August 15, 2013

ARRIGO D. JEZZI MEDLINE INDUSTRIES v. HARTMANN AG

1 2 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE 3 BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD 4 _____ MEDLINE INDUSTRIES, INC., 5 б Petitioner 7 v. PAUL HARTMANN AG 8 9 Patent Owner 10 11 12 Case IPR2013-00173 13 Patent U.S. 8,152,788 14 15 16 17 VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF 18 ARRIGO D. JEZZI 19 Thursday, August 15, 2013 9:30 a.m. 20 21 22 23 24 25 Reported by: Adrienne M. Mignano, RPR 800.211.DEPO (3376) Job Number: 336516 EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE 5 O LUTTONS

> Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 1 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 1 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

ARRIGO D. JEZZI MEDLINE INDUSTRIES v. HARTMANN AG 2 1 2 3 August 15, 2013 4 5 9:30 a.m. 6 New York, New York 7 8 Videotaped Deposition of ARRIGO D. JEZZI, held at the offices of PROSKAUER 9 ROSE, Eleven Times Square, New York, New 10 York, pursuant to Notice, before Adrienne M. 11 Mignano, a Notary Public of the State of New 12 13 York. 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 2 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 2 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

August 15, 2013 3

ARRIGO D. JEZZI MEDLINE INDUSTRIES v. HARTMANN AG

Γ

1		
2	APPEA	RANCES:
3		
4	LAUBSCHER	& LAUBSCHER, P.C.
5	Attorneys	for Medline
6		1160 Spa Road
7		Suite 2B
8		Annapolis, Maryland 21403
9	BY:	ROBERT D. SPENDLOVE, ESQ.
10		
11		
12	PROSKAUER	ROSE LLP
13	Attorneys	for Patent Owner
14		Eleven Times Square
15		New York, New York 10036
16	BY:	ANTHONY C. COLES, ESQ.
17		
18		
19	ALSO PRESI	ent:
20		EN ZARNETSKE Video Specialist
21		NOSKOWICZ
22		noskowicz ne Industries, Inc.
23		
24		
25		800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com
		NIDE

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 3 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 3 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	
2	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This is tape
3	number one of the videotaped
4	deposition of Mr. Arrigo D. Jezzi,
5	taken by patent owner, in the matter
6	of Medline Industries, Inc.,
7	petitioner, versus Paul Hartmann, AG,
8	patent owner, in the United States
9	Patent and Trademark Office, Before
10	the Patent Trial and Appeal Board,
11	Case Number IPR2013-00173.
12	This deposition is being held on
13	August 15, 2013 at approximately 10:05
14	a.m.
15	My name is Kristin Zarnetske.
16	I'm a legal videographer representing
17	Esquire Deposition Solutions. The
18	court reporter also in association
19	with Esquire is Adrienne Mignano.
20	This deposition is being held at
21	the firm Proskauer Rose, at 11 Times
22	Square, New York, New York.
23	Will counsel present please
24	introduce themselves for the record. 800.211.DEPO (3376)
25	MR. COLES: Anthony Coles for EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 4 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 4 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	
2	Paul Hartmann AG, the patent owner.
3	MR. SPENDLOVE: Robert Spendlove
4	of Laubscher & Laubscher on behalf of
5	Medline, the petitioner.
6	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Thank you.
7	Would the court reporter please
8	swear in the witness.
9	A-R-R-I-G-O D. J-E-Z-Z-I, called as a
10	witness, having been duly sworn
11	by a Notary Public, was examined and
12	testified as follows:
13	EXAMINATION BY
14	MR. COLES:
15	Q Good morning, Mr. Jezzi.
16	A Good morning.
17	Q Would you please state your name
18	for the record.
19	A Arrigo D. Jezzi.
20	Q Thank you.
21	And your home address?
22	A 169 Upland Terrace, Bala Cynwyd,
23	PA 19004.
24	Q And you were retained by Medline
25	to appear today? 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 5 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 5 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 Α Correct. 3 MR. COLES: I'd like to enter document number 25. It is a revised 4 5 deposition notice of petitioner's 6 declarant. 7 BY MR. COLES: 8 Mr. Jezzi, have you seen this 0 9 document before? 10 Yes, I have. Α 11 0 Okay. 12 And do you understand that you 13 are appearing today pursuant to this 14 notice? 15 Α Correct. 16 Ο Okay. 17 Do you understand that you're 18 testifying under oath today and it is no 19 different than if you were testifying in 20 Court? 21 Α Yes. If you don't understand a 22 0 23 question, please ask for clarification; is 24 that okay? 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 Α Yes. EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 6 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 6 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 Q Okay. 3 Otherwise, I'll assume you have 4 heard and understood my question. 5 You must give audible responses 6 to the questions so the reporter can 7 record what you say. Nodding your head or 8 shrugging your shoulders is not sufficient 9 for the court reporter. 10 Because the court reporter is 11 taking down everything we say, I'll try not to speak over you, and please wait 12 13 till I finish my questions before you 14 speak. 15 Is there any reason you might not be able to testify fully and honestly 16 17 today? 18 Α No. 19 Q Okay. 20 No alcohol this morning? No, I'm fine. 21 Α No medications that would affect 22 0 23 your testimony? No, I'm fine. 24 Α 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 Q Okay. EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 7 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 7 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 Did you do anything to prepare 3 for today's deposition? 4 Α Yes. 5 Ο What did you do? 6 Α Basically I reviewed the patents that we had on the declaration. 7 I reread the declaration, and I had the opportunity 8 9 to read the decision that the board 10 provided. 11 0 Did you meet with anyone? I met with Robert Spendlove 12 Α 13 about two weeks ago just to discuss the documents that we just discussed, that we 14 15 just mentioned. 16 Ο Did you speak with anyone at Medline? 17 18 Α Actually, no. I mean, we spoke 19 with David occasionally to coordinate the meeting, but he was not involved in any 20 21 one-on-one discussions. 22 Q Okay. 23 And which patents did you 24 review? 800.211.DEPO (3376) Which patents? Basically I EsquireSolutions.com 25 Α ESQUIRE

> Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 8 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 8 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

Γ

1	Jezzi
2	reviewed there were 15 patents in the
3	declaration, if I recall the number. I
4	didn't review in a lot of detail the ones
5	that were viewed as cumulative, which were
б	mostly the folding patents, but I reviewed
7	Belau, Goates, Karami '722, Karami '129,
8	Bruemmer, Shingu. Most of the ones that
9	were relevant and that were in the
10	declaration.
11	Q Did you review
12	A Excuse me, Benning and the
13	Beckert as well.
14	Q Have you ever been deposed
15	before?
16	A Once, but not in a patent case.
17	It was a bankruptcy case.
18	Q Were you a fact or expert
19	witness?
20	A I was a fact witness deposed by
21	the equity committee on a bankruptcy case
22	for Paragon Trade Brands.
23	Q Have you ever testified at
24	trial?
25	A No. 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 9 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 9 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	Q Have you ever been considered to
3	be retained as an expert for other cases
4	but not retained?
5	A Repeat the question again.
6	Q Have you ever been considered to
7	be retained as an expert for other cases
8	but not retained?
9	A Yes.
10	Q Okay.
11	How many times?
12	A Once.
13	Q Do you know why you were not
14	retained?
15	A Relationship with the client was
16	considered as a potential problem, so they
17	dismissed me.
18	Q You mean a conflict of interest?
19	A Yeah, I guess it would be that.
20	Q Okay.
21	Have you ever provided any other
22	opinions in connection with a litigation?
23	A I was involved as expert witness
24	in other cases that went to trial.
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) Actually that were in effect. They didesquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 10 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 10 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 not go to trial, but I was an expert 3 witness in at least three other cases. 4 0 Can you tell me what those three 5 cases are? 6 Α They're history. There was a case Tredegar against Applix on elastic 7 ears. There was another case Tredegar 8 9 against 3M on elastic ears. And there was 10 another one Valor Brands against Kimberly 11 Clark. 12 0 All right. 13 So the first case you discussed was -- what was the name of that company? 14 15 Tredegar and Applix. Α 16 0 Tredegar. 17 And you were retained by which 18 company? 19 By Applix. Α 20 And Applix was the plaintiff or Q 21 defendant? Defendant. 22 Α 23 0 And this was a patent 24 infringement case? 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 Correct. Α EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 11 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 11 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1		Jezzi	
2	Q	And Applix was accused of	
3	infringing	g a Tredegar patent?	
4	A	Correct.	
5	Q	Was it more than one patent?	
6	A	One patent.	
7	Q	And what did that patent per	rtain
8	to?		
9	A	It was the construction of t	che
10	elastic e	ar.	
11	Q	What is an elastic ear?	
12	A	The elastic ear is a side pa	art
13	to the dia	aper which basically stretche	es to
14	allow for	better comfort and a broader	2
15	range of	sizes in a diaper.	
16	Q	And you did not	
17		MR. COLES: Strike that.	
18	Q	And you were not deposed in	that
19	case?		
20	A	I was not deposed in that ca	ase.
21	Q	What was the result of that	
22	case?		
23	A	It was settled out of court.	
24	Q	And the second case you	
25	mentioned	was?	800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 12 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 12 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 Α Tredegar against 3M -- or 3M 3 against Tredegar. Tredegar was the defendant. 4 5 0 And you represented -- and you 6 were --7 I was retained by Tredegar this Α 8 time. 9 0 Okay. 10 And Tredegar was accused of 11 infringing a 3M patent? 12 Α Several 3M patents. 13 0 And what did those patents pertain to? 14 15 It was the material that went Α 16 into an elastic ear. They were material 17 and process patents. 18 And what was the result of that 0 19 case? 20 It went through a Markman Α 21 Hearing on claim construction. Tredegar prevailed on the definition of the claims, 22 23 which made them not infringe. 3M has 24 appealed that. I don't know the status of 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 it today. EsquireSolutions.com

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 13 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 13 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	Q And you did not provide any
3	testimony in this case?
4	A No.
5	Q Did you provide an expert
6	report?
7	A Yes.
8	Q And was the expert report
9	relating to infringement?
10	A The I don't remember whether
11	the expert report was submitted or not.
12	We prepared an invalidity opinion for the
13	attorneys for Tredegar.
14	Q Did you provide any testimony or
15	reports regarding the claim
16	interpretation?
17	A No. It was all support work to
18	the attorneys.
19	Q Did you prepare a report that
20	was submitted to the court?
21	A We did prepare a report. I
22	don't know whether it was submitted to
23	court or not.
24	Q Do you still have a copy of that
25	report? 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 14 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 14 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	A I don't think so. I deleted
3	most of my files at the request of the
4	attorneys when the case was terminated.
5	Q And the third case you mentioned
6	was what?
7	A That was a diaper ear design
8	case. Valor Brands, which is a diaper
9	converter, against Kimberly Clark, Keiper
10	Patent '298.
11	Q What is a diaper converter?
12	A Someone who makes a diaper.
13	Q And you represented I'm
14	sorry, you were retained by which
15	A Valor Brands.
16	Q And Valor Brands was the
17	plaintiff or defendant?
18	A They were a defendant.
19	Q And they were accused of
20	infringing a Kimberly Clark patent?
21	A Correct.
22	Q And was it just one patent?
23	A One patent.
24	Q And did you provide a report?
25	A Noninfringement report. 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 15 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 15 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	Q And was that given to the court?
3	A I believe it was. This case was
4	settled out of court.
5	Q When did you first learn about
6	Hartmann's U.S. Patent 8152788?
7	A The Beckert patent?
8	Q Correct.
9	A David Noskowicz called me and
10	asked me to look at the patent. So I
11	don't remember when that was. Two, three
12	years ago. Two years ago maybe,
13	year-and-a-half. I don't remember the
14	time.
15	Q Okay.
16	If I refer to that patent as the
17	'788 patent, you'll understand which
18	patent I'm talking about?
19	A Beckert '788, yes.
20	Q Okay.
21	So when Mr. Noskovicz contacted
22	you two or three years ago about this
23	patent, what was let me say that again.
24	When Mr. Noskowicz contacted you
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) two or three years ago, what did he as} EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 16 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 16 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 you to do? 3 MR. SPENDLOVE: Objection. 4 Mischaracterizes the testimony. 5 You may answer the question. Q 6 Α Repeat that. 7 Q You can answer the question. 8 Α Okay. 9 I actually don't remember. Ι 10 mean, the latest contact on that patent 11 was done I believe early this year, which 12 was basically mentioned that Hartmann had 13 written them a letter and was basically trying to assert the patent. 14 I do recall 15 that. 16 The reason I say that I don't remember the earlier conversations is 17 18 because I have done prior art searches for 19 Medline on occasion and this patent could 20 have come up on some of those prior art 21 searches. I don't remember because they included several -- I mean dozens of 22 23 patents in some of the areas that I was 24 asked to search. 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 But I do recall the EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 17 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 17 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	conversations we had earlier this year on
3	the subject, which is basically working
4	with Robert Spendlove on trying to figure
5	out what do we do with the patent and
6	whether the patent was valid or not.
7	Q So when you first learned
8	MR. COLES: Strike that.
9	Q So you first learned about this
10	patent when Mr. Noskowicz brought it to
11	your attention?
12	A That's correct.
13	And let me be specific. As part
14	of my consulting practice, I do a lot of
15	prior art searches, so it may be possible
16	that I have come came across this
17	patent before that, but it was not an
18	isolated issue with the patent. It was
19	part of a broader survey. So I don't
20	remember what we discussed at the earlier
21	time. I do remember the conversations we
22	had within the last, let's say, five to
23	six months.
24	MR. SPENDLOVE: As we're getting
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) kind of into this area, I'll just <i>EsquireSolutions.com</i>
l	

