UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., FOSSIL GROUP, INC., FOSSIL STORES I, INC., FOSSIL PARTNERS, L.P., OURA HEALTH OY, AND ONEPLUS TECHNOLOGY (SHENZHEN) CO., LTD.,

Petitioners,

v.

OMNI MEDSCI, INC.,
Patent Owner

Patent No. 9,651,533

Case No. IPR2025-01250

PATENT OWNER'S OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), Patent Owner hereby submits objections to evidence served by Petitioners with Petitioners' Reply (Paper 36/37, filed July 30, 2026). Patent Owner identifies the evidence objected to and summarizes the objections, including the Federal Rules of Evidence ("FRE" or "FED. R. EVID.") or other rules that form the basis for the objections.

I. Ex. 1123 – Supplemental Declaration of Jonathan Bradford

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1123 as hearsay being offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. FED. R. EVID. 801-807. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1123 because it is not sufficiently relevant, and any relevance is outweighed by the risks of confusion, substantial danger of unfair prejudice, and/or misleading the fact finder. FED. R. EVID. 401-403. Patent Owner further objects to Ex. 1123 as lacking foundation, assuming facts not in evidence, containing testimony on matters as to which the witness lacks personal knowledge, and as being conclusory. FED. R. EVID. 602, 701-703. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1123 to the extent it incorporates or otherwise references any exhibits Patent Owner has objected to as inadmissible evidence herein.

II. Ex. 1124 – Declaration of Brian Anthony

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1124 to the extent it incorporates or otherwise references any exhibits Patent Owner has objected to as inadmissible evidence herein.

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1124 as hearsay being offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. FED. R. EVID. 801-807, 901-902. Patent Owner also objects to Ex. 1124 as lacking foundation, assuming facts not in evidence, containing testimony on matters as to which the witness lacks personal knowledge and as being conclusory. Ex. 1124 is objected to under FRE 702 for failing to demonstrate that the declarant is qualified as an expert in the relevant subject matter. Ex. 1124 is further objected to under FRE 702(b)-(d) as failing to be based upon sufficient facts or data, as the product of unreliable principles and methods and for failing to reliably apply sound principles and methods to the facts of the case. Ex. 1124 is further objected to because it is not sufficiently relevant, and any relevance is outweighed by the risks of confusion, substantial danger of unfair prejudice, and/or misleading the fact finder. FED. R. EVID. 401-403.

Patent Owner specifically objects to ¶¶ 47-54 of Ex. 1124 as containing testimony on matters as to which the witness lacks personal knowledge (FED. R. EVID. 602) and as improper expert testimony not based on sufficient facts or data (FED. R. EVID. 702).

III. Ex. 1127 – Deposition Transcript of Igor Efimov, Ph.D.

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1127 to the extent it is offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. FED. R. EVID. 801-807. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1127 because it is not sufficiently relevant, and any relevance

is outweighed by the risks of confusion, substantial danger of unfair prejudice, and/or misleading the fact finder. FED. R. EVID. 401-403.

Patent Owner specifically objects to the following testimony cited in Petitioners' papers:

Page(s) / Line(s)	Objection(s)
107:7-111:4	Assumes facts, outside the scope of direct testimony. Petitioners asked Dr. Efimov about Samsung's business operations and corporate structure. This questioning was also outside the scope of Dr. Efimov's direct testimony. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(5)(ii).
126:2-139:7	Assumes facts, outside the scope of direct testimony. Petitioners asked Dr. Efimov about Samsung's business operations and corporate structure. This questioning was also outside the scope of Dr. Efimov's direct testimony. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(5)(ii).

IV. Ex. 1128 – Deposition Transcript of Mohammed Islam, Sc.D.

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1128 to the extent it is offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. FED. R. EVID. 801-807. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1128 because it is not sufficiently relevant, and any relevance

is outweighed by the risks of confusion, substantial danger of unfair prejudice, and/or misleading the fact finder. FED. R. EVID. 401-403.

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1128 because Petitioners' cross-examination was outside the scope of Dr. Islam's direct testimony. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(5)(ii). Petitioners' counsel refused to show Dr. Islam his declaration during the deposition and did not ask any direct questions about the content of the declaration.

