

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

REOLINK INNOVATION INC. AND SHENZHEN REOLINK TECHNOLOGY CO.,
LTD.,

Petitioner

v.

THROUGHTTEK CO., LTD.,

Patent Owner

Case IPR2024-00509

Patent RE47,842

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO OBJECTIONS BY PETITIONER

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"

Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

The Patent Owner ThroughTek, Inc. responds to Petitioner Reolink et al.’s objections to evidence filed with Patent Owner’s Response of November 15, 2024 and resubmitted on December 2, 2024 relating to the reexamination of US Patent RE47,842 (the ‘842 Patent) as the following:

Exhibit	Response to Objections
EX2001 (<i>Exclusivity Agreement</i>)	<u>Response to Rule 402, 403 Objections:</u> The Exclusivity Agreement is relevant because it helps to corroborates that the invention was conceived by ThroughTEK’s officer Mr. Kao, and that the Lorex Guide and Lorex Video are not prior art to the invention. The Exhibit also confirms the parties met and their respective product development roles were agreed upon. The Petitioner has not explained why the document is “unfairly prejudicial. “ <u>Response to Rule 802 Objection:</u> The document is admissible under Rule 803(8) as an exception because it is a business record. It is also not hearsay because it establishes legal rights and duties. It is further admissible because it is offered to show how the parties viewed their respective duties and obligations under the collaboration and is not offered to prove the matter asserted. <u>Response to Rule 901 Objection:</u> The authentication of the agreement will be provided subsequently.
EX2004 (<i>Declaration of Mr. Chen</i>)	<u>Response to Rule 402 Objection:</u> Mr. Chen is an expert in P2P technology and his declaration provides background information on Bluetooth peer to peer, Peer to Peer and Point to Point architecture and systems. His opinions and the basis thereof are relevant and admissible under FRE 702. .
EX2005 (<i>Declaration of Mr. Kao</i>)	<u>Response to Rule 402, 403 Objections:</u> The relevant of EX2005 is self-evident from the Patent Owner’s reply. This Petition was instituted based upon the Lorex Guide (EX1006) and Lorex Video (EX10008) which were considered as prior art by the Petitioner, and then combined with other prior art. (IPR- Paper 6, p.6) The Exclusivity Agreement and Exhibit 2005 corroborate that the claimed invention was conceived by Mr. Kao and disclosed to Lorex under confidentiality constraints prior to any statutory bar date.
EX2006 (<i>Photographs from meeting</i>)	<u>Response to Rule 402, 403 Objections:</u> EX2006 corroborates that Mr. Kardazhov was at a meeting between Lorax and ThroughTEK representative at which ThroughTEK contends that certain disclosures relating to the invention in the Patent were made. Mr. Kardazhov did not recall attending until the photos were provided, and Mr. Kardazhov did not deny that he is the person in the photo marked with his name.

	<u>Response to Rule 901 Objections:</u> ThroughTek will provide additional foundation for photographs subsequently.
--	---

Date: December 2, 2024

/Justin I. King/

Justin I. King
Lead Counsel for Patent Owner
Registration No. 50,464
WPAT, P.C.
8230 Boone Blvd., Suite 405
Vienna, Virginia, 22182
Tel: (703) 639-0151
Fax (703) 880-7487
Email: jking@wpat.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6, I hereby certify that on February 20, 2024 the foregoing PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO OBJECTIONS BY PETITIONER from Patent Owner Throughtek Co., Ltd. was served via email on the following counsel of record for the Petitioner:

Michael T. Hawkins
Nicholas W.
Stephens
Joseph Bauer
Fish & Richardson P.C.
hawkins@fr.com
nstephens@fr.com
jbauer@fr.com
IPR52472-0005IP1@fr.com

/Steve Yu/

Steve Yu

WPAT, P.C.
8230 Boone Blvd., Suite 405
Vienna, Virginia, 22182
Tel: (703) 639-0151
Fax (703) 880-7487