

Filed on behalf of Western Digital Technologies, Inc.

By: Michelle E. Armond

Douglas R. Wilson

Joseph Li

Monica Arnold

Yue Han

ARMOND WILSON LLP

4685 MacArthur Court, Suite 390

Newport Beach, CA 92660

Telephone: (949) 932-0778

Email: ipr@armondwilson.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

WESTERN DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

GODO KAISHA IP BRIDGE 1,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2024-01493
U.S. Patent No. 10,680,167

PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to the Federal Rules of Evidence (“FRE”) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), Petitioner Western Digital Technologies, Inc. timely objects to the evidence submitted by Patent Owner in this proceeding. Petitioner may move to exclude the challenged exhibits under 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c) unless Patent Owner provides evidence curing the objections identified by Petitioner below.

II. SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS

A. Exhibit 2080 - U.S. App. No. 10/824,835 (10-30-2025 Bokor Deposition EX2079)

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2080 because it is improperly filed with Patent Owner’s Motion to Strike without Board authorization. *See* 37 C.F.R. §42.5(c)(3) (“A late action will be excused on a showing of good cause...”). The filing of EX2080 is also untimely as it is new evidence and should have been filed with Patent Owner’s Response. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b); Consolidated Trial Practice Guide (“CTPG”), 73-74.

Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2080 under FRE 403 because its admission would be unduly prejudicial to Petitioner as it was untimely filed without Board authorization, and Petitioner has no opportunity to respond either with briefing or evidence in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”).

B. Exhibit 2081 - U.S. App. No. 10/646,246

Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2081 because it is improperly filed with Patent Owner’s Motion to Strike without Board authorization. *See* 37 C.F.R §42.5(c)(3) (“A late action will be excused on a showing of good cause...”). The filing of EX2081 is also untimely as it is new evidence and should have been filed with Patent Owner’s Response. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b); CTPG, 73-74.

Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2081 under FRE 403 because its admission would be unduly prejudicial to Petitioner as it was untimely filed without Board authorization, and Petitioner has no opportunity to respond either with briefing or evidence in violation of the APA.

ARMOND WILSON LLP

Dated: November 20, 2025

By: /Michelle E. Armond/

Michelle E. Armond (Reg. No. 53,954)

Douglas R. Wilson (Reg. No. 54,542)

Joseph Li (Reg. No. 74,998)

Monica Arnold (Reg. No. 77,262)

Yue Han (Reg. No. 80,950)

Attorneys for Western Digital Technologies, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e), a true copy of the foregoing **PETITIONER’S OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE** is being served electronically on November 20, 2025 to the following counsel for Patent Owner to the following email addresses:

Gerald B. Hrycyszyn
GHrycyszyn-PTAB@wolfgreenfield.com

Jie Xiang
JXiang-PTAB@wolfgreenfield.com

Thomas A. Franklin
TFranklin-PTAB@wolfgreenfield.com

Richard F. Giunta
RGiunta-PTAB@wolfgreenfield.com

Adam R. Wichman
AWichman-PTAB@wolfgreenfield.com

Scott A. McKeown
SMcKeown-PTAB@wolfgreenfield.com

ARMOND WILSON LLP

Dated: November 20, 2025

By: /Michelle E. Armond/

Michelle E. Armond (Reg. No. 53,954)

Douglas R. Wilson (Reg. No. 54,542)

Joseph Li (Reg. No. 74,998)

Monica Arnold (Reg. No. 77,262)

Yue Han (Reg. No. 80,950)

Attorneys for Western Digital Technologies, Inc.