

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

UATP IP, LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

SLICK SLIDE LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case PGR2024-00054
U.S. Patent No. 11,998,854

**PATENT OWNER'S OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE SUBMITTED WITH
PETITIONER'S REPLY BRIEF**

Patent Owner Slick Slide LLC (“Patent Owner” or “Slick Slide”) hereby objects to the following evidence that was served by Petitioner UATP IP, LLC with their Petitioner’s Reply Brief (“Reply”) on November 26, 2025, in the above-captioned proceeding. In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), these objections are being timely filed and served within five (5) business days of service of evidence to which these objections are directed.

A. Exhibit 1044 (Second Declaration of Dr. Youjiang Wang)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1044 for the following reasons: FRE 401-403 (relevance; more prejudicial than probative; confusing; and misleading); FRE 701-702 (improper expert testimony; opinions not based on sufficient facts or data); FRE 802 (hearsay); and FRE 901 (authentication).

Specifically, Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1044 to the extent that Dr. Wang’s testimony contains new opinions outside the scope of proper rebuttal and introduces theories not supported by underlying admissible evidence.

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1044 as irrelevant, lacking foundation, assuming facts not in evidence, calling for legal conclusion, and mischaracterizing evidence. Patent Owner further objects to the exhibit to the extent that it includes expert opinions for which the factual bases have not been disclosed, for which Dr. Wang does not have personal knowledge (FRE 602), and to the extent that Dr. Wang’s opinions constitute unreliable expert testimony under FRE 702 and 703, and as impermissibly based on hearsay under FRE 801-803 to the extent statements from references are relied on for the truth of the matter asserted.

Patent Owner objects to the portions of the exhibit not discussed or cited in the Reply as not being relevant to any issue on which trial has been instituted.

B. Exhibit 1048

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1048 for the following reasons:

For lack of authentication under FRE 901. As hearsay under FRE 801-803 to the extent statements therein are relied on for the truth of the matter asserted. And under FRE 401-403 as being irrelevant, more prejudicial than probative, confusing and misleading. Exhibit 1048 is relied upon to support an assertion that is not supported by the cited passages.

Patent Owner likewise objects to any portion of the Reply and Dr. Wang's Declaration (EX 1044) purporting to rely on Exhibit 1048.

C. Exhibits 1049, 1058, 1060, 1062, 1064, 1066 and 1068 (Videos)

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1049, 1058, 1060, 1062, 1064, 1066 and 1068 for the following reasons:

For lack of authentication under FRE 901. For lack of personal knowledge under FRE 602. As hearsay under FRE 801-803 to the extent statements therein are relied on for the truth of the matter asserted. And under FRE 401-403 as being irrelevant, more prejudicial than probative, confusing and misleading. Exhibits 1049, 1058, 1060, 1062, 1064, 1066 and 1068 have not been shown to be properly authenticated (Petitioner has not produced evidence sufficient to support a finding

that each item is what the proponent claims it is under FRE 901(a)). Each video contains hearsay statements and is relied upon for propositions that the video does not show or substantiate.

Patent Owner likewise objects to any portion of the Reply and Dr. Wang's Declaration (EX 1044) purporting to rely on Exhibits 1049, 1058, 1060, 1062, 1064, 1066 and 1068.

D. Exhibit 1051

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1051 for the following reasons:

For lack of authentication under FRE 901. As hearsay under FRE 801-803 to the extent statements therein are relied on for the truth of the matter asserted. And under FRE 401-403 as being irrelevant, more prejudicial than probative, confusing and misleading. Exhibit 1051 is relied upon to support an assertion that is not supported by the cited passages.

Patent Owner likewise objects to any portion of the Reply and Dr. Wang's Declaration (EX 1044) purporting to rely on Exhibit 1051.

E. Exhibit 1052

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1052 for the following reasons:

For lack of authentication under FRE 901. As hearsay under FRE 801-803 to the extent statements therein are relied on for the truth of the matter asserted. And under FRE 401-403 as being irrelevant, more prejudicial than probative, confusing and misleading. Exhibit 1052 is relied upon to support an assertion that is not supported by the cited passages.

Patent Owner likewise objects to any portion of the Reply and Dr. Wang's Declaration (EX 1044) purporting to rely on Exhibit 1052.

F. Exhibit 1053

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1053 for the following reasons:

For lack of authentication under FRE 901. As hearsay under FRE 801-803 to the extent statements therein are relied on for the truth of the matter asserted. And under FRE 401-403 as being irrelevant, more prejudicial than probative, confusing and misleading. Exhibit 1053 is relied upon to support an assertion that is not supported by the cited passages.