Patent Owner specifically objects to the following testimony cited in Petitioners' papers:

Page(s) / Line(s)	**Objection(s)**
30:1-15	Vague and ambiguous, outside the scope of direct testimony. The question was vague and ambiguous at least as to the terms/phrases "field of optical sensors," "increase light intensity to improve signal-to-noise ratio," and "prior to your patents." *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(a) and 403. Petitioners failed to lay foundation as to what these phrases referred to, including the temporal scope. This questioning was also outside the scope of Dr. Islam's direct testimony. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(5)(ii).

Page(s) / Line(s)	Objection(s)
34:6-36:22	Vague and ambiguous, outside the scope of direct testimony. The line of questioning was vague and ambiguous at least as to the terms/phrases "determine whether a signal-to-noise ratio has been increased," "a laboratory setting," and "determine whether it's been improved." *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(a) and 403. Petitioners failed to lay foundation as to what these phrases referred to, including the temporal scope. This questioning was also outside the scope of Dr. Islam's direct testimony. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(5)(ii). A hypothetical analysis of wearable devices far exceeds the scope of Dr. Islam's declaration.
37:2-38:13	Vague and ambiguous, incomplete hypothetical, outside the scope of direct testimony. The line of questioning was vague and ambiguous at least as to the terms/phrases "laboratory setting" and "tell if increasing light intensity improved the signal-to-noise ratio." *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(a) and 403. Petitioners failed to lay foundation as to what these phrases referred to, including the temporal scope. This questioning was

Page(s) / Line(s)	Objection(s)
	also outside the scope of Dr. Islam's direct testimony. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(5)(ii). A hypothetical analysis of wearable devices far exceeds the scope of Dr. Islam's declaration.
38:14-40:20	Vague and ambiguous, asked and answered, outside the scope of direct testimony. The line of questioning was vague and ambiguous at least as to the terms/phrases "increasing pulse rate" and "always improve the signal-to-noise ratio." Petitioners failed to lay foundation as to what these phrases referred to, including the temporal scope for this questioning. The question was also asked and answered multiple times. This questioning was also outside the scope of Dr. Islam's direct testimony. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(5)(ii). How a hypothetical wearable device operates in every conceivable condition is far outside the scope of Dr. Islam's declaration.
40:22-43:9	Vague and ambiguous, incomplete hypothetical, outside the scope of direct testimony. The questioning was vague and ambiguous at least as to the terms/phrases "increasing light

Page(s) / Line(s)	Objection(s)
	intensity," "not improve the signal-to-noise ratio," and "noise is increased." Petitioners failed to lay foundation as to what these phrases referred to, including the temporal scope. The questioning was also outside the scope of Dr. Islam's direct testimony. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(5)(ii). How a hypothetical wearable device operates in every conceivable condition is far outside the scope of Dr. Islam's declaration.
43:11-44:1	Vague and ambiguous, incomplete hypothetical, outside the scope of direct testimony. The line of questioning was vague and ambiguous at least as to the terms/phrases "noise is increased at the same time that pulse rate is increased" and "improve the signal-to-noise ratio." Petitioners failed to lay foundation as to what these phrases referred to, including the temporal scope. This questioning was also outside the scope of Dr. Islam's direct testimony. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(5)(ii). How a hypothetical wearable device operates in every conceivable condition is far outside the scope

Page(s) / Line(s)	Objection(s)
	of Dr. Islam's declaration.
44:3-48:6	Vague and ambiguous, incomplete hypothetical, asked and answered, outside the scope of direct testimony. The questioning was vague and ambiguous at least as to the terms/phrases "signal-to-noise ratio," the context (e.g., the question was not even directed to a "wearable device"), and temporal scope. The same question was asked and answered multiple times. This questioning was also outside the scope of Dr. Islam's direct testimony. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(5)(ii). How signal-to-noise ratios may change in any conceivable condition is far outside the scope of Dr. Islam's declaration.
48:8-49:3	Vague and ambiguous, outside the scope of direct testimony. This questioning was vague and ambiguous at least as to the terms/phrases "[p]rior to your patents," "increase pulse rate," "improve signal-to-noise ratio," and "field of spectroscopy." Petitioners failed to lay foundation as to what these phrases referred to, including the temporal scope. This questioning was