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 18 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 18 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	caution the witness not to reveal any
3	of the content of any discussions that
4	you have had with counsel.
5	Q Prior to your involvement in
6	this inter partes review, did you prepare
7	any report or written material regarding
8	the '788 Patent?
9	A No.
10	Q Did you perform a patent search
11	regarding this
12	MR. COLES: Let me strike that
13	again.
14	Q Prior to your involvement in
15	this IPR, did you perform a patent
16	validity search on the '788 Patent?
17	A No, not a patent validity
18	search.
19	Q Did you do another type of
20	search?
21	MR. SPENDLOVE: Again, any work
22	that was done, even if it wasn't
23	directly related to this IPR, may be
24	covered by the attorney-client
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) privilege, and I would just caution EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 19 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 19 of 207

Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	you not to reveal the content of any
3	discussions or materials you may have
4	provided.
5	MR. COLES: Are you saying the
6	fact that he did a search is
7	privileged?
8	MR. SPENDLOVE: Yes, it may be.
9	MR. COLES: So you're
10	instructing him not to answer that
11	question?
12	MR. SPENDLOVE: Yes.
13	Don't answer that question.
14	Q When were you first contacted
15	with respect to this review?
16	A I'm going to say earlier this
17	year. I don't remember the exact month.
18	I believe we submitted the declaration
19	I believe in February, so it probably was,
20	let's say, end of December or January.
21	I'm guessing at these dates. Exactly I
22	don't remember.
23	Q And who contacted you about the
24	IPR?
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) A The first contact was through EsquireSolutions.com
	ESOURE



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 20 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 20 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 David. 3 Q And were you asked to provide 4 any opinion? 5 А Pardon me? 6 Q Did Mr. Noskowicz ask you to 7 provide any opinion? 8 I don't provide opinions. Α I'm 9 not a patent attorney. So I just -- when 10 I do a prior art search or something like 11 that, I just provide patents. 12 And you were ultimately retained 0 13 to work on the IPR? Correct. 14 Α And who retained you? 15 0 16 Α Medline. 17 Q And what were you retained to 18 do? 19 Basically provide support to Α 20 Robert on the inter partes review. 21 Q Okay. 22 And how do you view your role in 23 this IPR? 24 Α Meaning? 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 What do you think is your jobesquireSolutions.com Q

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 21 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 21 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	A Primarily provide technical
3	support or technical interpretation to the
4	information that is provided in the
5	patents that we did. I also did a prior
6	art search to try to find out prior art
7	that would invalidate Beckert '788, which
8	was part of the declaration.
9	Q So it was your role to find that
10	the '788 Patent is invalid?
11	A Correct.
12	MR. SPENDLOVE: Object again.
13	I'll caution the witness to not
14	divulge any details of any of the
15	conversations or the information
16	that's been communicated.
17	Q Mr. Jezzi, are you being
18	compensated for your participation in the
19	IPR?
20	A Yes.
21	Q Okay.
22	Do you submit invoices?
23	A I submit invoices.
24	Q And to whom do you submit the
25	invoices? 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 22 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 22 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	A On this one, I have not
3	submitted it yet, so I guess that's to
4	be determined. Yeah, to be determined; I
5	have not submitted the invoice for the
6	work.
7	Q And to date, do you know about
8	how many hours you've spent working on the
9	IPR?
10	A Yes, I do. I keep an activity
11	log. And don't ask me what the hours is
12	because I don't remember.
13	Q Is it more than 50 hours?
14	A Probably. I can't throw out a
15	number because I don't but I do have a
16	log that I keep. I just haven't tallied
17	it.
18	Q Is it more than 20 hours, do you
19	think?
20	A It's probably in the 20 to 50
21	hour range, I'm guessing.
22	Q Okay.
23	A Probably more. I don't have a
24	number to give you.
25	Q Okay. 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 23 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 23 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 Are you being compensated for 3 your testimony here today? 4 Α Yes. 5 Did anyone place any Ο 6 restrictions on what you ought to do in 7 regard to this IPR? 8 Α No. 9 Have you had any restrictions on 0 10 what information you could review? 11 Α No. 12 0 How did you determine what to 13 review? Basically I figured that the 14 Α line of questioning would be specific to 15 the patents that we submitted in the 16 declaration and their interpretation. 17 So 18 I focused on that and the documents that 19 basically discussed those. 20 When you prepared your 0 21 declaration, how did you determine what documents you would use in your 22 23 declaration? 24 MR. SPENDLOVE: Objection. 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 Again, we're getting into informat Esquire Solutions.com

ESQUIRE SOLUTION S

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 24 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 24 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	that's implicated by the
3	attorney-client privilege.
4	So don't answer that.
5	Q Were there any restrictions on
6	how much time you could spend preparing
7	the declaration?
8	A No.
9	Q Are there any caps on the cost
10	for your work in connection with the IPR?
11	A No.
12	Q When you were retained for this
13	IPR, did you perform a prior art search?
14	MR. SPENDLOVE: Objection.
15	Again, we're getting into information
16	that has to do with attorney work
17	product and attorney-client privilege.
18	So I would ask you not to answer
19	that.
20	MR. COLES: I'm just trying to
21	find out where he obtained his the
22	prior art references that are in his
23	report and how he prepared his report.
24	MR. SPENDLOVE: I understand the
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) point of the question. I'm saying <i>EsquireSolutions.com</i>



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 25 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 25 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	that the process that went into
3	deciding what was in the report and
4	what wasn't and what was included and
5	how the approach was done is certainly
6	within the scope of the attorney work
7	product and certainly covered by the
8	restrictions on drafts and other
9	things that cover expert reports under
10	the PTAB, so I'm instructing him to
11	not answer that.
12	Q Mr. Jezzi, did you prepare the
13	report
14	A Yes, I did.
15	Q your declaration?
16	In preparing the report, did you
17	type it?
18	A I sent I did the draft, yes,
19	on the word processor basically.
20	Q Did you write the first draft of
21	the report?
22	A Yes, I did.
23	Q In preparing your report, did
24	you review any products?
25	A Yes, I did. 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 26 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 26 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1		Jezzi
2	Q	Did you review any Medline
3	products?	
4	A	Yes, I did.
5	Q	Did you review any Hartmann
6	products?	
7	A	No, I did not.
8	Q	Which Medline product did you
9	review?	
10	A	It's one called it is a brief
11	design th	at basically had side parts and
12	mechanica	l fasteners.
13	Q	Do you recall if it was called
14	the FitRi	ght?
15	А	I do not recall the name.
16	Q	Did you review any other
17	products?	
18	А	No, I did not.
19	Q	Have you done other work for
20	Medline p	rior to this IPR?
21	A	Yes, I have.
22	Q	Have you provided any testimony?
23	А	No.
24	Q	Do you have any acquaintances at
25	Medline?	800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 27 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 27 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

-		
1		Jezzi
2	A	No.
3		Professional acquaintances, yes,
4	obviously	
5	Q	Any prior colleagues from your
6	career?	
7	A	None that I worked with
8	beforehan	d.
9	Q	Okay.
10		Any relatives work at Medline?
11	А	Any what?
12	Q	Relatives.
13	A	No.
14	Q	Are any of your innovations or
15	work prod	uct incorporated into any Medline
16	product?	
17	A	No.
18		MR. COLES: Can we go off the
19	recor	d for one second?
20		THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is
21	10:28	a.m. We're going off the
22	recor	d.
23		(Thereupon, a recess was taken,
24	and t	hen the proceedings continued as
25	follo	ws:) 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com
		800.211.DEPO

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 28 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 28 of 207

Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 3 10:28 a.m. We're back on the record. MR. COLES: I'd like to enter a 4 5 document previously marked as Exhibit 6 1018. 7 BY MR. COLES: 8 Which is -- I'll give you the 0 9 long name: "Declaration under 35 USC Section 311-319 and 37 CFR Section 42 of 10 11 Arrigo D. Jezzi Supporting the Invalidity of U.S. Patent Number 8152788". 12 13 Α Okay. You have seen this document 14 0 15 before? 16 Α Yes. If I refer to this as your 17 Q 18 declaration, you'll understand that's the 19 document I'm talking about? 20 I'd like to jump to Appendix A at the back of your declaration. 21 22 Α Okay. 23 0 Let me know when you're there. 24 And Appendix A is your 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 curriculum vitae; is that correct? EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 29 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 29 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	A Correct.
3	Q You received a Bachelor of
4	Science in chemical engineering at Drexel;
5	is that correct?
6	A Correct.
7	Q What kind of classes did you
8	take in your chemical engineering?
9	A All the basic requirements for
10	chemical engineering, which included
11	almost a math minor, a chemistry minor,
12	plus all the prerequisite chemical
13	engineering courses starting with
14	stoichiometry, mass balances, all the way
15	through, you know, plant design.
16	Q Did you take physics?
17	A Many courses in physics.
18	Q Calculus?
19	A Many courses in calculus. Four
20	separate courses, probably 16 to 20
21	credits.
22	Q Okay.
23	And from 1970 to 1976, you were
24	a manager of process services at Scott 800.211.DEPO (3376)
25	Paper Company; is that correct? EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 30 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 30 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1		Jezzi
2	А	That is correct.
3	0	Your CV says that you were
4	responsib	le for mill technical services,
5	process c	ontrol, and development of new
6	paper mak	ing process for the production of
7	Job Squad	kitchen towels.
8		Do you see that?
9	A	Repeat that.
10	Q	It says you
11		MR. COLES: Strike that.
12	Q	Your CV says that you were
13	responsib	le for mill technical services,
14	process c	ontrol, and development of new
15	paper mak	ing process for the production of
16	Job Squad	kitchen towels.
17	A	Correct.
18	Q	Were you an inventor of that
19	paper mak	ing process?
20	A	No.
21	Q	Your CV also says that you
22	worked in	wet laid consumer tissue
23	manufactu	ring.
24		Do you see that?
25	A	State

