

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

DH INTERNATIONAL LTD.,

Patent Owner.

PTAB Case No. IPR2025-00172

Patent No. 9,022,294

**PATENT OWNER'S OBJECTIONS TO PETITIONER'S REPLY AND
SUPPLEMENTAL EXPERT DECLARATION
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 42.107**

Petitioner Apple Inc. (“Apple” or “Petitioner”) filed its Reply on December 9, 2025. Patent Owner (PO) makes the following objections regarding the Reply, Supplemental Expert Declaration, and other exhibits filed to support the Reply:

First, the PO objects to the Petition’s reliance on non-prior art reference Exh. 1005 (translation certificate) for failing to meet the particularity requirement of 35 C.F.R. § 42.63 and under Fed. Rule Evid. 401 and 403. The translator certificate fails to meet the requirements of 35 C.F.R. § 42.63 and 35 C.F.R. § 1.68 and the translation document cannot be considered prior art or relied upon by the Board in the Institution Decision.

Second, PO objects to the Petitioner’s Supplemental Expert Declaration of Michael Buehrer (Exhibit 1021) under Fed. Rule Evid. 401 and 403. The Declaration contains mostly vague and conclusory statements. Further, it also improperly contains Michael Buehrer’s opinions of the references and their combinations. For Example, “[i]t is my [Michael Buehrer’s] opinion that Suga’s network components as mapped to the data exchange device claim elements in the Petition.” Exh. 1021, ¶7.

Further, Mr. Michael Buehrer’s erroneous opinions are not of a POSITA standard; his opinions are of “persons of ordinary skill in my field.” *See* Exh. 1021, ¶3. Further, as the Exh. 1021 indicates that Mr. Buehrer used the erroneous standard

in his original Declaration (Exh. 1004), PO objects to Exh. 1004, Exh. 1021, the Petition, and Reply that rely on the respective exhibits 1004 and 1021.

Third, PO objects to Exhibit 1022 for lack of foundation, Fed. Rule Evid. 401 and 403. The screenshots show an interface that has a copyright, but the data accessed by the interface does not indicate a version or a copyright. The graphic image of a book cover does not indicate the copyright or whether it is even a book. There is no indication that the software was publicly available. Ultimately, the software is not a printed publication or patent.

Fourth, PO objects to Exhibit 1005 under Fed. Rule Evid. 401, as Exhibit 1005 (translation), is not prior art and is thus not relevant for the purpose being presented. Further, the exhibit is multiple exhibits combined and therefore should also stand or fall together, as that is how Petitioner filed them.

Fifth, PO objects to Exhibit 1017 under Fed. Rule Evid. 401 and 403 as not being the reference relied on in the Petition, Expert Declaration, and by the Board's Institution Decision, and Exhibit 1017 was not timely filed with the Petition.

.

Dated: December 15, 2025

Respectfully Submitted,

By: /s/ Robert Hart/

Robert Hart (Reg. No. 35,185)
Counsel for Patent Owner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e), the undersigned certifies Patent Owner Apple Inc. served this **PATENT OWNER’S OBJECTIONS TO PETITIONER’S REPLY AND SUPPLEMENTAL EXPERT DECLARATION** on the counsel of record for Petitioner Google LLC by filing this document through the P-TACTS, as well as delivering a copy via electronic mail to the following:

Paul R. Hart (Reg. No. 59,646)
Paul.Hart@eriseip.com

Adam P. Seitz (Reg. No. 52,206)
Adam.Seitz@eriseip.com

Date: December 15, 2025

By: /s/ *Robert Hart*
Robert Hart