

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTUITIVE SURGICAL, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

ETHICON LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-01247
U.S. Patent No. 8,479,969 B2

**PATENT OWNER'S SECOND SET OF OBJECTIONS TO
ADMISSIBILITY OF EVIDENCE SERVED BY PETITIONER INTUITIVE
SURGICAL, INC. IN *INTER PARTES* REVIEW**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b), Patent Owner Ethicon LLC hereby objects as follows to the admissibility of evidence filed by Petitioner Intuitive Surgical, Inc. in *Inter Partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 8,479,969 (IPR2018-01247).

Evidence	Objections
Exhibit 1017	<p>FRE 105: To the extent that any portion of this exhibit may be deemed admissible, such admissibility should be for a limited purpose.</p> <p>FRE 402/403: Paragraphs 3-7, 10, 12, and 16-17 of the exhibit are not relevant to any ground upon which trial was instituted at least because they are not cited in Petitioner’s Reply to Patent Owner’s Response. Moreover, the probative value of paragraphs 3-17 to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly cumulative evidence.</p> <p>FRE 602: As to at least paragraphs 3-17, the exhibit includes assertions for which evidence has not been introduced sufficient to show that the witness has personal knowledge of the matters asserted.</p> <p>FRE 701/702 and/or 37 C.F.R. § 42.65: As to at least</p>

Evidence	Objections
	<p>paragraphs 3-17, the exhibit declarant is not qualified to opine on what a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood and/or to perform legal analysis of invalidity. The opinion testimony offered in this exhibit is not based on scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge, and is also not based on personal knowledge. The opinion testimony includes unsubstantiated leaps and advances inaccurate, unqualified generalizations. The opinion testimony fails to properly disclose the underlying facts or data on which the opinion is based. The opinion testimony includes testimony on United States patent law.</p> <p>FRE 705 / 37 C.F.R. § 42.65: Exhibit includes expert testimony that does not disclose underlying facts or data.</p> <p>FRE 802: The entirety of the exhibit is inadmissible hearsay if offered to prove the truth of any matter allegedly asserted therein.</p>
Exhibit 1020	<p>FRE 402: The exhibit is not relevant to any ground upon which trial was instituted.</p> <p>FRE 403: The exhibit's probative value to any ground</p>

Evidence	Objections
	<p>upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly cumulative evidence.</p>
Exhibit 1023	<p>FRE 402: The exhibit is not relevant to any ground upon which trial was instituted.</p> <p>FRE 403: The exhibit's probative value to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly cumulative evidence.</p>
Exhibit 1026	<p>FRE 402: The exhibit is not relevant to any ground upon which trial was instituted.</p> <p>FRE 403: The exhibit's probative value to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly cumulative evidence.</p>
Exhibit 1027	<p>FRE 402: The exhibit is not relevant to any ground upon</p>

Evidence	Objections
	<p>which trial was instituted.</p> <p>FRE 403: The exhibit's probative value to any ground upon which trial was instituted is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly cumulative evidence.</p>

Dated: July 22, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

/Anish R. Desai/

Elizabeth S. Weiswasser (Reg No. 55,721)
Anish R. Desai (Reg. No. 73,760)
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
767 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10153
T: 212-310-8000

Adrian Percer (Reg. No. 46,986)
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
201 Redwood Shores Parkway
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
T: 650-802-3141

Christopher T. Marando (Reg. No. 67,898)
Christopher M. Pepe (Reg. No. 73,851)
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
2001 M Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
T: 202-682-7094

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that on July 22, 2019, the foregoing
PATENT OWNER'S SECOND SET OF OBJECTIONS TO
ADMISSIBILITY OF EVIDENCE SERVED BY PETITIONER INTUITIVE
SURGICAL, INC. IN *INTER PARTES* REVIEW was served via electronic
mail, upon the following:

Steven R. Katz
John C. Phillips
Ryan P. O'Connor
FISH & RICHARDSON
3200 RBC Plaza, 60 South Sixth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
katz@fr.com
phillips@fr.com
oconnor@fr.com

IPR11030-0049IP5@fr.com
PTABInbound@fr.com

/Timothy J. Andersen/
Timothy J. Andersen
Case Manager
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
2001 M Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036
T: 202-682-7075
timothy.andersen@weil.com