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 31 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 31 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 processes to make paper. 3 One is using water, which is sometimes referred to as wet laid, which 4 5 is the process that's made to use existing 6 toilet tissue like Cottonelle and Charmin. 7 And there is a aidlaid paper making process, which was used -- it is a 8 9 relatively different process that was used 10 in this particular case to make Job Squad 11 and the Baby Fresh baby wipes. 12 It says you worked as a process 0 13 engineer; is that correct? That is correct. 14 Α What is a process engineer? 15 0 The responsibility for that 16 Α particular role was to develop and 17 18 commercialize the process, which basically 19 was taking it from a start-up mode to 20 commercial operating levels. 21 Ο And what is involved in that? 22 Α Basically you try to optimize 23 the process. You try to make it run 24 faster with reduced waste and meeting the 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 quality specifications. EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 32 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 32 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 Q And what do you mean by "reduced waste"? 3 4 Α Basically when you start up a 5 new process like this one, your waste 6 levels sometimes are in very high levels, 7 like in the 20 percent, which are not commericial, so you try to reduce them to 8 9 down to 10, under 10, to five, four. 10 And by "waste", do you mean 0 11 material? Material that is outside of the 12 Α 13 quality specifications and does not meet specs, so that you cannot sell it. 14 15 And your CV says in 1976 you 0 16 left Scott Paper Company and you joined American Can Company; is that correct? 17 18 Α Correct. 19 Q Why did you leave Scott Paper 20 Company? 21 Α Say it again. 22 Q Why did you leave Scott Paper 23 Company? 24 At that time, I was in Sandusky, Α 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 Ohio, and we did not like the city. ⊥ EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 33 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 33 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi	
2	was a small city, population 30,000, that	
3	doubled in the summer to 60,000. So we	
4	left because of the geography primarily.	
5	Q Your CV says that you	
6	"coordinated the multi-functional efforts	
7	of the commercialization of 100MM" that	
8	means a hundred million?	
9	A A hundred million, yes.	
10	Q "commercialization of 100MM	
11	project in new aidlaid nonwoven	
12	technology."	
13	Do you see that?	
14	A Yes.	
15	Q Were you an inventor of that	
16	aidlaid nonwoven technology?	
17	A No, I was not.	
18	Q And what was this new aidlaid	
19	nonwoven technology?	
20	A It was a variant of the one	
21	below it. It was an aidlaid again using	
22	air as the medium to disperse the	
23	cellulose fibers to make a paper	
24	substrate. So it was a different	
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) technology from Denmark. It was licens EsquireSolutions.com	



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 34 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 34 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 to a Danish inventor, and our job again was basically to commercialize that 3 technology, which we did. 4 5 0 Your CV also says you had line 6 responsibilities for manufacturing a 7 process development --8 I had production Α 9 responsibilities. That's what that means. 10 And what are production 0 11 responsibilities? 12 Α Basically in an operation there 13 are people who support the operation, such as process engineers, people who run the 14 15 operations, which basically have the accountability for the budget, for the raw 16 material budgets and the production 17 18 schedules and volumes, et cetera, and I 19 had both of those responsibilities in this 20 assignment. 21 0 Okay. And your CV says that you left 22 23 American Can Company and joined Burlington 24 Industries in 1981; is that correct? 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 Α Correct. EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 35 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 35 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	Q And why did you leave American
3	Can Company?
4	A American Can Company was a
5	company that was like a mini-conglomerate,
6	and they basically had put the paper
7	division up for sale, and various buyers
8	were looking at the assets of the paper
9	division separately, and I thought they
10	were going to split up the company, so I
11	thought it was a good opportunity to leave
12	Green Bay for sunnier pastures such as
13	Greensboro, North Carolina, in the
14	wintertime.
15	Actually, the other thing is the
16	Burlington project was another
17	commercialization of a new nonwoven
18	technology, so that was another reason to
19	go there.
20	Q Would you explain this new
21	nonwoven technology?
22	A It was basically a carded
23	technology, which is basically a textile
24	type process that makes a web, and we were
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) ultrasonically bonding or consolidatin gEsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 36 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 36 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479
1 Jezzi 2 the fabric to compete with a duPont material called Sontara for medical 3 purposes and home furnishing applications. 4 5 What is a carded technology? Ο 6 Α Carded is when you take a staple 7 fiber, a polymeric fiber, that is cut to a certain length, typically around two 8 9 inches, and it is combed or opened in a 10 carding device, which is a roller machine 11 that has serrated appurtenances sticking out, okay, like a saw, and basically it 12 13 combs the fibers and forms them into a 14 uniform web. 15 It's the same technology used to 16 make yarn, just instead of a filament, they make a web out of it. 17 18 Ο Your CV says in 1983, you left 19 Burlington Industries and you joined Kimberly Clark; is that correct? 20 21 Α Correct. 22 Q And why did you leave 23 Burlington? 24 Basically the project that we Α 800.211.DEPO (3376) had was defunded by Burlington senior EsquireSolutions.com 25

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 37 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 37 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

2	management. They felt that the capital
3	costs for that technology were too high
4	and it really did not fit the technology
5	portfolio of a conventional textile
6	company. So I had an opportunity present
7	itself with Kimberly Clark and I took it.
8	Q Your CV says that you
9	"commercialized and developed two thin
10	maxi products, precursors to the ultra
11	thin design".
12	Do you see that?
13	A For Fem Care, yes.
14	Q Are you the inventor of that?
15	A No, I was not.
16	If you notice the resume, there
17	are several commercialized means you
18	took to commercialization. Co-invented
19	means exactly that. And developed means
20	that you were involved from, you know, the
21	invention typically from someone in your
22	group towards the commercialization phase.
23	So there are different facets of
24	the work that I have done that basically
25	fit those three categories. 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 38 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 38 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 Q Okay. 3 And in 1985, you changed your 4 position? 5 Α I was promoted to director of 6 nonwoven material development at Kimberly 7 Clark in Roswell, Georgia. It says that you "supported 8 0 9 international companies in development and 10 startup of bonded carded web processes and 11 materials". 12 Do you see that? 13 Α That's correct, yes. What does it mean to support 14 0 15 international companies? 16 Α Basically that department had responsibilities internationally as well, 17 18 and we were the technical core group doing 19 R&D and technical support for the 20 international nonwoven operations that the 21 company had. In this particular case, 22 those were in Korea, South Korea. 23 Q It also says --24 MR. COLES: Strike that. 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 Your CV also says that you EsquireSolutions.com 0

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 39 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 39 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	"developed and commercialized a new fiber
3	geometry spunbond diaper liner".
4	Do you see that?
5	A That's correct, yes.
б	Q And what is involved in
7	developing and commercializing a
8	A Basically this group had over 80
9	people, and one of the groups that we were
10	managing had the responsibility to
11	commercialize spunbond, which is one of
12	the materials that we will probably talk
13	about more. It is a nonwoven, it is a
14	continuous polypropylene filament, and
15	this effort was basically to use a
16	different geometry hole to create a
17	different geometry fiber that gave
18	different properties for the applications
19	of that nonwoven.
20	Q Is cost effectiveness important
21	in developing and commercializing a new
22	product?
23	A Yes.
24	Q And why is that?
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) A Well, if you it is easy t EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 40 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 40 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	commercialize something and spend as much
3	money as you can doing it and you can't
4	sell it because you can't make money. So
5	in every one of these programs in the
6	industry, we tend to balance cost
7	effectiveness so that we have a profit at
8	the end of the day when we sell the
9	material. So it is a balancing act of
10	trying to do both basically, new materials
11	at an effective cost.
12	Q Okay.
13	And in 1987, your position
14	changed; is that true?
15	A That's correct. I was
16	transferred back up to Nina, Wisconsin as
17	director of infant care business support,
18	which was basically the Huggies short-term
19	group, meaning that it was basically doing
20	technical support and product development
21	for the existing product that was being
22	sold.
23	Q Okay.
24	And your CV says you "developed
25	and implemented the him/her Huggies 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 41 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 41 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 product"? 3 Α Yes. 4 Q What is a him/her Huggies 5 product? 6 Α Gender specific boy/girl, and 7 basically we were given a charge to come up within less than six months a product 8 9 to compete with the gender specific 10 Pampers that was out there, and that was 11 that project. 12 0 Your CV says you "commercialized 13 tape landing zone nontransfer layer improved nonwoven waist elastic and new 14 improved leg gathers diapers". 15 16 Α Correct. 17 Q Do you see that? 18 Α Yes. 19 What is a tape landing zone? Q 20 A tape landing zone was a second Α generation closure system attachment. 21 What it basically was in order to reduce 22 23 the cost of the film back sheet to reduce 24 the basis weight of the film to make it 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 thinner, you were limited because the EspireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 42 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 42 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 would rupture the back sheet if it went 3 too thin. So the concept, the idea was to 4 put a patch of another film on top of it 5 only in the target zone where you were 6 attaching the tape, so that you could 7 refasten it without tearing the back 8 sheet. 9 And what is tape in this 0 10 context? 11 Α Tape is a piece of film. Usually it was polypropylene film. 12 It was 13 probably around one-and-a-half mils thick and it had adhesive and it was attached to 14 15 the back sheet. 16 0 And what is that tape used for? Basically that's a reinforcing 17 Α 18 patch for the adhesive tape to go on it, 19 and that's called the tape landing zone. 20 And the tape is used to close 0 21 the diaper on? 22 Α Correct. The tape would be 23 attached to that tape landing zone to 24 provide the closure. 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 Q Okay. EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE: SOLUTION S

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 43 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 43 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 Previously you said you want the 3 film back sheet to --MR. COLES: Strike that. 4 5 Previously you testified that 0 6 you want the basis weight of the film to 7 be reduced to make the film thinner? For cost reduction. 8 Α 9 And how does making the film 0 10 thinner reduce cost? 11 Α You have less materials so it is 12 almost proportional. 13 According to your CV, in 1989, 0 your responsibilities at Kimberly Clark 14 15 changed; is that correct? 16 Α That's correct. I was transferred to a different group. 17 That 18 was adult care incontinence. 19 According to your resume, you 0 20 "conceived, developed and commercialized Poise bladder control pads that are 21 currently 180MM business for the company"; 22 is that correct? 23 24 Α That's correct. 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 What is conceived, developed Esquire Solutions.com 0

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 44 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 44 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 commercialized? 3 Α Basically I had the idea for the 4 product and basically took it through 5 fruition and commercialized it. 6 Q Are you an inventor of this? We couldn't patent that. I 7 Α conceived the idea basically. I was the 8 9 one who originated the project, but we 10 felt that there was a lot of prior art and 11 could not get patents on that design. 12 According to your CV, you also 0 13 became director, infant care advanced product development. 14 15 Do you see that? 16 Α Correct. 17 Q Can you tell me what years you 18 were at that position? 19 Basically at that time the Α 20 Huggies franchise had three R&D groups, 21 and it was basically a business support, 22 which was short-term existing product 23 which I described earlier. The second 24 group was the product development, which 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 was in a two-year mode. And then the EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 45 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 45 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 advanced was the five-year mode products. 3 So we were looking at long-term diaper 4 designs for the Huggies franchise. 5 And you were in this position of 0 6 director of infant care advanced product development for how long? 7 Oh, about six months. I left 8 Α 9 after that. 10 0 Okay. 11 According to your CV, in 1993, 12 you left Kimberly Clark and you joined 13 Confab, Incorporated? That was a private label company 14 А 15 in King of Prussia, PA, yes. And why did you leave Kimberly 16 0 17 Clark to go to Confab? 18 Α I was zigzagging up the career 19 advancement line, and I had an offer for a vice-presidency at a smaller company, and 20 21 King of Prussia is next to my hometown of Philadelphia, so we took the opportunity 22 at that time. 23 24 0 Okay. 800.211.DEPO (3376) According to your CV, in 1994 Esquire Solutions.com 25

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 46 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 46 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 you left Confab; is that correct? 3 Α Correct. 4 0 And where did you go from there? 5 Basically I started consulting. Α 6 If you look, it follows up on the 7 consulting side. The key client at that time was Paragon Trade Brands, and after 8 9 some period consulting, I joined them full 10 time. And, again, it was just a bigger, 11 better job. 12 Between August 1994 and October 0 13 of 1995, what was your role at Paragon Trade Brands? 14 15 In October of '95, I basically А 16 started out at -- I have to look at the schedule. I started out in R&D product 17 18 development. I had purchasing as well. 19 And so that was the original position that 20 I had in corporate materials and 21 technology it was called. 22 And then I picked up 23 international and then I picked up the 24 operations and engineering groups later as 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 I went through career advancement at EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 47 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 47 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 Paragon. 3 Q Your CV says that "it controls 4 about 70 percent of the baby diaper 5 private label/store brands". 6 Do you see that? 7 Α Yes. Is that still the case today? 8 0 9 Paragon Trade Brands employed it Α as a result of a patent infringement 10 11 lawsuit that occurred at the end of 1998, I believe. And as a result of that, a 12 13 venture capital firm purchased them and then they were resold to Tyco. 14 15 So at this time, Paragon does 16 not exist. It was bought out ultimately as part of First Quality, and I do not 17 18 know First Quality's baby diaper share, 19 but it is probably a little bit less than 20 that, maybe 50 percent. The market has grown though from those numbers in 21 absolute volume. 22 23 0 Okay. 24 And when you left Paragon Trade 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 Brands in April 1999, what did you do? Esquire Solutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 48 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 48 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