Page(s) / Line(s)	Objection(s)
	also outside the scope of Dr. Islam's direct testimony. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(a) and 403.
49:5-50:19	Vague and ambiguous, incomplete hypothetical, outside the scope of direct testimony. This questioning was vague and ambiguous at least as to the terms/phrases "turns up the pulse rate of the light," "improve the signal-to-noise ratio," and "laboratory setting." Petitioners failed to lay foundation as to what these phrases referred to, including the temporal scope. This questioning was also outside the scope of Dr. Islam's direct testimony. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(a) and 403.
48:8-49:3	Vague and ambiguous, outside the scope of direct testimony. This questioning was vague and ambiguous at least as to the terms/phrases "[p]rior to your patents," "increase pulse rate in a wearable device to improve signal-to-noise ratio," and "the field of spectroscopy." *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(a) and 403. Petitioners failed to lay foundation as to what these phrases referred to, including the temporal scope. This questioning was also outside the scope of Dr. Islam's direct testimony. *See* Fed. R. Evid.

Page(s) / Line(s)	Objection(s)
	611(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(5)(ii).
74:1-14	Vague and ambiguous, outside the scope of direct testimony. This questioning was vague and ambiguous at least as to the terms/phrases "[p]rior to your patents," "was it known," "synchronize light emitters and detectors in a wearable device to improve signal-to-noise ratio." *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(a) and 403. Petitioners failed to lay foundation as to what these phrases referred to, including the temporal scope. This questioning was also outside the scope of Dr. Islam's direct testimony. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(5)(ii).
74:17-76:12	Vague and ambiguous, incomplete hypothetical, outside the scope of direct testimony. This questioning was vague and ambiguous at least as to the terms/phrases "[i]f you were analyzing a wearable device," "tell if synchronizing the light sources and detectors would improve the signal-to-noise ratio," "laboratory setting," "determine whether synchronizing the light sources and detectors in a wearable device would improve the

Page(s) / Line(s)	Objection(s)
	signal-to-noise ratio." *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(a) and 403. Petitioners failed to lay foundation as to what these phrases referred to, including the temporal scope. This questioning was also outside the scope of Dr. Islam's direct testimony. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(5)(ii). A hypothetical analysis of wearable devices far exceeds the scope of Dr. Islam's declaration.
78:9-79:12	Vague and ambiguous, incomplete hypothetical, outside the scope of direct testimony. This questioning was vague and ambiguous at least as to "the noise changed" and the "signal changed." This questioning was also outside the scope of Dr. Islam's direct testimony. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(5)(ii). A hypothetical analysis of signal-to-noise ratio with no context far exceeds the scope of Dr. Islam's declaration.
82:12-83:3	Vague and ambiguous, incomplete hypothetical, outside the scope of direct testimony. This questioning was vague and ambiguous at least as to "change detection" and "always improve the signal-to-noise ratio." A hypothetical analysis of

Page(s) / Line(s)	Objection(s)
	wearable devices far exceeds the scope of Dr. Islam's declaration.
85:7-17	Vague and ambiguous, outside the scope of direct testimony. This questioning was vague and ambiguous at least as to the terms/phrases "[p]rior to your patents," "was it known," and "change detection in wearable devices." *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(a) and 403. Petitioners failed to lay foundation as to what these phrases referred to, including the temporal scope. This questioning was also outside the scope of Dr. Islam's direct testimony. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(5)(ii).
87:6-22	Vague and ambiguous, outside the scope of direct testimony. This questioning was vague and ambiguous at least as to the terms/phrases "[p]rior to your patents," "was it known," "the field of optical sensors," "change detection," and "improve signal-to-noise ratio." *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(a) and 403. Petitioners failed to lay foundation as to what these phrases referred to, including the temporal scope. This questioning was

Page(s) / Line(s)	Objection(s)
	also outside the scope of Dr. Islam's direct testimony. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(5)(ii).
88:2-89:3	Vague and ambiguous, incomplete hypothetical, outside the scope of direct testimony. This questioning was vague and ambiguous at least as to the terms/phrases "[i]n a laboratory setting" and "determine whether change detection was being used to improve signal-to-noise ratio in a wearable device." *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(a) and 403. Petitioners failed to lay foundation as to what these phrases referred to, including the temporal scope. This questioning was also outside the scope of Dr. Islam's direct testimony. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(5)(ii). A hypothetical laboratory analysis of wearable devices far exceeds the scope of Dr. Islam's declaration.
99:9-101:4	Vague and ambiguous, outside the scope of direct testimony. This questioning was vague and ambiguous at least as to the terms/phrases "[p]rior to your patents," "was it known," and "spatially separated detectors in a wearable device." *See* Fed. R.

