UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTEL CORPORATION
Petitioner

v.

PACT XPP SCHWEIZ AG,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2020-00541

Patent No. 9,075,605

PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS TO PATENT OWNER'S EVIDENCE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.64

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64, Petitioner objects to the following exhibits submitted by Patent Owner. These objections are being timely served within 10 business days of the institution of trial, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1). The institution of trial in this matter occurred on September 9, 2020.

PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS

Exhibit No.	Objections
Exhibit 2002	**FRE 401/402:** Relevance. Patent Owner cites this exhibit for its procedural arguments, which were expressly rejected and no longer at issue, and Patent Owner has not identified any other relevance for this exhibit. **FRE 403:** Any probative value of this exhibit is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues.
Exhibit 2003	**FRE 401/402:** Relevance. Patent Owner cites this exhibit for its procedural arguments, which were expressly rejected and no longer at issue, and Patent Owner has not identified any other relevance for this exhibit. **FRE 403:** Any probative value of this exhibit is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues.
Exhibit 2004	**FRE 401/402:** Relevance. Patent Owner cites this exhibit for its procedural arguments, which were expressly rejected and no longer at issue, and Patent Owner has not identified any other relevance for this exhibit. **FRE 403:** Any probative value of this exhibit is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues.
Exhibit 2005	**FRE 401/402:** Relevance. Patent Owner cites this exhibit for its procedural arguments, which were expressly rejected and no longer at issue, and Patent Owner has not identified any other relevance for this exhibit.

	FRE 403: Any probative value of this exhibit is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues.
Exhibit 2006	**FRE 401/402:** Relevance. Patent Owner cites this exhibit for its procedural arguments, which were expressly rejected and no longer at issue, and Patent Owner has not identified any other relevance for this exhibit. **FRE 403:** Any probative value of this exhibit is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues.
Exhibit 2007	**FRE 401/402:** Relevance. Patent Owner cites this exhibit for its procedural arguments, which were expressly rejected and no longer at issue, and Patent Owner has not identified any other relevance for this exhibit. **FRE 403:** Any probative value of this exhibit is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues.
Exhibit 2008	**FRE 401/402:** Relevance. Patent Owner cites this exhibit for its procedural arguments, which were expressly rejected and no longer at issue, and Patent Owner has not identified any other relevance for this exhibit. **FRE 403:** Any probative value of this exhibit is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues.
Exhibit 2009	**FRE 401/402:** Relevance. Patent Owner cites this exhibit for its procedural arguments, which were expressly rejected and no longer at issue, and Patent Owner has not identified any other relevance for this exhibit. **FRE 403:** Any probative value of this exhibit is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues.
Exhibit 2010	**FRE 401/402:** Relevance. Patent Owner cites this exhibit for its procedural arguments, which were expressly rejected and no longer at issue, and Patent Owner has not identified any other relevance for this exhibit.

	FRE 403: Any probative value of this exhibit is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues.
Exhibit 2011	**FRE 401/402:** Relevance. Patent Owner cites this exhibit for its procedural arguments, which were expressly rejected and no longer at issue, and Patent Owner has not identified any other relevance for this exhibit. **FRE 403:** Any probative value of this exhibit is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues.
Exhibit 2012	**FRE 401/402:** Relevance. Patent Owner cites this exhibit for its procedural arguments, which were expressly rejected and no longer at issue, and Patent Owner has not identified any other relevance for this exhibit. **FRE 403:** Any probative value of this exhibit is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues.
Exhibit 2013	**FRE 401/402:** Relevance. Patent Owner cites this exhibit for its procedural arguments, which were expressly rejected and no longer at issue, and Patent Owner has not identified any other relevance for this exhibit. **FRE 403:** Any probative value of this exhibit is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues.
Exhibit 2014	**FRE 401/402:** Relevance. Patent Owner cites this exhibit for its procedural arguments, which were expressly rejected and no longer at issue, and Patent Owner has not identified any other relevance for this exhibit. **FRE 403:** Any probative value of this exhibit is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues.
Exhibit 2015	**FRE 401/402:** Relevance. Patent Owner cites this exhibit for its procedural arguments, which were expressly rejected and no longer at issue, and Patent Owner has not identified any other relevance for this exhibit.

	FRE 403: Any probative value of this exhibit is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues.
Exhibit 2016	**FRE 401/402:** Relevance. Patent Owner cites this exhibit for its procedural arguments, which were expressly rejected and no longer at issue, and Patent Owner has not identified any other relevance for this exhibit. **FRE 403:** Any probative value of this exhibit is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues.
Exhibit 2017	**FRE 401/402:** Relevance. Patent Owner cites this exhibit for its procedural arguments, which were expressly rejected and no longer at issue, and Patent Owner has not identified any other relevance for this exhibit. **FRE 403:** Any probative value of this exhibit is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues.
Exhibit 2018	**FRE 401/402:** Relevance. Patent Owner cites this exhibit for its procedural arguments, which were expressly rejected and no longer at issue, and Patent Owner has not identified any other relevance for this exhibit. **FRE 403:** Any probative value of this exhibit is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues.
Exhibit 2019	**FRE 401/402:** Relevance. Patent Owner cites this exhibit for its procedural arguments, which were expressly rejected and no longer at issue, and Patent Owner has not identified any other relevance for this exhibit. **FRE 403:** Any probative value of this exhibit is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues.
Exhibit 2020	**FRE 401/402:** Relevance. Patent Owner cites this exhibit for its procedural arguments, which were expressly rejected and no longer at issue, and Patent Owner has not identified any other relevance for this exhibit.

	FRE 403: Any probative value of this exhibit is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues.
Exhibit 2021	**FRE 401/402:** Relevance. Patent Owner cites this exhibit for its procedural arguments, which were expressly rejected and no longer at issue, and Patent Owner has not identified any other relevance for this exhibit. **FRE 403:** Any probative value of this exhibit is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues.
Exhibit 2022	**FRE 401/402:** Relevance. Patent Owner cites this exhibit for its procedural arguments, which were expressly rejected and no longer at issue, and Patent Owner has not identified any other relevance for this exhibit. **FRE 403:** Any probative value of this exhibit is substantially outweighed by a danger of confusing the issues.

Date: September 23, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Kevin Bendix

Kevin Bendix (Reg. No. 67,164)
kevin.bendix@kirkland.com
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
555 South Flower Street, Suite 3700
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Telephone: (213) 680-8400
Facsimile: (213) 680-8500

Robert A. Appleby, P.C. (Reg. No. 40,897)
robert.appleby@kirkland.com
Gregory S. Arovas, P.C. (Reg. No. 38,818)
greg.arovas@kirkland.com
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
601 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10022
Telephone: (212) 446-4800
Facsimile: (212) 446-4900

Attorneys for Petitioner Intel Corporation

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing Petitioner's Objections to Patent Owner's Evidence was served on September 23, 2020, by filing this document through the Patent Review Processing System as well as via email directed to counsel of record for the Patent Owner at the following:

Ziyong Li, Esquire
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
50 California Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
(415) 875-6373
seanli@quinnemanuel.com

Nima Hefazi, Esquire
Joseph M. Paunovich, Esquire
QUINN, EMANUEL, URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 443-3000
nimahefazi@quinnemanuel.com
joepaunovich@quinnemanuel.com

Attorneys for Patent Owner

/s/ Kevin Bendix
Kevin Bendix