Γ

1	Jezzi
2	A Basically at that time the
3	company was under bankruptcy, and I joined
4	Clopay Plastic Products as vice-president
5	of global technology, and I also had
6	international responsibilities with them.
7	Q According to your CV, you "led
8	development effort for a new elastomeric
9	film and laminate"?
10	A Yes.
11	Q Were you an inventor on that?
12	A No, I was not. I have some
13	patents in some materials on the elastic
14	side, not the laminate side. So no, that
15	material was already patented and we were
16	in the throes of commercializing it.
17	Q And one
18	MR. COLES: Strike that.
19	Q Your CV says you are skilled in
20	intellectual property management?
21	A Yes. I think since basically
22	after starting with Kimberly Clark, I
23	would probably say that 20 to 25 percent
24	of my responsibility or my time was spent
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) on IP management of one sort of anotherEsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 49 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 49 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 So it is a very active as part of the role 3 as product developer at Kimberly Clark, 4 and subsequently even in private label, to 5 be engaged with intellectual property 6 matters. 7 0 Okay. And what experience do you have 8 9 in intellectual property management? 10 Well, basically starting with Α 11 Kimberly Clark, we were very sensitive to IP matters there. So we had four lawsuits 12 13 with Proctor & Gamble, which Kimberly Clark prevailed on all four counts. 14 15 We were involved in one of them 16 very actively supporting that particular litigation from a technical standpoint, 17 18 which basically provides the data to the 19 lawyers so they can use to verify their 20 position against the IP that was there. 21 Chairing IP steering committees 22 in particular areas of diaper 23 construction. We had broken the diaper into various areas, and director or 24 800.211.DEPO (3376) manager basically presided over those EsquireSolutions.com 25

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 50 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 50 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	committees, and we looked, for instance,
3	at tape closure systems or looked at
4	absorbent core or what have you, and then
5	we looked at the disclosures that were
6	submitted by the scientific body of the
7	company and determined which to patent,
8	which not to patent, et cetera.
9	So those are some of the
10	responsibilities. As I grew into chief
11	technical officer, which were the VPs of
12	R&D positions, we determined strategies of
13	where to patent, what countries, getting
14	disclosures out. We looked at issues of
15	infringement and invalidity. We did write
16	to practice support work for the attorneys
17	when we launch new products.
18	Q And you said you looked at tape
19	closure systems?
20	A That was part of the diaper, so
21	yes.
22	Q And what were you looking at
23	tape closure systems with respect to
24	intellectual property management?
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) A At Kimberly Clark, actually EsquireSolutions.com
	DECOLUDE



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 51 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 51 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 happened to be the area that I was 3 managing, that I was supporting for a 4 period of time, maybe a year, and we 5 basically looked at the disclosures that 6 were being submitted by the scientists, product developers, and then we basically 7 looked at it and prioritized them, and 8 9 then determined which ones to patent or 10 not to patent. Basically also looking at 11 the technology behind these concepts and the potential for commercialization and 12 13 consumer benefit. What is the consumer benefit of 14 0 15 a tape closure system? 16 Α Well, there are two. One, it basically holds the diaper in place so it 17 18 doesn't fall off the baby. That is a 19 primary function. The other benefits that 20 we looked at were trying to fix the 21 negatives that these systems had, such as 22 lotion contamination as an example, where 23 when applying the tape, adhesive tape to 24 the baby, the mother contaminated the tape 800.211.DEPO (3376) and it wouldn't stick, and that was a VEsquire Solutions.com 25



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 52 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 52 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 high consumer complaint, so we were 3 addressing those technical and performance 4 issues. 5 At that time, we were actively 6 involved in mechanical fasteners and mechanical closure systems, and we were 7 looking at the benefits and looking at 8 9 cost effectiveness of those systems vis-a-vis adhesive tapes. Those were the 10 11 issues we were kind of looking at. 12 What is a mechanical fastener? 0 13 Α Mechanical fastener is another way to describe what people generically 14 15 call Velcro, which is a trademark. And rather than use the word "Velcro", which 16 everybody relates to, we tend to define 17 18 them as mechanical fasteners. 19 Are mechanical fasteners 0 20 different than a tape? A mechanical fastener in the 21 Α industry would be differentiated over a 22 23 tape. A tape would be one typically with 24 adhesive as the closing mechanism. A 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 mechanical fastener would be using hook Esquire Solutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 53 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 53 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 or some form of hook engagement as the 3 closure system. 4 Q And the purpose of the 5 mechanical fastener would be to hold the 6 diaper on to where? 7 Α The real advantage that we saw was the elimination of contamination 8 9 because you could not contaminate a 10 mechanical fastener with lotion or anything else. If you did, it would still 11 12 function. 13 And the other advantage was that it had very good retention forces to hold 14 15 the closure in place as opposed to a tape that sometimes, because of the chemistry 16 of the polymer, would age or it would have 17 18 some chemical interaction that would not 19 provide that closure continuously. 20 What did you mean by "it would 0 21 still function"? Meaning that it would still 2.2 Α 23 remain closed when you wanted it closed, 24 and you could refasten it several times 800.211.DEPO (3376) and it would still close upon multiple Esquire Solutions.com 25

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 54 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 54 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 refastenings, which adhesive tape would 3 have some limitations to that. 4 0 And what did you mean "it had 5 very good retention forces"? 6 Α Depending on what you want to do, you can vary the retention forces and 7 then you could -- basically what you want 8 9 to do is to have the hook close and have 10 good closure forces upon three to five 11 refastenings. Having good retention forces means it stays closed when you want 12 13 it to stay closed. What does that mean, "stay 14 0 15 closed when you want it to stay closed"? Basically stay fastened, adhere 16 Α 17 to the surface that you're engaging it to. 18 Q And that's to retain the diaper 19 on the user? 20 Α Correct. Let's look at your declaration. 21 0 22 Do you have it in front of you? 23 Is this your signature on page 24 60? 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 I would hope so. Α EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 55 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 55 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 Yes. 3 Q And who wrote this declaration? 4 Α I wrote the primary draft and 5 then continued to embellish it upon 6 subsequent discussions with Mr. Spendlove. Did anyone other than 7 0 Mr. Spendlove assist you in writing this 8 9 declaration? 10 Α No. 11 0 Which portions of the 12 declaration did Mr. Spendlove write? 13 Α Basically I wrote the primary draft, and where Mr. Spendlove helped me 14 was in the formatting of the declaration. 15 I had experience writing invalidity and 16 noninfringement declarations before. And 17 18 on an inter partes review, using the term 19 grounds and things of that sort were the 20 areas that he guided me and structuring 21 how to present it. 22 I'm sorry, did you say you Q 23 prepared a report for inter partes review 24 previously? 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 No, for invalidity and Α EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 56 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 56 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 noninfringement opinions. 3 MR. COLES: Let's take a break. 4 We have to change the tape. 5 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 6 10:59 a.m. on August 15, 2013. It's 7 the end of tape number one. (Thereupon, a recess was taken, 8 9 and then the proceedings continued as 10 follows:) 11 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 11:07 a.m. on August 15, 2013. 12 This 13 is tape number two. BY MR. COLES: 14 15 Mr. Jezzi, how much time did you 0 16 spend preparing the declaration? 17 Again, I don't remember the Α 18 number, the total number of hours, but 19 probably in and out over a week. 20 Q Okay. 21 Let's turn to paragraph 6 of 22 your declaration. 23 Α Which paragraph? 24 0 6. 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 Α Okay. EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 57 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 57 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 Paragraph 6 lists three patent Q 3 publications. 4 Do you see those? 5 Α Yes. 6 Q And as opposed to issued patents, do you understand the difference? 7 8 Yes, it's an application. Α 9 Do you know the status of these 0 patents? 10 11 Α No -- well, let me see. Ι 12 abandoned the mitt-like glove for the 13 collection and disposal of pet excrement. So that one is in limbo someplace because 14 15 I'm not acting on it. Surface treatment of elastomeric 16 films with coatings to prevent -- the 17 18 mitt-like glove for the collection and 19 disposal of pet excrement, I have 20 abandoned pursuing it. So I don't know 21 the status. It is probably dead. The methods of manufacturing 22 23 multilayer elastomeric laminates was under 24 Clopay, and I do not know the status. As 800.211.DEPO (3376) well as the second one, surface treating guire Solutions.com 25

ESQUIRE:

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 58 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 58 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 elastomeric films with coatings. Those 3 were both Clopay patents and I don't know 4 the status. 5 0 Why did you abandon the 6 mitt-like glove application? 7 Α There was quite a bit of prior art. I wrote that patent myself. 8 Ι 9 submitted it on my own, and the examiner 10 had asked a significant number of questions with a lot of prior art that I 11 had not found. And I thought that the 12 13 cost would be very high to hire an attorney to finish it. 14 15 And another key point was that 16 the commercialization process that I was trying to use disappeared on me. 17 The 18 contract manufacturer decided not to 19 pursue it as well. So for those two 20 reasons, I abandoned it rather than spend 21 more money. 22 Q Let's look at paragraph 3 of 23 your declaration. 24 Α Okay. 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 Paragraph 3 lists several 0 EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 59 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 59 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	patents and patent publications.
3	Do you see that
4	A Yes.
5	Q Did you conduct a prior art
6	search to find these documents?
7	A I believe I did most of them,
8	yes.
9	Q Do you know if any were given to
10	you by counsel?
11	A I provided counsel with a list
12	that was longer than this actually, and as
13	a result of reviewing, we narrowed it to
14	the most to basically these. I do not
15	recall which were provided by counsel,
16	however.
17	Q But some may have been?
18	A Pardon me?
19	Q But some references may have
20	been?
21	A I think so, but I'm not sure
22	which ones.
23	Q Did you review everything on
24	this list?
25	A Yes. 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 60 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 60 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	Q Did you consider anything that
3	is not listed here?
4	A We considered others that are
5	not listed here.
6	Q Did you read the entirety of the
7	documents that you list here?
8	A Repeat that. Did I read the
9	entire patent?
10	Q Correct.
11	A Yes.
12	Q Are you familiar with the terms
13	intrinsic and extrinsic evidence as they
14	relate to patent law?
15	A Briefly.
16	Q Okay.
17	What do you understand
18	"intrinsic evidence" to be?
19	A I think by definition it's my
20	understanding that it probably means what
21	is included within the specifications of
22	these patents would be intrinsic.
23	Extrinsic would be information
24	that would be outside of what would be
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) possibly included in the specification EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 61 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 61 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 the patent. 3 Q And did you review any extrinsic evidence in reaching your conclusions in 4 5 this declaration? 6 Α No, we did not. 7 0 Okay. Why not? 8 9 MR. SPENDLOVE: Again, we're starting to get here again into 10 11 questions that relate to the decisions and strategy, and I'll ask you not to 12 13 answer that. In respect to this IPR, have you 14 0 15 considered any other information other than the information in your declaration? 16 17 Α Meaning were there other patents 18 besides these? 19 Any other documents or things 0 20 that you may have looked at subsequent 21 to --22 No, we only looked at patents Α 23 that were published and applications. 24 After you signed your 0 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 declaration, have you looked at any othersquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 62 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 62 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 documents relating to this IPR? 3 Α No, I have not. Correction, I have looked at two 4 5 other patents that were cited as 6 references in some of these just for clarification in trying to understand what 7 they were discussing in the specification. 8 9 Do you know what a prosecution 0 10 history is? 11 Α Yes, the file history. What we 12 call file history? 13 0 Correct. 14 Α Yes. Have you looked at the 15 0 prosecution history of the '788 Patent? 16 Briefly. 17 Α 18 Ο Do you know what a continuation 19 application is? 20 Α Yes. And what do you think that is? 21 0 22 Α It is basically a process that 23 is used that you can augment what is 24 claimed on a existing patent that you have 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 applied for subsequently and still EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 63 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 63 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 maintain the date of inventorship. 3 0 Do you know if the '788 Patent 4 has any continuation applications? 5 It is my understanding that Α 6 there is one, but I have not looked at it. 7 And have you reviewed the file 0 history of any continuation of the '788 8 9 Patent? 10 No, I have not. Α 11 0 Have you read any documents related to this IPR other than your 12 13 declaration and the documents cited in it? I did read the review from the 14 Α 15 board on the decision that they rendered. Since you wrote this decision, 16 0 17 have you formed any additional opinions 18 regarding the '788 Patent? 19 Not really. Α 20 Have you received any new 0 21 information about the '788 patent since you signed the declaration? 22 23 Α No. MR. COLES: I'm going to enter 24 800.211.DEPO (3376) what's previously been indicated a **E**squireSolutions.com 25



