UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LENOVO (UNITED STATES) INC.
Petitioner

v.

TELEFONAKTIEBOLAGET LM ERICSSON,
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2024-00702
Patent No. 10,425,817

PATENT OWNER'S OBJECTION TO EVIDENCE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1)

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Pursuant to 37 C.FR. § 42.64(b)(1), Patent Owner Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson ("Ericsson" or "Patent Owner") respectfully files and serves the following objections to evidence that Petitioner served on Patent Owner with its Petition. A chart listing Patent Owner's objections and its bases for the objections is provided below.

Exhibits	**Objections**
Ex. 1002 (Declaration of Harry V. Bims, P.hD)	***Relevance***: A number of paragraphs are not cited in the Petition and, therefore, are not relevant, such as ¶¶ 1–23, 26-45, 109-110, 112-120, 127-132, 142-143. F.R.E. 402; F.R.E. 403; 37 C.F.R. § 42.61.
Ex. 1007 (3GPP TR 33.899, Study on the security aspects of the next generation system)	***Hearsay***: The exhibit constitutes inadmissible hearsay, and no hearsay exception applies. *See* FRE 801–807. ***Relevance***: The exhibit is not part of a proper ground or combination asserted in the Petition because, among other reasons, the exhibit is not incorporated by reference into the alleged prior art references relied upon by the Petition and is not asserted as prior art in any of the grounds. F.R.E. 402; F.R.E. 403; 37 C.F.R. § 42.61. Additionally, Lenovo has provided insufficient admissible evidence establishing the date of publication as prior art.
Ex. 1010	***Hearsay***: The exhibit constitutes inadmissible hearsay, and no hearsay exception applies. *See* FRE 801–807.

Exhibits	**Objections**
(5G-ENSURE Deliverable D3.1 5G-PPP security enablers technical roadmap)	Additionally, Lenovo has provided insufficient admissible evidence establishing the date of publication.
Ex. 1011 (Martínez, et al., A Survey of the Elliptic Curve Integrated Encryption Scheme)	***Hearsay***: The exhibit constitutes inadmissible hearsay, and no hearsay exception applies. *See* FRE 801–807. ***Relevance***: The exhibit is not part of a proper ground or combination asserted in the Petition because, among other reasons, the exhibit is not incorporated by reference into the alleged prior art references relied upon by the Petition and is not asserted as prior art in any of the grounds. F.R.E. 402; F.R.E. 403; 37 C.F.R. § 42.61. Additionally, Lenovo has provided insufficient admissible evidence establishing the date of publication as prior art.
Ex. 1012 (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2016/0094988 to Lee)	***Relevance***: The exhibit is not part of a proper ground or combination asserted in the Petition because, among other reasons, the exhibit is not incorporated by reference into the alleged prior art references relied upon by the Petition and is not asserted as prior art in any of the grounds. F.R.E. 402; F.R.E. 403; 37 C.F.R. § 42.61.
Ex. 1013 (3GPP TS 23.501, System Architecture for the 5G System, Version 0.4.0)	***Hearsay***: The exhibit constitutes inadmissible hearsay, and no hearsay exception applies. *See* FRE 801–807. ***Relevance***: The exhibit is not part of a proper ground or combination asserted

Exhibits	**Objections**
	in the Petition because, among other reasons, the exhibit is not incorporated by reference into the alleged prior art references relied upon by the Petition and is not asserted as prior art in any of the grounds. F.R.E. 402; F.R.E. 403; 37 C.F.R. § 42.61. Additionally, Lenovo has provided insufficient admissible evidence establishing the date of publication as prior art.
Ex. 1014 (3GPP TS 33.501, Security Architecture and Procedures for 5G System, V0.2.0)	***Hearsay***: The exhibit constitutes inadmissible hearsay, and no hearsay exception applies. *See* FRE 801–807. ***Relevance***: The exhibit is not part of a proper ground or combination asserted in the Petition because, among other reasons, the exhibit is not incorporated by reference into the alleged prior art references relied upon by the Petition and is not asserted as prior art in any of the grounds and is not cited in the Petition. F.R.E. 402; F.R.E. 403; 37 C.F.R. § 42.61. Additionally, Lenovo has provided insufficient admissible evidence establishing the date of publication as prior art.
Ex. 1015 (3GPP TS 23.003, Numbering, Addressing, and Identification, Version 15.0.0)	***Hearsay***: The exhibit constitutes inadmissible hearsay, and no hearsay exception applies. *See* FRE 801–807. ***Relevance***: The exhibit is not part of a proper ground or combination asserted

Exhibits	**Objections**
	in the Petition because, among other reasons, the exhibit is not incorporated by reference into the alleged prior art references relied upon by the Petition and is not asserted as prior art in any of the grounds and is not cited in the Petition. F.R.E. 402; F.R.E. 403; 37 C.F.R. § 42.61. Additionally, Lenovo has provided insufficient admissible evidence establishing the date of publication as prior art.
Ex. 1016 (Declaration of Friedhelm Rodermund)	***Hearsay***: The exhibit constitutes inadmissible hearsay, and no hearsay exception applies (including Attachment B). *See* FRE 801–807. ***Relevance***: A number of paragraphs are not cited in the Petition and, therefore, are not relevant, such as ¶¶ 1–42, 58-60. F.R.E. 402; F.R.E. 403; 37 C.F.R. § 42.61. ***Authenticity***: Attachment B is not authenticated as required by FRE 901 and are not self-authenticating. Additionally, Lenovo has provided insufficient admissible evidence establishing the date of publication of Attachment B as prior art.
Ex. 1017 (Declaration of Nathaniel E Frank-White)	***Hearsay***: The exhibit constitutes inadmissible hearsay, and no hearsay exception applies (including Exhibit B). *See* FRE 801–807.

Exhibits	Objections
	Relevance: A number of paragraphs are not cited in the Petition and, therefore, are not relevant, such as ¶¶ 1–7. F.R.E. 402; F.R.E. 403; 37 C.F.R. § 42.61. ***Authenticity***: Exhibit B is not authenticated as required by FRE 901 and are not self-authenticating. Additionally, Lenovo has provided insufficient admissible evidence establishing the date of publication of Attachment B as prior art.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 2, 2024

/s/ Scott W. Hejny

Scott W. Hejny
Reg. No. 45,882
shejny@mckoolsmith.com
Christian J. Hurt
Reg. No. 63,659
churt@mckoolsmith.com
McKool Smith, P.C.
300 Crescent Court, Suite 1500
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: (214) 978-4000
Fax: (214) 978-4044

Attorneys for Patent Owner
Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that the above-captioned **PATENT OWNER'S OBJECTION TO EVIDENCE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(B)(1)** is being served on counsel for petitioner via electronic mail on June 28, 2024, in its entirety on the following counsel of record for Respondent:

Robert A. Appleby	rappleby@kirkland.com
W. Todd Baker	todd.baker@kirkland.com
John R. Rhine	john.rhine@kirkland.com
	Lenovo_PTAB@kirkland.com

/s/ Scott W. Hejny
Scott W. Hejny
Reg. No.45,882
MCKOOL SMITH, P.C.
300 Crescent Court, Suite 1500
Dallas, TX 75201
Tel.: 214-978-4241
Fax: 214-978-4044