Page(s) / Line(s)	Objection(s)
	Evid. 611(a) and 403. Petitioners failed to lay foundation as to what these phrases referred to, including the temporal scope. This questioning was also outside the scope of Dr. Islam's direct testimony. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(5)(ii).
104:4-20, 104:22-105:14	Vague and ambiguous, outside the scope of direct testimony. This questioning was vague and ambiguous at least as to the terms/phrases "[p]rior to your patents," "was it known" and "the field of optical sensing." Petitioners failed to lay foundation as to what these phrases referred to, including the temporal scope. This questioning was also outside the scope of Dr. Islam's direct testimony. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(5)(ii).
105:16-105:22	Vague and ambiguous, incomplete hypothetical, outside the scope of direct testimony. This questioning was vague and ambiguous at least as to the terms/phrases "laboratory setting" "how would you determine" and "improve signal-to-noise ratio." Petitioners failed to lay foundation as to what these

Page(s) / Line(s)	Objection(s)
	phrases referred to, including the temporal scope. This questioning was also outside the scope of Dr. Islam's direct testimony. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(5)(ii).
112:18-113:20, 114:14-115:1	Vague and ambiguous, outside the scope of direct testimony. This questioning was vague and ambiguous at least as to the terms/phrases "prior to your patents" "was it known" and "compare wavelengths in a wearable device to improve the signal-to-noise ratio." Petitioners failed to lay foundation as to what these phrases referred to, including the temporal scope. This questioning was also outside the scope of Dr. Islam's direct testimony. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(5)(ii).
118:12-119:18	Vague and ambiguous, incomplete hypothetical, outside the scope of direct testimony. This questioning was vague and ambiguous at least as to the terms/phrases "[i]n a laboratory setting" and "determine whether comparing wavelengths improve the signal-to-noise ratio in a wearable device." *See*

Page(s) / Line(s)	Objection(s)
	Fed. R. Evid. 611(a) and 403. Petitioners failed to lay foundation as to what these phrases referred to, including the temporal scope. This questioning was also outside the scope of Dr. Islam's direct testimony. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 611(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(5)(ii). A hypothetical laboratory analysis of wearable devices far exceeds the scope of Dr. Islam's declaration.

V. Ex. 1129 – LinkedIn Resume of Abhay Rai

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1129 as hearsay being offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. FED. R. EVID. 801-807, 901-902. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1129 as not authenticated. FED. R. EVID. 901-902. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1129 because it is not sufficiently relevant, and any relevance is outweighed by the risks of confusion, substantial danger of unfair prejudice, and/or misleading the fact finder. FED. R. EVID. 401-403.

VI. Ex. 1130 – LinkedIn Resume of Leo Lautenschlager

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1130 as hearsay being offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. FED. R. EVID. 801-807, 901-902. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1130 as not authenticated. FED. R. EVID. 901-902.

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1130 because it is not sufficiently relevant, and any relevance is outweighed by the risks of confusion, substantial danger of unfair prejudice, and/or misleading the fact finder. FED. R. EVID. 401-403.

VII. Ex. 1131 – LinkedIn Resume of Badri Padmanabhan

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1131 as hearsay being offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. FED. R. EVID. 801-807, 901-902. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1131 as not authenticated. FED. R. EVID. 901-902. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1131 because it is not sufficiently relevant, and any relevance is outweighed by the risks of confusion, substantial danger of unfair prejudice, and/or misleading the fact finder. FED. R. EVID. 401-403.

VIII. Ex. 1132 – LinkedIn Resume of Sanjity Thayyilthodiyil

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1132 as hearsay being offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. FED. R. EVID. 801-807, 901-902. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1132 as not authenticated. FED. R. EVID. 901-902. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1132 because it is not sufficiently relevant, and any relevance is outweighed by the risks of confusion, substantial danger of unfair prejudice, and/or misleading the fact finder. FED. R. EVID. 401-403.

IX. Ex. 1133 – LinkedIn Resume of Kevin Lee

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1133 as hearsay being offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. FED. R. EVID. 801-807, 901-902.

