.R. §42.63(b) (“***Translation required.*** When a party relies on a document or is required to produce a document in a language other than English, a translation of the document into English and an affidavit attesting to the accuracy of the translation must be filed with the document.”); PTAB Consolidated Trial Practice Guide, 24 (Nov. 2019) (“Translations therefore must be provided for: (1) those documents produced in discovery under 37 C.F.R. § 42.51; and (2) all documents relied on, or

otherwise used, during the proceedings. Unless accompanied by an English language translation, such documents in a language other than English will not be considered by the Board.”).

Patent Owner further objects to Exhibit 1014 under F.R.E. 401 and 402 as irrelevant and under F.R.E. 403 because its probative value is substantially outweighed by other considerations, including unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, and waste of time.

B. Exhibit 1015

Patent Owner hereby objects to Exhibit 1015 as presenting new evidence that is outside the scope permitted under 37 C.F.R. §42.23(b).

Patent Owner further objects to Exhibit 1015 under F.R.E. 401 and 402 as irrelevant and under F.R.E. 403 because its probative value is substantially outweighed by other considerations, including unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, and waste of time.

C. Exhibit 1016

Patent Owner hereby objects to Exhibit 1016 as presenting new evidence that is outside the scope permitted under 37 C.F.R. §42.23(b).

Patent Owner further objects to Exhibit 1016 under F.R.E. 401 and 402 as irrelevant and under F.R.E. 403 because its probative value is substantially

outweighed by other considerations, including unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, and waste of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 9, 2024

By: / Jessica Kaiser /
Jessica C. Kaiser
Reg. No. 58,937
Lead Counsel for Patent Owner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e), I certify that on December 9, 2024, a copy of
PATENT OWNER'S OBJECTIONS TO PETITIONERS' EVIDENCE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1) was served upon the below-listed counsel by
electronic mail:

Hao Tan
haotan@archlakelaw.com

Shen Wang
shenwang@archlakelaw.com

Christopher J. Fahy
christopher@archlakelaw.com

Dated: December 9, 2024

By: /Jessica Kaiser/
Jessica C. Kaiser
Reg. No. 58,937
Lead Counsel for Patent Owner