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 64 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 64 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 Exhibit 1001. It is U.S. Patent 3 8152788 to Beckert, B-E-C-K-E-R-T, et 4 al. 5 MR. SPENDLOVE: What was the 6 exhibit number on this one? 7 MR. COLES: 1001. 8 BY MR. COLES: 9 Mr. Jezzi, do you have an 0 10 opinion about how the claims of this 11 patent should be construed? 12 Α To answer your question, no, I 13 don't have an opinion. I mean, I have an opinion on what I think of the patent or 14 15 claims, but not how they should be construed. 16 17 Can we look at paragraph 18 of Q 18 your declaration? 19 Α Okay. 20 Oh, we did have it. Okay. Just 21 trying to remember your question. Okay. Go ahead. 22 23 Q Okay. 24 Have you read paragraph 18 of 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 your declaration? EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 65 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 65 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

	ARRIGO D. JE MEDLINE IND	ZZI USTRIES v. HARTMANN AG	August 15
1		Jezzi	
2	А	Oh, paragraph 18?	
3	Q	Paragraph 18.	
4	A	Okay, I'm sorry. The one about	-
5	Claim 14?		
6	Q	No.	
7		(Witness reviewing document)	
8	A	Okay.	
9	Q	So is it my understanding that	
10	you have	applied	
11		MR. COLES: Let me withdraw	
12	that.		
13	Q	Is it my understanding that	
14	paragraph	18 describes how you have	
15	interpret	ed the claims of the '788 Patent	?
16	А	We tried to look at the claims	
17	in the br	oadest understanding of what the	зÀ
18	were goin	g after.	
19		And to answer your previous	
20	question,	on Claim 14, we felt that was	
21	confusing	and we did make a comment on	

originally, I didn't remember that quickly 23 24 enough.

Okay.

that. But when you asked the question

25

22

800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com



Q

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 66 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 66 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

Γ

1	Jezzi
2	Can you look at Claim 1 of the
3	'788 Patent? Let me know when you have
4	read it.
5	(Witness reviewing document)
6	A Okay.
7	Q How many side parts does the
8	claim require?
9	A It basically requires two or
10	four, I believe, because they talk about
11	front side parts and rear side parts.
12	Q Does the claim require two or
13	four?
14	A They basically talk I mean,
15	they talk about the rear area. I'm just
16	trying to see if they bring in the front
17	area.
18	They talk about side parts and
19	the back, so I would say four.
20	Q What is a first and second side
21	edge in this claim?
22	A Basically the side of the
23	substrates, the top or the bottom of it.
24	Q What is a substrate?
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) A The substrate is the web or EsquireSolutions.com
	/ FCUIIDE

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 67 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 67 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

Γ

1	Jezzi
2	material that these side parts are made of
3	or the back sheet is made of or the liner
4	is made of. Most materials are X, Y
5	structured with very little Z direction,
6	and the X, Y, the top and bottom of that
7	structure is considered the outer face or
8	the faces.
9	Q In this claim, what does
10	"joined" mean?
11	A Repeat that.
12	Q What does the word "joined"
13	mean?
14	A Where are you reading?
15	Q "Side parts joined to said first
16	and second side edges."
17	A Basically attached.
18	Q Let's look at paragraph 28 of
19	your declaration.
20	A Paragraph 28. Okay.
21	Q In paragraph 28, you have a
22	sentence that reads as follows.
23	"Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the
24	art would understand that the recited side
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) parts need not be discrete or separate EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 68 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 68 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 from the main part of the chasis, but may instead comprise a lateral extension of 3 one or more layers of the main part." 4 5 Do you see that? 6 Α Yes. 7 0 Okay. Is that type of lateral 8 9 extension of one or more layers of the 10 main part described in the '788 Patent? I don't remember. I would have 11 Α 12 to look through it. I would have to go 13 through it to see if it is actually specified. 14 15 0 Go ahead. Okay. 16 Α 17 (Witness reviewing document) 18 Okay. 19 (Record read) I did not find a specific 20 Α 21 reference to that when I looked at it 22 quickly. 23 Q Okay. Thank you. 24 Also in paragraph 28 of your 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 declaration, you include a quotation. EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 69 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 69 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	Do you see that?
3	A In paragraph 28, I say what?
4	Q You include a quotation.
5	Do you see that?
6	A Okay.
7	Q Why did you include this quote
8	in your declaration?
9	A Again, going back to someone who
10	is skilled in the art and looking at a
11	diaper construction and looking at the
12	evolution of the diaper construction, the
13	separate parts that are attached to the
14	main chasis are basically a continuation
15	of the original hourglass design of a
16	diaper, which has lateral extensions from
17	the main body.
18	Whether they are attached or
19	part of the main body, in my opinion, it
20	falls under doctrine of equivalence, it is
21	constituting the same performance
22	requirements. It is just a different way
23	of basically demonstrating that
24	embodiment. But to me, they accomplish
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) the same function and that's why that EsquireSolutions.com

SESQUIRE SULLER

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 70 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 70 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 included. 3 0 And what is that function that 4 they are accomplishing? 5 Basically the side parts or the Α 6 lateral extensions from the main body are there to cross fold and provide the leg 7 cutout openings as well as the coverage of 8 9 the torso so that you can provide the 10 attachment to them, to the main body to fold over the chasis upon closure. 11 Do different materials have 12 0 13 different properties? 14 Α Yes. 15 And could side parts of 0 different materials have different 16 properties than the back sheet? 17 18 Α Yes. 19 So could they be performing a 0 20 different function? 21 Typically the side parts design Α 22 something that was generated at Kimberly 23 Clark. The primary function of designing 24 side parts was to introduce elasticity to 800.211.DEPO (3376) the diaper closure system, and a way tEsquireSolutions.com 25

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 71 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 71 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

70'
76) om
80



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 72 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 72 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479
1	Jezzi
2	And would you consider this
3	quote to be extrinsic evidence of the '788
4	Patent?
5	A I don't know how to answer that.
6	It could be; it could not.
7	Again, when you look at the
8	evolution of side parts in diaper design,
9	being, you know, the side part being a
10	normal extension of the diaper ears that
11	were formed by cutouts, I think you can
12	say intrinsic. If you take the opposite
13	argument, you can say extrinsic. So it
14	depends on how you want to position it.
15	Q In your career, have you come
16	across the word "breathability"?
17	A Absolutely, yes.
18	Q What does that mean?
19	A It means that it has moisture
20	vapor transmission or air transmission
21	through the membrane, through the
22	substrate.
23	Q What is the substrate?
24	A Typically breathability is
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) always for the most part included in EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 73 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 73 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 nonwoven because it is a fiber structure 3 which is open. Breathability in back 4 sheet, most of the part tends to relate to 5 film that has micropores that allows vapor 6 to transmit through it. 7 0 In diapers, are the back sheets typically breathable? 8 9 Today they are. That evolution Α occurred in the late 90s by Kimberly 10 11 Clark, and then followed by P&G, then 12 followed by everybody else. Mostly with a 13 breathable microporous film. And then the secondary evolution of that is the 14 15 nonwoven film laminate that is discussed 16 in some of these patents. Would a nonwoven film laminate 17 Ο 18 be more breathable? 19 Α No, not necessarily. Breathability is a variable and it can be 20 21 varied whether it is single film or as a 22 laminate. So it depends. But typically 23 lamination tends to reduce breathability 24 unless you do some other steps to it to 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 make it more breathable. EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 74 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 74 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 Q Returning to Claim 1 of the '788 3 Patent. 4 Α Okay. 5 What does the word "mechanical" Ο 6 mean, "mechanical closure" mean? 7 Again, a mechanical fastener, a Α mechanical closure, for the most part in 8 the industry refers to a hook material 9 10 like a Velcro-type attachment system. And that would be distinguished 11 0 12 from an adhesive tape? 13 Α Yes. And in Claim 1 of the '788 14 0 Patent, what does the word "fastening" 15 mean in the term "detachable fastening"? 16 Repeat. What does the word --17 Α 18 Ο Fastening in the term 19 "detachable fastening". 20 Detachable fastening means that А you can close it and open it multiple 21 It is refastenable, refastenable. 22 times. 23 0 And what does the word 24 "retaining" in the term "retaining forces" 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 mean? EsquireSolutions.com

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 75 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 75 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	A Retaining forces to me by this
3	definition means the force that the
4	mechanical fastener has on the receiving
5	material. That's viewed as a retaining
6	force, and it could be several types of
7	retaining forces measured.
8	Q And the retaining force is to
9	retain the diaper on the user?
10	A Correct.
11	Q Let's look at Claim 6 of the
12	'788 Patent.
13	A Okay.
14	Q Let me know when you have read
15	it.
16	(Witness reviewing document)
17	A Okay.
18	Q What does the word "discrete"
19	mean in the term "discrete not directly
20	connected side parts"?
21	A Discrete means separate,
22	individualized.
23	Q And what does the term "not
24	directly connected mean?
25	A That means they are not 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com
l	



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 76 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 76 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 coextensive. They are not part of the 3 chasis. 4 0 You think not directly connected 5 means not directly connected to the 6 chasis? 7 That is -- basically that it is Α not directly connected side parts. To me 8 9 that means that they are not an original 10 part of it, of the chasis. 11 0 Do you understand that the side 12 parts can be connected to each other in 13 this claim? Okay. Let me read it again. 14 Α 15 (Witness reviewing document) 16 To me it means they are separate, that they are four individual 17 18 side parts. 19 0 So when you see the words "not 20 directly connected", you mean they are not directly connected to each other? 21 That's correct. 22 Α 23 0 And in Claim 6, what does the 24 word "attached" mean? 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 What is the definition of what squire Solutions.com Α

