

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

3D SYSTEMS CORPORATION AND 3D SYSTEMS, INC.,

Petitioner

v.

INTREPID AUTOMATION, INC.,

Patent Owner

IPR2025-01242

U.S. Patent No. 11,338,511

**PATENT OWNER OBJECTIONS TO ADMISSIBILITY OF EVIDENCE
SERVED WITH PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b), Patent Owner objects as follows to the admissibility of evidence served with the initial Petitioner Reply on June 15, 2026. Patent Owner reserves its rights to: (1) timely file a motion to exclude these objectionable exhibits or portions thereof; (2) challenge the credibility and/or weight that should be afforded to these exhibits, whether or not Patent Owner files a motion to exclude the exhibits; (3) challenge the sufficiency of the evidence to meet Petitioner’s burden of proof on any issue, including, without limitation, whether Petitioner met its burden to prove the prior art status of the alleged prior art on which it relies, whether or not Patent Owner has objected to, or files a motion to exclude, the evidence; and (4) cross examine any Petitioner declarant within the scope of his or her direct testimony that relates to these exhibits, without regard to whether Patent Owner has objected to the testimony or related exhibits or whether the testimony or related exhibits are ultimately found to be inadmissible.

Evidence	Objections
Ex. 1035 - Excerpts of Rebuttal Report of William J. Allen Intrepid Automation, Inc. v. 3D Systems Corporation et al, Dkt. 27-5, 24-cv-02262-AGS-DDL	Incomplete, Irrelevant, Misleading, Prejudicial, Hearsay (FRE 106, 401, 402, 403, 802): The portions of this document cited by 3DS, when taken in isolation, provide an irrelevant, incomplete, prejudicial, and misleading characterization of the Patent Owner’s positions, and therefore confuses the issues in the case. Ex. 1035 is the opinions of an expert witness regarding protectability of 3D

	Systems' alleged trade secrets, which is a different issue with a completely different standard than the patentability of the challenged patent in view of Petitioner's Grounds, which are the only issues to be considered by the Board in this proceeding, resulting in misleading or prejudicial evidence. Intrepid further objects on the basis of hearsay.
Ex. 1036 - LinkedIn Profile of Ben Wynne, CEO of Intrepid	Incomplete, Irrelevant, Misleading, Hearsay, Authenticity (FRE 106, 401, 402, 403, 802, 901): This document cited by 3DS provides an irrelevant, incomplete, and misleading characterization of the level of ordinary skill or the knowledge of skilled artisans in the field as of the asserted date of the invention, and therefore confuses the issues in the case. Intrepid further objects to this document as hearsay if offered for the truth of employment history, technical skills, project descriptions, or achievements of Mr. Wynne. Intrepid further objects on the basis that this document was not authenticated as the inventor's actual, complete, accurate, unaltered LinkedIn page.

Respectfully submitted,

MILLER JOHNSON/IRWIN IP

Dated: June 19, 2026

/Nathan P. Sportel/

Nathan P. Sportel (Reg. No. 67,980)

Jeff Catalano

Attorneys for Patent Owner

Intrepid Automation, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e), a true and correct copy of **PATENT OWNER OBJECTIONS TO ADMISSIBILITY OF EVIDENCE SERVED WITH PETITIONER'S REPLY** are being served electronically on June 19, 2026, to the e-mail addresses shown below:

Bryan L. Baysinger
John P. Zimmer
Ben Roxborough
MAYNARD NEXSEN PC
104 S. Main Street, Suite 900
Greenville, SC 29601
(864) 282-1117 Tel
BBaysinger@maynardnexsen.com
JZimmer@maynardnexsen.com
BRoxborough@maynardnexsen.com

Dated: June 19, 2026

/Nathan P. Sportel/
Nathan Sportel (Reg. No. 67,980)
Jeff Catalano
Attorneys for Patent Owner
Interpid Automation, Inc.