

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Google LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

Withrow Networks Inc.,
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2025-00775
U.S. Patent No. 10,771,849

PATENT OWNER'S OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE

Patent Owner Withrow Networks Inc. (“Patent Owner” or “Withrow”) hereby submits objections to Petitioner Google LLC’s (“Petitioner” or “Google”) evidence submitted during the preliminary proceeding within ten business days of institution of trial pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1). The discussion below identifies the evidence Patent Owner objects to and identifies the grounds for the objection with particularity, including the Federal Rules of Evidence (“FRE”) or other rules that form the basis for the objections. Patent Owner also objects to Petitioner’s reliance on or citation to any objected evidence in its papers.

I. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGED EVIDENCE AND GROUNDS

1. Exhibit No. 1002 - Declaration of Dr. Nathaniel Polish

Patent Owner has yet to complete cross-examination of Dr. Polish but intends to do so in advance of Due Date 1. Patent Owner therefore reserves the right to object to and move to exclude Exhibit 1002 or any testimony therein on the basis of FRE 602 (lack of personal knowledge), FRE 702 (lack of qualification as expert), FRE 703 (insufficient support for expert testimony), FRE 402 (relevance), or FRE 403 (excluding evidence for prejudice, confusion, waste of time, or other reasons).

Patent Owner objects under FRE 703 to all paragraphs of Exhibit 1002 that rely on Exhibits to which Patent Owner objects below as inadmissible evidence. *See, e.g.*, Ex. 1002 at paragraphs 17; 89-94 (Exhibit 1004); 136 (Exhibit 1005); 48-

51, 143, 145, 154, 159, 225 (Exhibit 1006); 60, 95-98, 162, 219 (Exhibit 1007); 232 (Exhibit 1011); 242, 244, 246, 255 (Exhibit 1014); 242 (Exhibit 1015); 162, 211, 222, 242 (Exhibit 1018); 195, 246, 255 (Exhibit 1019); 41, 54, 55, 57, 59, 124, 178, 206, 211, 222, 233, 240, 250, 251, 255, 283 (Exhibit 1020); 57, 59, 136, 137, 144, 162, 178, 211, 219, 231, 233, 245, 247, 250, 255 (Exhibit 1021); 48-50, 143, 159, 225 (Exhibit 1022); 50, 143, 225 (Exhibit 1023); 60, 136, 162, 219, 231, 277, 286, 294, 297 (Exhibit 1027); 60, 136, 211, 222, 288-290, 294 (Exhibit 1028); 201, 214 (Exhibit 1029); 43 (Exhibit 1032); 46 (Exhibit 1033); 46 (Exhibit 1034); 52 (Exhibit 1037); 52-53 (Exhibit 1038); 206-207, 214, 283 (Exhibit 1039); 207, 283 (Exhibit 1040); 99-102, 207, 284-85, 302-304 (Exhibit 1041); 206-207, 214, 283 (Exhibit 1042); 207, 283 (Exhibit 1043); 211 (Exhibit 1044); 207, 283 (Exhibit 1047); 99 (Exhibit 1054); 89, 95, 99 (Exhibit 1063); 4,7 (Exhibit 1064).

2. Exhibit No. 1004 - Marco Mattavelli, Sylvain Brunetton, Computational Graceful Degradation for Video Decoding, Signal Processing IX Theories and Applications, Proceedings of Eusipco-98 Ninth European Signal Processing Conference (1998) (“Mattavelli”)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1004 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. For example, to the extent that the dates presented in Exhibit 1004 are relied upon by Petitioner as proof of dates relevant to the creation or publication date of Exhibit

1004 itself, those dates are inadmissible hearsay. *See, e.g., Standard Innovation Corp. v. Lelo, Inc.*, IPR2014-00148, Paper 41 at 15-16 (PTAB April 23, 2015).

This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1004 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

3. Exhibit No. 1005 – Excerpts from John Watkinson, The MPEG Handbook, MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4 (2001) (“Watkinson”)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1005 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1005 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

4. Exhibit No. 1006 - Excerpts from David Gourley et al., HTTP: The Definitive Guide (2002) (“Gourley et al.”)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1006 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1006 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

5. Exhibit No. 1007 - Shih-Hao Wang et al., A Platform-Based MPEG-4 Advanced Video Coding (AVC) Decoder with Block Level Pipelining, Proc. of the 2003 Joint Conference of the Fourth International Conference on Information, Communications & Signal Processing and Fourth PacificRim Conference on Multimedia Vol. 1, (ICICS-PCM 2003) (“Wang”)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1007 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. For example, to the extent that the dates presented in Exhibit 1007 are relied upon by Petitioner as proof of dates relevant to the creation or publication date of Exhibit 1007 itself, those dates are inadmissible hearsay. *See, e.g., Standard Innovation Corp. v. Lelo, Inc.*, IPR2014-00148, Paper 41 at 15-16 (PTAB April 23, 2015). This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R.

Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1007 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

6. Exhibit No. 1011 - Microsoft Computer Dictionary (5th Ed. 2002) (excerpted)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1011 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1011 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

7. Exhibit No. 1014 - A Guide to MPEG Fundamentals and Protocol Analysis (Including DVB and ATSC), Tektronix (2000)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1014 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1014 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was,

its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

8. Exhibit No. 1015 - Archived Webpage (Internet Archive Wayback Machine) of A Guide to MPEG Fundamentals and Protocol Analysis (Including DVB and ATSC), Tektronix (June 16, 2002)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1015 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. This exhibit purports to be an archived copy of a website, but Petitioner fails to offer an effective declaration or other foundational evidence or facts necessary to authenticate this Exhibit. *See Neste Oil Oyj v. REG Synthetic Fuels, LLC*, IPR2013-00578, Paper 53 at 4 (PTAB March 12, 2015) (“Neste has not provided the testimony of any witness with personal knowledge of the websites depicted in the printouts; nor do we have any other basis for concluding that the contents of the website are authentic. For this reason, [the challenged Wayback Machine exhibits] lack authentication and are inadmissible.”). Exhibit 1015 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative evidence) under Fed. R.

Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

9. Exhibit No. 1018 - Stephan Mietens et al., New Complexity Scalable MPEG Encoding Techniques for Mobile Applications, EURASIP Journal on Applied Signal Processing 2004(2):236-252 (2004) (“Mietens”)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1018 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1018 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

10. Exhibit No. 1019 - Joseph Y. Hui et al., Client-Server Synchronization and Buffering for Variable Rate Multimedia Retrievals, 14 IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications 226 (Jan. 1996) (“Hui et al.”)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1019 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1019 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be

misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

11. Exhibit No. 1020 - Excerpts from Peter Symes, Digital Video Compression (2004) (“Symes”)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1020 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1020 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

12. Exhibit No. 1021 - Excerpts from Fernando Pereira, Touradj Ebrahimi, The MPEG-4 book (2002) (“Pereira et al.”)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1021 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1021 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative

evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

13. Exhibit No. 1022 - Excerpts from Craig Hunt and Robert Bruce Thompson, Windows NT TCP/IP Network Administration (1998) (“Hunt et al.”)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1022 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1022 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

14. Exhibit No. 1023 - Excerpts from Douglas E. Comer, Internetworking with TCP/IP Vol. 1: Principles, Protocols, and Architectures (4th ed. 2000)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1023 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1023 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative

evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

15. Exhibit No. 1027 - Thomas Stockhammer et al., H.264/AVC in Wireless Environments, 13 IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology 657 (July 2003) (“Stockhammer”)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1027 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1027 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

16. Exhibit No. 1028 - Excerpts from Iain E. G. Richardson, H.264 and MPEG-4 Video Compression: Video Coding for Next-generation Multimedia (2003) (“Richardson”)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1028 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1028 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative

evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

17. Exhibit No. 1029 - Arnaud Bourge and Joel Jung, Low-power H.264 video decoder with graceful degradation, Visual Communications and Image Processing 2004, 5308 Proceedings of SPIE-IS&T Electronic Imaging 372 (2004) (“Bourge”)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1029 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1029 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

18. Exhibit No. 1032 - Shanwei Cen et al., Flow and Congestion Control for Internet Media Streaming Applications, Proc. SPIE 3310, Multimedia Computing and Networking 1998, 250 (Dec. 29, 1997) (“Cen et al.”)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1032 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1032 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be

misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

19. Exhibit No. 1033 - Jian Lu, Signal Processing for Internet Video Streaming: A Review, Proc. SPIE Image and Video Communications and Processing (Jan. 2000) (“Lu”)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1033 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1033 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

20. Exhibit No. 1034 - H. Schulzrinne et al., Real Time Streaming Protocol (RTSP), Internet Engineering Task Force, Internet Society (April 1998)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1034 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1034 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be

misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

21. Exhibit No. 1037 - DV Format, Digital Video, Canon U.S.A., Inc. (Oct. 13, 1999)
https://web.archive.org/web/19991013131445/http://canondv.com:80/s_hared/dvinfo/dvinfo2.html

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1037 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. This exhibit purports to be an archived copy of a website, but Petitioner fails to offer an effective declaration or other foundational evidence or facts necessary to authenticate this Exhibit. *See Neste Oil Oyj v. REG Synthetic Fuels, LLC*, IPR2013-00578, Paper 53 at 4 (PTAB March 12, 2015) (“Neste has not provided the testimony of any witness with personal knowledge of the websites depicted in the printouts; nor do we have any other basis for concluding that the contents of the website are authentic. For this reason, [the challenged Wayback Machine exhibits] lack authentication and are inadmissible.”). Exhibit 1037 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative evidence) under Fed. R.

Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

22. Exhibit No. 1038 - Alan T. Wetzel, Michael R. Schell, Consumer Applications of the IEEE 1394 Serial Bus, and a 1394/DV Video Editing System, IEEE (1996) (“Wetzel et al.”)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1038 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1038 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

23. Exhibit No. 1039 - Won-Kyu Paik and Sun-Young Hwang, Design of a novel synthesis filter for real-time MPEG-2 audio decoder implementation on a DSP chip, 45 IEEE Transactions on Consumer Electronics 1119 (1999) (“Paik”)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1039 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1039 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative

evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

24. Exhibit No. 1040 - Keun-Sup Lee et al., Software Optimization of the MPEG-Audio Decoder Using a 32-Bit MCU RISC Processor, 48 IEEE Transactions on Consumer Electronics 671 (Aug. 2002) (“Lee”)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1040 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1040 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

25. Exhibit No. 1041 – Martin Wolters et al., A closer look into MPEG-4 High Efficiency AAC, Audio Engineering Society (AES), 115th AES Convention (Oct. 10-13, 2003) (“Wolters”)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1041 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. For example, to the extent that the dates presented in Exhibit 1041 are relied upon by Petitioner as proof of dates relevant to the creation or publication date of Exhibit 1041 itself, those dates are inadmissible hearsay. *See, e.g., Standard Innovation Corp. v. Lelo, Inc.*, IPR2014-00148, Paper 41 at 15-16 (PTAB April 23, 2015).

This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1041 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

26. Exhibit No. 1042 - Patrick De Smet et al., Do Not Zero-Pute: An Efficient Homespun MPEG-Audio Layer II Decoding and Optimization Strategy, Proc. of ACM Multimedia 2004 conference, pp. 376-379 (2004) (“De Smet”)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1042 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1042 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

27. Exhibit No. 1043 - Patrick De Smet and Ignace Bruyland, Optimized Recursive Subband Synthesis Windowing for Implementing Efficient MPEG Audio Decoders, 10 IEEE Signal Processing Letters 303 (Oct. 2003) (“De Smet & Bruyland”)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1043 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1043 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

28. Exhibit No. 1044 - MPEG-4 Overview – (V.21 – Jeju Version), International Organisation for Standardisation Organisation International De Normalisation ISO/IEC JTC1/SC29/WG11 Coding of Moving Pictures and Audio (Mar. 2002)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1044 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1044 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative

evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

29. Exhibit No. 1047 - Vladimir Z. Mesarovic et al., Optimized Huffman Decoding for AAC, Silicon for Audio – AES 16th UK Conference, pp. 117-122 (2001) (“Mesarovic”)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1047 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1047 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

30. Exhibit No. 1054 - 115th AES Convention (Oct. 10-13, 2003) program and related webpages and links

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1054 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Ex. 1054 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative

evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document.

31. Exhibit No. 1057 - List of Claims of U.S. Patent No. 10,771,849

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1057 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. Exhibit 1057 is also not relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401, and even if it was, its admission would be unfairly prejudicial (*e.g.*, it would confuse the issues, be misleading, result in undue delay, waste time, or needlessly present cumulative evidence) under Fed. R. Evid. 403 in that this information has not been shown to have existed on the purported date of this document. Exhibit 1057, to the extent it simply reproduces claims of U.S. Patent No. 10,771,849, is objectionable on the basis of the best evidence rule under FRE 1022.

32. Exhibit No. 1063 - Expert Declaration of Dr. Ingrid Hsieh-Yee

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1063 as hearsay offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 801-807. This exhibit has not been authenticated and is not self-authenticating. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 901-902. To the extent Ex. 1063 purports to include and discuss Exhibits that are objected to herein, Patent Owner hereby objects to the Declaration on the same grounds expressed as to each such Exhibit.

II. CONCLUSION

To the extent Petitioner fails to correct the defects identified above, Patent Owner may file a motion to exclude under 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c) at the appropriate time in accordance with the Scheduling Order in this proceeding.

Dated: October 14, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Roger S. Thompson

Roger Thompson (Reg. No. 29,594)

rthompson@villegascefo.com

Damir Cefo (Reg. No. 51,538)

dcefo@villegascefo.com

VILLEGAS & CEFO, LLP

1350 Avenue of the Americas, Floor 2

New York, New York 10019

P: 646-844-0679

Kyle Deighan (Reg. No. 75,525)

kdeighan@calfee.com

Mark McDougall (Reg. No. 62,670)

mmcdougall@calfee.com

Andrew Alexander (Reg. No. 80,055)

aalexander@calfee.com

CALFEE, HALTER & GRISWOLD LLP

The Calfee Building

1405 East Sixth Street

Cleveland, Ohio 44114

P: 216-622-8200

F: 216-241-0816

*Attorneys for Patent Owner Withrow
Networks Inc.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing **PATENT OWNER'S
OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE** was served on the date below via email to the following email addresses:

Eamonn Gardner (egardner@cooley.com)

Reuben Chen (rchen@cooley.com)

Joseph Van Tassel (jvantassel@cooley.com)

Dated: October 14, 2025

/s/Roger S. Thompson
*Attorney for Patent Owner Withrow
Networks Inc.*