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 77 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 77 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	Q The word "attached".
3	A Joined, glued, bonded to each of
4	the two side edges.
5	Q Take a look at Claim 7 and let
6	me know when you have read it.
7	(Witness reviewing document)
8	A Okay.
9	Q What does "discrete not directly
10	connected side parts" mean to you in this
11	claim?
12	A The same.
13	Q And does the word "discrete"
14	have the same meaning as in Claim 6?
15	A Yes.
16	Q And does the term "not directly
17	connected" have the same meaning as in the
18	Claim 6?
19	A Yes.
20	Q And does the word "attached"
21	have the same meaning as in Claim 6?
22	A Yes.
23	MR. COLES: I'm going to
24	introduce 1007, U.S. Patent number
25	6936129 to Karami. 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 78 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 78 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	BY MR. COLES:
3	Q Mr. Jezzi, did you read the
4	Karami '129 Patent in its entirety?
5	A Yes.
6	Q Did you read its file wrapper?
7	A Pardon me?
8	Q Did you read its file wrapper?
9	A No.
10	Q Let's turn to paragraph 46 of
11	your declaration.
12	A Okay.
13	Q In paragraph 46 of your
14	declaration, you write, "However, one
15	skilled in the art would understand that
16	the conventional nonwoven material that
17	are used in the laminates such as that
18	described in Karami '129 for cloth-like
19	outer covers are of the carded or spunbond
20	type of nonwoven, and that these nonwoven
21	materials offer marginal
22	engagement/retention properties to hook
23	mechanical fasteners when compared with
24	landing zone material of the type <i>800.211.DEPO (3376)</i>
25	positioned on the wings." EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 79 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 79 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 Do you see that? 3 Α Yes. 4 Ο What is a "landing zone" that 5 you refer to? 6 Α The landing zone is an attachment that is added to the diaper 7 that has better affinity for attachment 8 9 whether it is for a tape or for a 10 mechanical fastener. So is there a difference between 11 0 12 the tape landing zone and the landing zone 13 material described in Karami? 14 А Yes. 15 And what are those differences? 0 16 Different material, different Α chemistry, different composition and 17 18 process. 19 So a diaper can either have a Q mechanical fastener or an adhesive 20 21 fastener to fasten the diaper around the user's waist? 22 23 Α To answer that simply, yes. 24 There are diaper designs that combine both 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 adhesive fasteners and mechanical EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 80 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 80 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 fasteners and there are those that use 3 those systems separately. 4 Q Okay. 5 So let's go to paragraph 31 of 6 your declaration. Why don't you read that 7 and let me know when you have read it. (Witness reviewing document) 8 9 Α Okay. In that paragraph, there is a 10 0 sentence that reads as follows: 11 "Any 12 diaper that is fastened around a user's 13 waist (as opposed to being pulled up over a user's legs in the manner of a training 14 15 pant) must have the means to mechanically fasten the sides together." 16 17 Do you see that? 18 Α Yes. 19 That is not a hundred percent 0 correct because it could be either 20 21 mechanical or adhesive? 22 Α Correct. 23 0 Would you want to correct that 24 statement? 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 MR. SPENDLOVE: Objection. EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 81 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 81 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	Mischaracterizes his testimony.
3	Q You can answer that question.
4	MR. SPENDLOVE: You can answer.
5	A I can answer?
6	Q Sure.
7	A I mean, to me we use the word
8	"mechanically", but it could imply
9	adhesive. I mean, this basically says any
10	diaper that is fastened around a user's
11	waist as opposed to being pulled over as a
12	pull-on must have a means to fasten the
13	side edges together. It does not have to
14	be exclusively mechanically. It could be
15	one of the three one of the two other
16	options we discussed.
17	Q Okay.
18	Let's return to paragraph 46 of
19	your declaration right now. And we were
20	discussing the last sentence of your
21	declaration, if you recall. Let me know
22	when you're there.
23	MR. SPENDLOVE: I'm sorry, do
24	you mean the last sentence of that
25	paragraph? 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 82 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 82 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 MR. COLES: I'm sorry. Correct. 3 Thank you. 4 Α And that's the one that says, 5 "However, one skilled in the art would 6 understand that the conventional nonwoven 7 materials that are used in the laminate such as that described in Karami '129 for 8 9 cloth-like outer covers are carded or 10 spunbond type nonwoven, and that these 11 nonwoven materials offer marginal 12 engagement/retention properties to hook 13 mechanical fasteners when compared with landing zone material of the type 14 15 positioned on the wings." 16 0 What do you mean by "marginal engagement/retention properties" in the 17 18 sentence? 19 Different materials provide Α 20 different engagement forces to mechanical fasteners, and there is a hierarchy of 21 which materials provide the least and the 22 23 highest. 24 And basically what that means is 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 that if you design a material to be the squire Solutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 83 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 83 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	landing zone or the loop material for a
3	mechanical fastener, you can assume that
4	it is going to have a higher retention
5	force than a material that is not
6	specifically designed for that function.
7	That's what I mean by that.
8	So when Karami '129 uses a
9	targeted zone for mechanical fastening,
10	that zone that they are attaching to will
11	have a higher retentive force than the
12	zones that are not designed to provide
13	that benefit, even though the other ones
14	will have some form of retentive forces as
15	well.
16	Q What do you mean by "some form
17	of retentive forces"?
18	A Most nonwoven materials will
19	have some retentive forces and they vary
20	by the type of hook you use and the
21	material. And so the difference between
22	these is that Karami is adding a targeted
23	specifically designed loop material for
24	engagement as opposed to the standard
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) material that that target material is <i>EsquireSolutions.com</i>

ESQUITE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 84 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 84 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 going on. Is the carded or spunbond type 3 Q 4 of nonwoven used as landing zone material? 5 Α Yes. Most -- well, yes, they 6 are. 7 Will they offer sufficient 0 retention properties to hold the diaper 8 9 onto the user? 10 Α I believe they do. You're 11 looking at a system approach in combination with the hook that specify, so 12 13 it would have to be considered as a combined system, but the answer would be 14 15 yes. 16 MR. COLES: I'm going to introduce what has previously been 17 18 indicated as Exhibit 1006. It is a 19 U.S. Patent Publication, U.S. 20 2005/0256496 to Benning, et al. 21 BY MR. COLES: Did you read the Benning 22 Q 23 reference in its entirety? 24 Yes. Α 800.211.DEPO (3376) Did you read its file wrapperEsquireSolutions.com 25 0

ESQUIRE: D L U T L D N S

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 85 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 85 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 No, I did not. Α 3 Ο What limitations in the '788 4 Patent, Claim 1 --5 MR. COLES: Let me rephrase 6 that. What limitations in Claim 1 of 7 0 the '788 Patent do you use Benning for in 8 9 your invalidity analysis? 10 Basically the area that -- the Α statement that said that "were in said 11 side parts and said front and/or said rear 12 13 area are folded upon themselves at least about one folding line extending in a 14 15 longitudinal direction". 16 0 And any other portions? 17 Α That was the primary one, 18 although there were probably other 19 descriptions in here that went against the 20 dependent claims. Are there any elements of Claim 21 0 22 2 for which you use Benning in your 23 invalidity analysis? 24 I don't think we used -- let me Α 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 look. EsquireSolutions.com

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 86 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 86 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	(Witness reviewing document)
3	Yes, we use Benning in areas for
4	Claim 2 in combination with other
5	fasteners for obviousness.
6	Q In Benning, what element or
7	elements of the patent do you say
8	correspond to the claimed "closure means"?
9	A Repeat that again.
10	Q In Benning, what element or
11	elements of the patent do you say
12	correspond to the claimed "closure means"?
13	A I mean, paragraph 0030, page 3
14	of Benning covers some form of closure
15	means in the last three sentences.
16	(Witness reviewing document)
17	Paragraph 0055 refers to, you
18	know, closure systems or closing tapes.
19	And the tapes "interact in a releasably
20	adherent manner with an outside or the
21	front region of the main body portion".
22	And they do make several descriptions of a
23	closure system. All diapers have closure
24	systems.
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) Q And in Benning, what element EsquireSolutions.com
	PESOLUDE



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 87 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 87 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 elements of the patent do you say 3 corresponds to the outer face of said side 4 part? 5 Α Okay. Let me understand your 6 question. 7 Which elements of Benning correspond to --8 9 Yes, to the outer face of said 0 10 side part of Claim 1 of the '788 Patent. 11 Α I think one of them that I just discussed -- let me look at it -- talked 12 13 about that if I recall. (Witness reviewing document) 14 15 "The tapes (44) interact in a 16 releasably adherent manner with an outside or the front region of the main body 17 18 portion." So you're saying the outside of 19 Q 20 the -- I'm sorry. "The outside of the 21 front region (22) of the main body portion (20)" --22 23 Α Yeah, I think that's what that 24 means. 800.211.DEPO (3376) -- is the outer face of said EsquireSolutions.com 25 0

ESQUIRE: SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 88 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 88 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 side part? 3 Α Uh-huh. 4 You're talking side parts. 5 Wait. Hold on. Okay. 6 And your question was 7 specifically to side parts? 8 Correct. 0 9 Even though I can't find a Α specific citation to side parts, when you 10 look at the drawings, it's conceivable 11 12 that they could attach to themselves or to 13 the other one depending on the size of the side part. 14 15 Ο I'm sorry, what is a side part? 16 Α I'm just saying that, you know, they didn't cite anything specifically to 17 18 side parts or attachment target zones that they've referred, at least the ones that I 19 could find quickly here through this 20 21 notification, were on the main body. But if you look at the drawings, if these side 22 23 parts are long enough, which they appear 24 to be, they could overlap and reattach to 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 each other. EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 89 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 89 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1		Jezzi	
2	Q	Are you saying that the Benr	ning
3	reference	does not explicitly disclose	e the
4	closure s	ystems attaching to the side	
5	parts?		
6	A	On this quick review, I did	not
7	see a ref	erence to attachment to side	
8	parts.		
9	Q	Does Benning disclose using	an
10	adhesive	tape as a closure?	
11	А	Yes, they do.	
12	Q	Does Benning disclose a nonv	voven
13	side part	?	
14	А	I would think they do, but]	let
15	me go fin	d it.	
16	Q	Take a look at paragraph 32.	
17	А	On what, on the declaration	
18	or		
19	Q	32 of the Benning.	
20	А	Okay.	
21		(Witness reviewing document))
22		Yes, they describe a nonwove	en.
23	Q	Can adhesive tape detachab	У
24	fasten to	a nonwoven side part?	800.211.DEPO (3376)
25	A	Yes.	EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 90 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 90 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 Q Would it retain the diaper on 3 the user? 4 Α Perhaps. Again, without -- you 5 could possibly modify the adhesive to be 6 very attachable to a nonwoven surface, depending on the nonwoven surface. 7 Let's look at paragraph 35 of 8 0 9 your declaration. 10 In paragraph 35 of your 11 declaration, you write: "Benning 12 discloses that the side parts [material 13 sections] in the front region and rear region 'extend beyond lateral longitudinal 14 edges of the main body portion and connect 15 the front region and the back region when 16 the article is worn'." 17 18 Do you see that? 19 Α Uh-huh. 20 What is being connected in this? 0 The way this is described, to me 21 Α it could mean it could be either connected 2.2 23 to the main body or to the side parts. It 24 depends on the girth of the individual and 800.211.DEPO (3376) the overlap of the ears front and back Esquire Solutions.com 25



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 91 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 91 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	Q And does Benning describe
3	connecting to the side parts?
4	A It was not cited specifically, I
5	don't think, but they could. I mean,
6	looking at the design of the diaper, they
7	could connect to the side parts.
8	Q And why do you say that?
9	A Because it depends on the
10	consumer. You know, the reason these side
11	parts are designed the way they are and
12	sized the way they are is to provide
13	flexibility in the waist dimension that
14	these diapers can fit a certain body. So
15	if the individual is somewhat obese, you
16	will probably see side part to side part
17	connection. If the individual is thinner,
18	then it would probably fold over into
19	the you know, the two side parts would
20	connect to each other or connect to the
21	outer cover or to the main part of the
22	body. So it is a variable again.
23	Q When diapers are designed
24	MR. COLES: Strike that.
25	Let's take a break. 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 92 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 92 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is
3	12:03 p.m. on August 15, 2013. This
4	is the end of tape number two.
5	(Thereupon, a recess was taken,
6	and then the proceedings continued as
7	follows:)
8	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is
9	12:10 p.m. on August 15, 2013. This
10	is tape number three.
11	BY MR. COLES:
12	Q Mr. Jezzi, do materials with
13	different retention properties have
14	different costs?
15	A Yes.
16	Q And are materials with higher
17	retention properties more expensive than
18	materials with lesser retention
19	properties?
20	A Not necessarily.
21	Q Why would you say "not
22	necessarily"?
23	A It depends on what you're trying
24	to do and how you're trying to apply them.
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) Typically materials that are specifica EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 93 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 93 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	designed for loop target zones probably
3	have a value add because they have been
4	treated or modified. So they would
5	probably be more expensive than a
6	conventional material that is not intended
7	to be used for that particular function.
8	Q Let's return to paragraph 35 of
9	your declaration.
10	And in paragraph 35, you write:
11	"In addition, Benning discloses that the
12	side parts [material sections] in the
13	front region and rear region 'extend
14	beyond lateral longitudinal edges of the
15	main body portion and connect the front
16	region and the back region when the
17	article is worn', e.g., Benning Exhibit
18	1006, Claim 26. This could only be done
19	if the closure means [tapes 44] are
20	dimensioned for detachable fastenings to
21	the outer face of the main part and to the
22	outer face of the side parts in the front
23	area."
24	Do you see that? 800.211.DEPO (3376)
25	A Yes. EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 94 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 94 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 Q Would you please explain why 3 this is so? Well, this is consistent with 4 А 5 what I had mentioned before, that 6 depending on the consumer, the side parts can go either on the outer face of the 7 main part of the chasis or the body of the 8 9 diaper, or it can overlap and attach to 10 the other side part or to the back side 11 parts depending on the girth of the 12 individual. 13 0 And what do you mean in the sentence by "detachable fastening"? 14 15 All systems in diapers are --Α provide detachable fastening, and that is 16 the ability for the diaper closure system 17 18 to be opened and closed multiple times for 19 repositioning of the garment on the 20 wearer. 21 0 And can a fastening system detach --2.2 MR. COLES: Strike that. 23 24 Can a mechanical fastening 0 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 system fasten to any type of material? EsquireSolutions.com

