

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COMCAST CABLE COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

ENTROPIC COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2024-00431
Patent 7,295,518 B1

**PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS TO EXHIBITS IN PATENT OWNER'S
RESPONSE**

Comcast (“Petitioner”) hereby makes the following objections pursuant to 37

C.F.R. § 42.64(b):

Exhibit No.	Section	Objections
2003	Entirety	Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2003 under Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402, and 403 (lack of relevance), 901 and 902 (lack of authentication), and 801 and 802 (inadmissible hearsay). Insofar as Patent Owner cites Exhibit 2003 to purportedly support its allegations concerning what a person of ordinary skill in the art (POSITA) would have known or understood in the relevant timeframe (<i>see</i> Patent Owner’s Response (POR), p. 19), Exhibit 2003 is not relevant. The ’518 patent has an earliest possible priority date of August 30, 2001, whereas Exhibit 2003 was purportedly published in 2022—over 20 years later. Exhibit 2003 is objected to on this basis. <i>See</i> Fed. R. Evid. 401 and 402. Additionally, because Exhibit 2003 was published over 20 years after the earliest possible priority date of the ’518 patent and is not indicative of what a POSITA

Exhibit No.	Section	Objections
		would have known or understood in the relevant timeframe, it only serves to confuse the issues, cause unfair prejudice, and waste time. <i>See</i> Fed. R. Evid. 403. Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2003 for this additional reason. Insofar as Patent Owner relies on statements within Exhibit 2003 to prove the truth of a matter asserted therein (<i>see, e.g.</i>, POR, p. 19), the statement was made outside the current proceeding and thus constitutes inadmissible hearsay. <i>See</i> Fed. R. Evid. 801, 802. Exhibit 2003 does not meet any exception provided under Fed. R. Evid. 803-804 and 807. Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2003 for this additional reason. Exhibit 2003 is not self-authenticating. <i>See</i> Fed. R. Evid. 902. Patent Owner offers no evidence of what Exhibit 2003 is or any support for its authenticity or accuracy. <i>See</i> POR, p. 19. Therefore, Exhibit 2003 lacks proper authentication. <i>See</i> Fed. R. Evid. 901.

Exhibit No.	Section	Objections
		Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2003 at least for this additional reason.
2004		Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2004 under Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402, and 403 (lack of relevance), 901 and 902 (lack of authentication), and 801 and 802 (inadmissible hearsay). Insofar as Patent Owner cites Exhibit 2004 to purportedly support its allegations concerning what a person of ordinary skill in the art (POSITA) would have known or understood in the relevant timeframe (<i>see</i> Patent Owner’s Response (POR), p. 19), Exhibit 2004 is not relevant. The ’518 patent has an earliest possible priority date of August 30, 2001, whereas Exhibit 2004 was purportedly published on May 20, 2024—over 22 years later. Exhibit 2004 is objected to on this basis. <i>See</i> Fed. R. Evid. 401 and 402. Additionally, because Exhibit 2004 was published over 22 years after the earliest possible priority date of the ’518 patent and is not indicative of what a POSITA

Exhibit No.	Section	Objections
		would have known or understood in the relevant timeframe, it only serves to confuse the issues, cause unfair prejudice, and waste time. <i>See</i> Fed. R. Evid. 403. Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2004 for this additional reason. Insofar as Patent Owner relies on statements within Exhibit 2004 to prove the truth of a matter asserted therein (<i>see, e.g.</i>, POR, p. 19), the statement was made outside the current proceeding and thus constitutes inadmissible hearsay. <i>See</i> Fed. R. Evid. 801, 802. Exhibit 2004 does not meet any exception provided under Fed. R. Evid. 803-804 and 807. Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2004 for this additional reason. Exhibit 2004 is not self-authenticating. <i>See</i> Fed. R. Evid. 902. Patent Owner offers no evidence of what Exhibit 2004 is or any support for its authenticity or accuracy. <i>See</i> POR, p. 19. Therefore, Exhibit 2004 lacks proper authentication. <i>See</i> Fed. R. Evid. 901.

Exhibit No.	Section	Objections
		Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2004 at least for this additional reason.

Dated: December 23, 2024

By: /Frederic M. Meeker/

Frederic M. Meeker
Reg. No. 35,282
Banner & Witcoff, Ltd.
1100 13th Street, NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 824-3000
fmeeker@bannerwitcoff.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e), the undersigned hereby certifies that the foregoing PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS TO EXHIBITS IN PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE was served electronically via e-mail on December 23, 2024 on the following counsel of record for Patent Owner:

JASON.ENGEL.PTAB@KLGATES.COM
ERIK.HALVERSON@KLGATES.COM
JARED.LUND@KLGATES.COM

Dated: December 23, 2024

By: /Carlos Goldie/

Carlos Goldie