

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SUZHOU MOJAWA INTELLIGENT ELECTRONIC CO., LTD.,

Petitioner,

v.

SHENZHEN SHOKZ CO., LTD.,

Patent Owner.

PTAB Case No. IPR2025-00843

Patent No. 11,310,582 B2

**PATENT OWNER'S OBJECTIONS TO PETITIONER'S
EVIDENCE IN A PRELIMINARY PROCEEDING
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1)**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), Patent Owner Shenzhen Shokz Co., Ltd. (“Shokz” or “Patent Owner”) objects to evidence submitted during a preliminary proceeding by Petitioner Suzhou Mojawa Intelligent Electronic Co., Ltd. (“Petitioner”) with its Petition (Paper 1) filed April 30, 2025. The objections are based on 37 C.F.R. Part 42, and the relevant portions of Federal Rules of Evidence (“F.R.E.”) that are applicable to *Inter Partes* Review proceedings under 37 C.F.R. § 42.62. These objections have been timely filed and served within ten business days of the institution of trial.

I. Exhibits 1004-1009, 1018

Patent Owner objects to these exhibits as improper translations under 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(b) and Federal Rules of Evidence 604 and 901. None of these exhibits contains an affidavit by the translator attesting that the translator is fluent in both the original language and English, and that the translator correctly translated the exhibit. The affidavits attached to these Exhibits appear to have been signed by individuals other than the translator, and thus the exhibits are not properly accompanied by translator affidavits. Exhibits 1004-1006 are signed by a “project manager” who does not state that he performed the translation, nor identify the translator at all. Exhibits 1007-1009 do not contain a translation affidavit or translator’s signature at all, nor do they identify the individual who performed the translation or the qualifications of the translator.

II. Exhibits 1017, 1020 and 1021

Patent Owner objects to Exhibits 1017, 1020, and 1021 as irrelevant because they are not cited in the Petition. See 37 C.F.R. §42.6(a)(3) (“Arguments must not be incorporated by reference from one document into another document.”); Consolidated Trial Practice Guide November 2019 at 35-363 (“[P]arties that incorporate expert testimony by reference in their petitions ... without providing explanation of such testimony risk having the testimony not considered by the Board.”), citing *Cisco Systems, Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC*, IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2014) (informative) (“we will not consider arguments that are not made in the Petition, but are instead incorporated by reference to the [expert’s] Declaration”).

III. Exhibit 1032

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1032 as untimely and lacking relevance because it was not filed with or cited by the Petition. See 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b).

These objections have been timely filed and served within ten business days of the institution of the trial.

Dated: December 3, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/Babak Tehranchi/

Lead Counsel

Babak Tehranchi, Reg. No. 55,937

PERKINS COIE LLP
11452 El Camino Real, Ste. 300
San Diego, CA 92130

Back-Up Counsel

Bing Ai, Reg. No. 43,312

Wei Yuan, Reg. No. 71,772

John Esterhay, Reg. No. 73,512

Evan Day, Reg. No. 75,992

Attorneys for Shenzhen Shokz Co., Ltd.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true copy of the foregoing PATENT OWNER'S OBJECTIONS TO PETITIONER'S EVIDENCE was served in its entirety by electronic mail on the Petitioner via its attorneys of record:

James M. Heintz - jim.heintz@us.dlapiper.com
Matthew Satchwell - matthew.satchwell@us.dlapiper.com
Shaobin Zhu - shaobin.zhu@us.dlapiper.com
Michael L. Burns - michael.burns@us.dlapiper.com
Benjamin S. Mueller - benjamin.mueller@us.dlapiper.com
DLA-Mojawa-IPRs@us.dlapiper.com

Dated: December 3, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

PERKINS COIE LLP
1301 Second Avenue Suite 4200
Seattle, WA 98101-3804

/Meghan Bright/

Meghan Bright
Patent Paralegal