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 95 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 95 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	A A mechanical fastening system
3	can attach to a variety of materials. It
4	is a combination performance of the design
5	of the hook as well as the design of the
6	materials to be attached, and it is a
7	pretty broad range.
8	Q What do the hooks attach to?
9	A What do the hooks attach to?
10	The original Velcro invention on this
11	mechanical fastener basically took the
12	hook material and attached itself to a
13	fibrous structure and engaged that way.
14	Q Was that fiber structure a loop?
15	A Not necessarily. It could have
16	been straight fibers. It could have been
17	a loop. It could have been a knit. Quite
18	a broad range of materials that are used
19	for this attachable surface. It could
20	have been a film with a specific
21	topography as well that in some cases have
22	been designed, but not for diapers
23	necessarily.
24	Q So in diapers, the material to
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) which the hooks engage must be a fiber EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 96 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 96 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	A Typically they are fibrous in
3	nature. But there could be many
4	processes, several processes to make that
5	fabric or fiber structure.
6	Q And what are those processes?
7	A The original commercial loop
8	materials used in the industry were a knit
9	material. I reference Guilford Mills. 3M
10	developed a carded material that was
11	treated to provide more accentuated loops
12	which they still sell. Applix uses a knit
13	material. Kimberly Clark uses a treated
14	spunbond. You can use spunlace that is
15	apertured or treated à la Karami as well.
16	So there are quite a variety.
17	Q The hooks connect
18	MR. COLES: Strike that.
19	Q But there are materials that
20	hooks cannot connect to; is that correct?
21	A Yes, I think there are materials
22	that hooks cannot connect to like wood and
23	concrete, yes.
24	Q Are there materials that are
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) used in a diaper to which hooks cannot EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 97 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 97 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 connect? 3 Α I would think that thick films 4 probably would fall in that category. 5 What is a thick film? Q 6 Α The film that a diaper tape is made of. 7 8 And a diaper tape is like an 0 9 adhesive tape? 10 It is an adhesive tape. Α It is 11 basically a coated film that is relatively 12 thick. 13 0 And most all the materials used in a diaper --14 15 MR. COLES: Let me rephrase 16 that. And hooks can connect to all 17 Q 18 other materials that are used in a diaper? 19 Basically certainly the liner, Α 20 the acquisition zone, the leg cuffs, the 21 outer cover if it is a nonwoven. If you use a very thin film, you could probably 22 23 puncture it and then it would have 24 retentive forces, but that's probably 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 something you wouldn't want to do. Mos Squire Solutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 98 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 98 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 films right now are nonwoven laminated. 3 So I would say that for the most 4 part, the hooks will engage to most of the 5 materials in a diaper. The absorbent 6 core, the individual unbonded cellulose fibers obviously is not an engagement 7 material. It wouldn't work there as well. 8 9 And all of these materials would 0 have sufficient retention forces to hold 10 11 the diaper on the user? 12 Α The liner, the outer cover, the 13 leg cuff, the ear material more than likely. The thin film, you probably would 14 15 not and the diaper tape would not. But most of the other ones would. 16 17 Q Okay. 18 You say the liner cover --19 MR. COLES: Strike that. The liner, the outer cover, the 20 Q leg cuff and the ear material more than 21 likely would retain? 22 23 Α Would retain the diaper in 24 place, yes. 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 And the thin film? 0 EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE SOLUTION S

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 99 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 99 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	A Probably would not.
3	Q And the diaper tape would not
4	retain the hooks.
5	MR. COLES: I'd like to
6	introduce Exhibit 1005. It is U.S.
7	Patent Publication U.S. 2003/0119404
8	to Belau, B-E-L-A-U, et al.
9	BY MR. COLES:
10	Q Mr. Jezzi, did you read Belau in
11	its entirety?
12	A Yes.
13	Q Did you read its file wrapper?
14	A No.
15	Q Okay.
16	And what limitations in the '788
17	Patent, Claim 1, do you use Belau for
18	invalidity analysis?
19	A Hold on.
20	(Witness reviewing document)
21	Basically Belau talks about
22	different retentive forces across the
23	surface of an attachment zone.
24	Q Which elements of Claim 1 of the
25	'788 Patent does that relate to? <i>EsquireSolutions.com</i>

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 100 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 100 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 Basically it is the different --Α 3 I'll just say that it is the "Said mechanical closure means and said outer 4 5 face of said main part are lower than 6 retaining forces between said mechanical closure means and said outer face of said 7 side parts and said front areas wherein 8 9 the side parts in said front and/or said 10 rear area are foldable on themselves." 11 Basically the differential retaining force 12 between the side parts and the main body 13 of the diaper. And any other elements of Claim 14 0 15 1 found in Belau? That was the primary one. 16 Α And also -- on Claim 1, that's correct. 17 There 18 are other dependent claims that I think 19 Belau would cover as well in combination. And which claims are those? 20 0 Well, they do discuss the side 21 Α 22 parts as two and four. They have side 23 parts on Belau as well. 24 In Belau, which claim element --0 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 MR. COLES: Strike that. EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE:

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 101 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 101 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

Γ

1	Jezzi
2	Q In Belau, which element or
3	elements of Belau do you say correspond to
4	the claim closure means?
5	A To the what?
6	Q Closure means.
7	(Witness reviewing document)
8	A I mean, you start with paragraph
9	003 of Belau talking about mechanical
10	fastening systems typically employing two
11	components, a male hook and a female loop.
12	Basically they talk about different
13	treatments of that loop material to
14	provide different characteristics, and
15	they also talk about using these different
16	characteristics. They talk about the
17	engagement of the hook in these different
18	areas.
19	Q Have you finished your answer?
20	A Yes.
21	Q Okay.
22	And in Belau, what element or
23	elements of the patent do you say
24	correspond to the outer face of said side
25	parts? 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 102 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 102 of 207

Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	MR. SPENDLOVE: Objection.
3	Mischaracterizing prior testimony and
4	foundation.
5	(Witness reviewing document)
6	A Well, there is paragraph 0078
7	that discusses the attachment of the
8	mechanical fastener to the side part of
9	the diaper.
10	Q 0078?
11	A Yes.
12	Q And where does it say that?
13	A Shown in Figure 6A and 6B.
14	If you look at Figure 6B, you're
15	looking at the loop material extends
16	beyond the chasis, okay? So and they
17	discuss that "the fastening means that the
18	hook and loop fastening system including a
19	pair of outside panels with one attached
20	to each side of the diaper. Each side
21	panel includes a stretch strip panel and
22	connected to the chasis".
23	And just by looking at that
24	picture, and the fact that you've got a 800.211.DEPO (3376)
25	hook and you've got a tape landing zon Esquire Solutions.com

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 103 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 103 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 a hook landing zone that have different 3 engagement characteristics, will allow 4 that to attach to the side part. 5 0 And in Figure 6B, what are the 6 side parts? 7 The side parts are described at Α 76B. It's those two edges that extend 8 9 beyond the chasis. 10 0 And where does Belau show 11 connecting the side panels to the 76B side 12 parts? 13 Α If you read 0018, again depending on the girth of the baby, that 14 15 could be a possibility and it could attach 16 to that. But you're saying it is not 17 Q 18 explicitly disclosed? 19 MR. SPENDLOVE: Objection. On brief review, I've not found 20 А 21 it yet, but I'm on page 10 only. 22 Q Would you like to continue your 23 review? 24 Well, I'd like to. Α 800.211.DEPO (3376) (Witness reviewing document) EsquireSolutions.com 25

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 104 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 104 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	I can continue reading this
3	thing, but I have not found any specific
4	reference to attachment 76B. I'm not
5	saying that it is not there, but
6	Q So in paragraph 39 of your
7	declaration let me know when you're
8	there.
9	You haven't completed your
10	answer?
11	A No, I'm fine. Go ahead.
12	Q I thought you had completed your
13	answer.
14	In paragraph 39 of your
15	declaration, you write that "Belau
16	discloses 'that the retaining forces
17	between the mechanical closure means and
18	the outer face of the main part are lower
19	than the retaining forces between the
20	mechanical closure means and the outer
21	face of the side parts in the front
22	area'."
23	Do you see that?
24	A Paragraph 39?
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) Q Correct. Of your declaration EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 105 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 105 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	(Witness reviewing document)
3	A Okay.
4	Q Where was that disclosed in the
5	Belau patent?
6	MR. SPENDLOVE: Objection.
7	THE WITNESS: I don't have to
8	answer?
9	MR. SPENDLOVE: No, you do. I'm
10	just objecting because I have an issue
11	with the question, but, yeah, you
12	should still go ahead and answer it.
13	(Witness reviewing document)
14	A Well, the Belau patent talks
15	about a loop material that is designed to
16	have different characteristics. And by
17	the description of the drawings and
18	another prior art patent that they
19	discuss, it would be obvious to someone
20	skilled in the art that it would generate
21	different retentive forces across its
22	surface.
23	Q What is the other prior art
24	reference that is discussed?
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) A I call it the Dunkerley Paten EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 106 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 106 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	which is basically if you look at some of
3	the figures, it would be similar. It's
4	the patent that Kimberly Clark has, which
5	they come up with a similar embossing
6	patent on spunbond to make it the loop
7	material. And so when you look at it,
8	through embossing, specific embossing, and
9	basically this is the technique that Belau
10	is using to vary the retentive forces.
11	You know, to someone like myself, the
12	retentive forces are not under
13	different embossing patterns would
14	generate different retentive forces. It
15	would be different because of the
16	embossing pattern.
17	Q And is that Kimberly Clark
18	patent you referred to mentioned in the
19	Belau Patent?
20	A I think it is a Stokes patent,
21	but 5858515, paragraph 009.
22	Q Does the Belau Patent show
23	MR. COLES: Let me strike that.
24	Q Does the Belau Patent describe
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) having "the retaining forces between th EsquireSolutions.com
l	

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 107 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 107 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 mechanical closure means and the outer 3 face of the main part being lower than the 4 retaining forces between the mechanical 5 closure means and the outer face of the 6 side parts"? 7 Specifically I don't recall that Α passage the way you just read it, but they 8 9 do talk about -- their design in their patent basically describes the material 10 11 that would generate different retentive 12 forces across its surface. 13 Let's look at paragraph 43 of 0 your declaration. Let me know when you're 14 15 there. 16 (Witness reviewing document) 17 Α That's basically what I was 18 referring to, the different embossing that 19 is shown in Figure 1. 20 So paragraph 43 of your 0 declaration, you write: "Specifically, 21 Belau discloses a diaper where the center 22 23 region [main part] has different 24 characteristics than the outer regions 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 [side parts]. (Belau Exhibit 2005, FigesquireSolutions.com