Patent Owner likewise objects to any portion of the Reply and Dr. Wang's Declaration (EX 1044) purporting to rely on Exhibit 1053.

G. Exhibit 1054

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1054 for the following reasons:

For lack of authentication under FRE 901. As hearsay under FRE 801-803 to the extent statements therein are relied on for the truth of the matter asserted. And under FRE 401-403 as being irrelevant, more prejudicial than probative, confusing and misleading. Exhibit 1054 is relied upon to support an assertion that is not supported by the cited passages.

Patent Owner likewise objects to any portion of the Reply and Dr. Wang's Declaration (EX 1044) purporting to rely on Exhibit 1054.

H. Exhibit 1055

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1055 for the following reasons:

For lack of authentication under FRE 901. For lack of personal knowledge under FRE 602. As hearsay under FRE 801-803 to the extent statements therein are relied on for the truth of the matter asserted. And under FRE 401-403 as being irrelevant, more prejudicial than probative, confusing and misleading. Exhibit 1055 includes testimony that was taken in a different proceeding under different issues and has not been shown to be relevant, admissible, or properly authenticated. Exhibit 1055 is relied upon for assertions not supported by the cited passages.

Patent Owner likewise objects to any portion of the Reply and Dr. Wang's Declaration (EX 1044) purporting to rely on Exhibit 1055.

I. Exhibit 1056

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1056 for the following reasons:

For lack of authentication under FRE 901. As hearsay under FRE 801-803 to the extent statements therein are relied on for the truth of the matter asserted. And under FRE 401-403 as being irrelevant, more prejudicial than probative, confusing and misleading. Exhibit 1056 is relied upon to support an assertion that is not supported by the cited passages. Petitioner has not shown that Exhibit 1056, being a Great Britain patent, is relevant to any issue in the present proceeding. Exhibit 1056 concerns different legal standards.

Patent Owner likewise objects to any portion of the Reply and Dr. Wang's Declaration (EX 1044) purporting to rely on Exhibit 1056.

J. Exhibit 1057

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1057 for the following reasons:

For lack of authentication under FRE 901. As hearsay under FRE 801-803 to the extent statements therein are relied on for the truth of the matter asserted. And under FRE 401-403 as being irrelevant, more prejudicial than probative, confusing and misleading. Exhibit 1057 is relied upon to support an assertion that is not supported by the cited passages.

Patent Owner likewise objects to any portion of the Reply and Dr. Wang's Declaration (EX 1044) purporting to rely on Exhibit 1057.

K. Exhibit 1059

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1059 for the following reasons:

For lack of authentication under FRE 901. For lack of personal knowledge under FRE 602. As hearsay under FRE 801-803 to the extent statements therein are relied on for the truth of the matter asserted. And under FRE 401-403 as being irrelevant, more prejudicial than probative, confusing and misleading. Exhibit 1059 is relied upon to support an assertion that is not supported by the cited passages.

Patent Owner likewise objects to any portion of the Reply and Dr. Wang's Declaration (EX 1044) purporting to rely on Exhibit 1059.

L. Exhibit 1061

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1061 for the following reasons:

For lack of authentication under FRE 901. For lack of personal knowledge under FRE 602. As hearsay under FRE 801-803 to the extent statements therein are relied on for the truth of the matter asserted. And under FRE 401-403 as being irrelevant, more prejudicial than probative, confusing and misleading. Exhibit 1061 is relied upon to support an assertion that is not supported by the cited passages.

Patent Owner likewise objects to any portion of the Reply and Dr. Wang's Declaration (EX 1044) purporting to rely on Exhibit 1061.

M. Exhibit 1063

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1063 for the following reasons:

For lack of authentication under FRE 901. For lack of personal knowledge under FRE 602. As hearsay under FRE 801-803 to the extent statements therein are relied on for the truth of the matter asserted. And under FRE 401-403 as being irrelevant, more prejudicial than probative, confusing and misleading. Exhibit 1063 is relied upon to support an assertion that is not supported by the cited passages.

Patent Owner likewise objects to any portion of the Reply and Dr. Wang's Declaration (EX 1044) purporting to rely on Exhibit 1063.