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1133 as not authenticated. FED. R. EVID. 901-902. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1133 because it is not sufficiently relevant, and any relevance is outweighed by the risks of confusion, substantial danger of unfair prejudice, and/or misleading the fact finder. FED. R. EVID. 401-403.

X. Ex. 1134 – Samsung System LSI Webpage

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1134 as hearsay being offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. FED. R. EVID. 801-807, 901-902. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1134 as not authenticated. FED. R. EVID. 901-902. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1134 because it is not sufficiently relevant, and any relevance is outweighed by the risks of confusion, substantial danger of unfair prejudice, and/or misleading the fact finder. FED. R. EVID. 401-403.

XI. Ex. 1135 – SEC Consolidated Financial Statements

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1135 as hearsay being offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. FED. R. EVID. 801-807, 901-902. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1135 because it is not sufficiently relevant, and any relevance is outweighed by the risks of confusion, substantial danger of unfair prejudice, and/or misleading the fact finder. FED. R. EVID. 401-403.

XII. Ex. 1136 – SDS Consolidated Financial Statements

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1136 as hearsay being offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. FED. R. EVID. 801-807, 901-902.

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1136 because it is not sufficiently relevant, and any relevance is outweighed by the risks of confusion, substantial danger of unfair prejudice, and/or misleading the fact finder. FED. R. EVID. 401-403.

XIII. Ex. 1137 – Declaration of James Nowell

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1137 as hearsay being offered for a hearsay purpose and to which no valid exception applies. FED. R. EVID. 801-807. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1137 because it is not sufficiently relevant, and any relevance is outweighed by the risks of confusion, substantial danger of unfair prejudice, and/or misleading the fact finder. FED. R. EVID. 401-403. Patent Owner further objects to Ex. 1137 as lacking foundation, assuming facts not in evidence, containing testimony on matters as to which the witness lacks personal knowledge, and as being conclusory. FED. R. EVID. 602, 701-703. Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1137 to the extent it incorporates or otherwise references any exhibits Patent Owner has objected to as inadmissible evidence herein.

XIV. Ex. 1138 – Declaration of Brian Anthony (Redacted)

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1138 on the same grounds as its objections to Ex. 1124. Ex. 1138 is a redacted version of Ex. 1124, and Patent Owner incorporates by reference all objections stated above with respect to Ex. 1124.

XV. Ex. 1139 – Deposition Transcript of Igor Efimov, Ph.D. (Redacted)

Patent Owner objects to Ex. 1139 on the same grounds as its objections to

Ex. 1127. Ex. 1139 is a redacted version of Ex. 1127, and Patent Owner incorporates by reference all objections stated above with respect to Ex. 1127.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 6, 2026

By: /s/ *Jennifer Hayes*

Reg. No. 50,845
Nixon Peabody LLP
300 South Grand Avenue, Suite 4100
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3151
Tel. 213-629-6190
Fax 213-629-6001

Lead Counsel for Patent Owner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing **Patent Owner's Objections to Evidence** was served on August 6, 2026, by email:

James L. Davis, Jr.
Hyun-Joong Kim
Fan (Frances) Zhang
Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP
1540 El Camino Real Suite 120
Menlo Park, CA 94025
Telephone: (650) 815-2600
Fax: (650) 815-2601
CT-SamsungOmniMedsci@sheppardmullin.com
jdavis@sheppardmullin.com
hykim@sheppardmullin.com
fzhang@sheppardmullin.com

Jasjit S. Vidwan
Robert G. Pluta
MAYER BROWN LLP
1999 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-1101
Tel.: 202.263.3065
JVidwan@mayerbrown.com
RPluta@mayerbrown.com

Jared A. Smith
Ricardo J. Bonilla
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
12860 El Camino Real, Suite 400
San Diego, CA 92130
Phone: +1 858-678-4702
Fax: +1 858-678-5099
jasmith@fr.com
rbonilla@fr.com

Jack Shaw
CHERRY JOHNSON SIEGMUND JAMES PC
8140 Walnut Hill Lane, Suite 105
Dallas, Texas 75231
Tel: 254-732-2242
Fax: 866-627-3509
jshaw@cjsjlaw.com

Counsel for Petitioners

By: /s/ *Jennifer Hayes*

Lead Counsel for Patent Owner