N. Exhibit 1065

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1065 for the following reasons:

For lack of authentication under FRE 901. For lack of personal knowledge under FRE 602. As hearsay under FRE 801-803 to the extent statements therein are relied on for the truth of the matter asserted. And under FRE 401-403 as being irrelevant, more prejudicial than probative, confusing and misleading. Exhibit 1065 is relied upon to support an assertion that is not supported by the cited passages.

Patent Owner likewise objects to any portion of the Reply and Dr. Wang's Declaration (EX 1044) purporting to rely on Exhibit 1065.

O. Exhibit 1067

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1067 for the following reasons:

For lack of authentication under FRE 901. For lack of personal knowledge under FRE 602. As hearsay under FRE 801-803 to the extent statements therein are relied on for the truth of the matter asserted. And under FRE 401-403 as being irrelevant, more prejudicial than probative, confusing and misleading. Exhibit 1067 is relied upon to support an assertion that is not supported by the cited passages.

Patent Owner likewise objects to any portion of the Reply and Dr. Wang's Declaration (EX 1044) purporting to rely on Exhibit 1067.

P. Exhibit 1069

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1069 for the following reasons:

For lack of authentication under FRE 901. For lack of personal knowledge under FRE 602. As hearsay under FRE 801-803 to the extent statements therein are relied on for the truth of the matter asserted. And under FRE 401-403 as being irrelevant, more prejudicial than probative, confusing and misleading. Exhibit 1069 is relied upon to support an assertion that is not supported by the cited passages.

Patent Owner likewise objects to any portion of the Reply and Dr. Wang's Declaration (EX 1044) purporting to rely on Exhibit 1069.

Q. Exhibits 1070 and 1071

Patent Owner objects to Exhibits 1070 and 1071 for the following reasons:

Exhibits 1070 and 1071 are unavailable to Patent Owner, and Petitioner has not filed a motion to seal as required by 37 C.F.R. § 42.14. Because the exhibits are not accessible, Patent Owner cannot verify their authenticity or content.

Patent Owner preserves further objections to Exhibits 1070 and 1071 for lack of authentication under FRE 901. For lack of personal knowledge under FRE

602. As hearsay under FRE 801-803 to the extent statements therein are relied on for the truth of the matter asserted. And under FRE 401-403 as being irrelevant, more prejudicial than probative, confusing and misleading.

Patent Owner likewise objects to any portion of the Reply and Dr. Wang's Declaration (EX 1044) purporting to rely on Exhibits 1070 and 1071.

R. Exhibit 1072

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1072 for the following reasons:

For lack of authentication under FRE 901. For lack of personal knowledge under FRE 602. As hearsay under FRE 801-803 to the extent statements therein are relied on for the truth of the matter asserted. And under FRE 401-403 as being irrelevant, more prejudicial than probative, confusing and misleading. Exhibit 1072 is relied upon to support an assertion that is not supported by the cited passages.

Patent Owner likewise objects to any portion of the Reply and Dr. Wang's Declaration (EX 1044) purporting to rely on Exhibit 1072.

S. Exhibit 1073

Patent Owner objects to Exhibit 1073 for the following reasons:

For lack of authentication under FRE 901. For lack of personal knowledge under FRE 602. As hearsay under FRE 801-803 to the extent statements therein are relied on for the truth of the matter asserted. And under FRE 401-403 as being irrelevant, more prejudicial than probative, confusing and misleading. Exhibit 1073 is relied upon to support an assertion that is not supported by the cited passages.

Patent Owner likewise objects to any portion of the Reply and Dr. Wang's Declaration (EX 1044) purporting to rely on Exhibit 1073.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 4, 2025

/Brett A. Schatz/
Brett A. Schatz
Reg. No. 59,764
Louis H. Sitler
Reg. No. 81,818
Wood, Herron & Evans LLP
600 Vine Street
Suite 2800
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 707-0418

Attorneys for Patent Owner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e), the undersigned certifies that on December 4, 2025, a complete and entire copy of the foregoing Patent Owner's Objection to Evidence Submitted with Petitioner's Reply Brief was provided via email to the Petitioner by serving the email correspondence addresses of record as follows:

W. Karl Renner, Reg. No. 41,265
Thomas A Rozylowicz, Reg. No. 50,620
Craig A. Deutsch, Reg. No. 69,264
Kiersten M. Batzli, Reg. No. 75,476

Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street, Suite 3200
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Tel.: 202-783-5070 Fax: 877-769-7945

/Louis H. Sitler/
Louis H. Sitler
Wood, Herron & Evans LLP
600 Vine Street
Suite 2800
Cincinnati, OH 45202