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 108 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 108 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479
1	Jezzi
2	1, Paragraph 0034.) Pattern - unbonded
3	nonwoven material (4) is divided into a
4	plurality of regions or zones (4A, 4B),
5	which have different bond patterns in a
6	direction. The different bond patterns
7	provide different, specific functionality
8	or characteristics to the regions 4A and
9	4B. The outer region (4B) of the material
10	(4) provide different characteristics in
11	the center region (4A)."
12	Do you see that?
13	A Yes. And that's correct.
14	Q Does Belau describe what those
15	different characteristics of region 4B
16	might be?
17	A They describe several different
18	characteristics and they briefly touch on
19	retentive forces. To me though, you know,
20	being knowledgeable on what I'm seeing
21	here, there would be obviously different
22	retentive forces between those surfaces 4B
23	and 4A.
24	Q And where in the patent does it
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) describe those different retentive for EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 109 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 109 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 MR. SPENDLOVE: Objection. 3 Foundation. 4 You can answer. 5 Α I mean, I don't think that they 6 mention retentive forces specifically in 7 the patent though, but it is implied to 8 me. As someone skilled in the art, I 9 looked at this and that's what it is 10 telling me. 11 0 Okay. 12 Let's look at the Belau Patent, 13 paragraph 0080. And in that paragraph, around the middle, there is a sentence 14 15 that says, "Outer region (76B) provide characteristics other than an affixing 16 17 region for the hook elements." 18 Do you see that? 19 I don't find it. Α Where is it 20 again? 21 Q It is paragraph --008, right? 22 Α 23 Q 0080. 24 Oh, 8-0. Α 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 8-0. Q EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 110 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 110 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	A Okay.
3	Q And do you recall previously you
4	said 76B was the side parts?
5	MR. SPENDLOVE: Objection.
6	Q Is that correct?
7	A Say it again, please.
8	MR. COLES: Can you read that.
9	(Record read)
10	A That's correct, yes.
11	Q And do you see the sentence in
12	0080 that says, "Outer region (76B)
13	provide characteristics other than an
14	affixing region for the hook elements"?
15	A Okay.
16	Q And did you recall reading that
17	sentence when you prepared your
18	declaration?
19	A I wrote it several months ago so
20	probably not. I don't remember.
21	Q Okay.
22	And what do you understand that
23	sentence to mean?
24	A Basically this is they say
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) that one of hooks that is provided by EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 111 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 111 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 outer region is greater -- let's see --3 "provides characteristics other than an affixing region for the hook element". 4 So 5 they basically are saying that they are 6 not intending it to have a fixation for 7 the hook element. And further down in paragraph 8 0 9 80, there is another sentence that says, 10 "Moreover, the outer regions (76B) are not 11 used as loop area for the fastening 12 system." 13 Do you see that? Repeat that. How far down? I 14 Α 15 don't have lines on here. Second to last sentence. 16 0 17 Α Okay. 18 Do you recall reading that Q 19 sentence when you prepared your 20 declaration? I don't remember if I did or 21 Α 22 not. 23 Q And what do you understand that 24 sentence to mean? 800.211.DEPO (3376) Basically I guess they were EsquireSolutions.com 25 Α



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 112 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 112 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 using it as a pull tab rather than a loop 3 That does not mean that it would area. 4 not function as a loop area. 5 Ο What does that mean --6 Α Again, remember the commentary that I have made repeatedly about the 7 girth of the wearer, and that's going to 8 9 determine the intent of the use of some of 10 these materials and applications. So if 11 you have a very large baby, that would be the target zone for where the hook is 12 13 going to be attached. Whether it would attach it well or not, it depends, but --14 15 What do you mean "they are using 0 it as a pull tab rather than a loop area"? 16 Basically it is a finger tab, 17 Α 18 just to position the diaper maybe. 19 Q Turn to paragraph 78 of your 20 declaration. 21 Α Which paragraph? 22 Q 78. 23 Α Of? Your declaration. Of your 24 0 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 declaration. Let me know when you're EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 113 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 113 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 there. 3 Α Okay. Paragraph 78 reads, "Belau 4 0 5 discloses a diaper having four discrete 6 not directly connected side parts wherein 7 one side part is attached to each of two side edges of the front area and a further 8 9 side part is attached to each of two side 10 edges of the rear area." 11 Do you see that? 12 Α Yes. 13 0 Where are the side parts connected to the side edges of the front 14 15 area? 16 MR. SPENDLOVE: Objection. 17 Mischaracterizes. 18 Part 76A would be their Α 19 connecting means for that. 20 (Witness reviewing document) As far as I'm concerned as 21 22 someone skilled in the art, that diaper 23 Figure 6B shows four side parts. 24 Let's take a look at Belau 0 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 paragraph 73. Let me know when you're Esquire Solutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 114 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 114 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 there. 3 What is pattern unbonded 4 material (4)? 5 Material (4) is this target zone Α 6 that they are attaching to the diaper. 7 And is 76B and 76A part of Q material (4)? 8 9 Α Yes. So would you say they are a 10 0 11 single piece of material? 12 Α It looks like that way, yes. 13 0 And they are connected? 14 Α Yes. So would you say that 76B is in 15 0 part -- are directly connected? 16 76B and 76A are directly 17 Α 18 connected and make item 4. 19 Q Okay. 20 Would you say 76B is connected 21 to 76B? 76B is connected to 76A. 22 Α 23 0 And 76B -- 76A and 76B are one 24 piece of material? 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 It looks like that way from UsquireSolutions.com Α

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 115 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 115 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	design, although it doesn't have to be.
3	Q What is disclosed in Belau
4	regarding material (4); is it one piece?
5	A It looks to be one piece.
6	MR. COLES: I'm going to
7	introduce what's been identified as
8	Exhibit 1008. It is U.S. Patent
9	8162913 to Goates, et al.
10	BY MR. COLES:
11	Q Mr. Jezzi, did you read Goates
12	in its entirety?
13	A Yes.
14	Q And did you read its file
15	wrapper?
16	A No.
17	Q Okay.
18	Can we look at Goates, Column 4,
19	lines 25 to 26. Let me know when you're
20	there.
21	A Okay.
22	Q The patent says "joined" and its
23	derivatives refer to the "adhering,
24	bonding, sewing together or the like of
25	two separate elements". 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 116 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 116 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	Do you see that?
3	A Uh-huh.
4	Q Is that consistent with your
5	understanding of the word "joined" in
6	Claim 1 of the '788 Patent?
7	MR. SPENDLOVE: Objection.
8	A Joined means attached. Yes, I
9	would say so.
10	Q Okay.
11	Did you consider this when you
12	interpreted the claim?
13	A Yes.
14	Q You considered this sentence
15	from this patent?
16	A I don't remember.
17	Q Okay.
18	Does Goates show side parts in
19	said front area as required in Claim 1 of
20	the '788 Patent?
21	A Yes, they do, because if you
22	look at Figure 4, the extension of the
23	front panel constitutes, you know, side
24	parts even though they are not detached or
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) separately attached. So we define thatEsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 117 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 117 of 207

Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 the side parts basically could be an extension of the chasis. 3 4 0 Okay. 5 And this extension of the front 6 panel that constitutes the side parts, are 7 they joined to a side edge? They would be a homogeneous part 8 Α 9 of the chasis, so they would be an 10 integral part of the main body, but would 11 form extensions. 12 0 Okay. 13 So is there a side edge to which the side part is joined? 14 15 In that Figure 4, no. Α 16 Ο Okay. 17 In the Goates patent, what 18 element or elements of the patent do you 19 say correspond to the closure means of 20 Claim 1 of the '788 Patent? 21 MR. SPENDLOVE: Objection. Mischaracterization, foundation. 22 23 Α If you look at paragraph 8, line 24 56, they discuss a diaper ears which are 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 equivalent to side parts, and they als Esquire Solutions.com

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 118 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 118 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 quote absorbent article having front and 3 back ears, Van Dyke, which basically discusses four side parts. 4 5 I'm sorry, where is this? 0 6 Α Look at Column 8, lines 56 through 67, discussing ears which are 7 equivalent to side parts, and they also 8 9 reference Van Dyke, which is basically 10 discussing four side parts. 11 0 And what is the closure means 12 that corresponds --13 MR. COLES: Strike that. What is the element in Goates 14 0 15 that corresponds to the claim closure 16 means? 17 MR. SPENDLOVE: Objection. 18 Foundation, characterization. 19 "Alternatively the fastening Α 20 members" -- Column 10, lines 3 --21 "Alternatively, the fastening members are attached to the ears (34, 134), and can be 22 23 configured to engage the inner surface of 24 the diaper. In such configuration, the 800.211.DEPO (3376) fastening members can be attached to the squire Solutions.com 25



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 119 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 119 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 ears on the outer surface of the diaper." 3 That's closure means. 4 Q Okay. 5 And what element --6 Α Basically they also talk about 7 having these engage the outer cover or the liner or the attachment panel. 8 9 And in which -- is there an 0 element or elements of the patent that you 10 11 say correspond to the outer face of the 12 side part in Claim 1? 13 Α There is a commentary here as to the attachment to the -- to the outer 14 15 surface -- can be attached to the ears on the inner surface -- I'm just rambling --16 17 can be attached to the ears on the outer 18 surface of the diaper which means the 19 outer face of the main body. And they are 20 also talking about attaching it to the 21 liner, which is the material that is next to the body of the diaper. And the loop, 22 23 a target zone located on the outer cover 24 of the diaper. 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 Again, depending on the size EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 120 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 120 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 the baby, you could attach one ear against 3 the other ear if they overlapped. And is that disclosed in --4 Q 5 No, but it is just something Α 6 that happens with these designs. 7 You have to let me finish my 0 question and I'll try not to speak over 8 9 you when you're answering. 10 I'm sorry. Α 11 0 Okay. 12 So Goates does not disclose 13 attaching the hooks to the ear, the ear in the front; is that correct? 14 15 MR. SPENDLOVE: Objection. 16 Asked and answered. 17 They don't make a specific Α 18 reference to the attachment to the ear to 19 the best of my knowledge reviewing it the 20 last five minutes. 21 Q Okay. 22 Let's look at paragraph 37 of 23 your declaration. Let me know when you're 24 there. 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 Α Okay. EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 121 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 121 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	Q In paragraph 37, the last
3	sentence, you write: "The suitable
4	location of the attachment panel may be
5	the side parts of the front waist region."
6	Do you see that?
7	A Uh-huh.
8	Q Is that described in the Goates
9	patent?
10	A Specifically no, but it could.
11	Q Okay.
12	Let's look at paragraph 39 of
13	your declaration. Let me know when you're
14	there.
15	A Okay.
16	Q So in paragraph 39 of your
17	declaration, you write that Goates
18	discloses "that the retaining forces
19	between the mechanical closure means and
20	the outer face of the main part are lower
21	than the retaining forces between the
22	mechanical closure means and the outer
23	face of the side parts in the front area."
24	Is that correct?
25	A That's correct. 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 122 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 122 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	Q Does the Goates reference
3	disclose this?
4	A I think you're picking one
5	patent out of one, two, three, four, five,
6	six patents that we claimed here, and I
7	can tell you that Karami '129 would fall
8	under that definition, and we're looking
9	at these in conjunction for obviousness in
10	combination, so isolating one may not
11	include all the specifics that you're
12	looking at here.
13	So I don't know. I would have
14	to go through that. I don't think there
15	was a specific reference in Goates talking
16	about the outer face of the side parts,
17	but in combination with the other patents,
18	it is pretty obvious that it would be.
19	Q Sorry, so when you say each
20	disclose it, you really mean in
21	combination
22	A In combination.
23	Q they all disclose it?
24	A These were combined.
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) Karami '129 certainly has th ∉squireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 123 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 123 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 forces on the outer face of the side parts 3 being much higher than the outer cover 4 because they are putting a targeted loop 5 material. 6 Q Okay. 7 So --And the same thing with '772. 8 Α 9 So there is, you know --10 So Goates, you're not so sure if 0 11 it shows that? 12 Α Pardon me? 13 Are you saying you're not sure 0 if Goates shows this? 14 15 I'm not sure. I would have to Α 16 review it again. 17 Q Do you want to take some time to 18 review it? 19 Α Okay. (Witness reviewing document) 20 21 I can't find the wording, but there is a key word here in which they 22 23 describe the side parts, and that is 24 elastomeric ears, and to someone like 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 myself skilled in the art, an elastomerEsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE: SOLUTION S

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 124 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 124 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 ear has much higher -- because of the 3 construction which is a laminate and its corrugation and the cross direction and 4 5 elasticity, it will provide a higher 6 retentive force than the main body of the diaper. So I guess that's basically what 7 I read into the patent. 8 9 And where are the elastomeric 0 ears in this patent? 10 11 Α It's Column 11, paragraph 12 starting at line 56. 13 And just to describe the material that is used, and that material 14 15 if you were to test existing elastomeric ears would have much greater retentive 16 forces than the typical materials used for 17 18 the outer cover. 19 Are the elastomeric ears the 0 20 part that receives the fastenings --21 Α It could if they overlap, and we discussed the width or the girth of the 22 23 baby. That could be a possibility and it 24 would attach to each other. 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 Are the elastomeric ears -- EsquireSolutions.com 0



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 125 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 125 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 MR. COLES: Strike that. 3 Q The elastomeric ears, 34 and 134, correspond to the said side parts in 4 5 said front area of Claim 1 of the '788 6 Patent? 7 Α They would make the side parts in the back area, but they could overlap 8 9 and they would attach to each other. 10 Like a T-shaped diaper? 0 11 Α Huh? 12 Like a T-shaped diaper? 0 13 Yes, this is -- yeah, correct. Α Let's go to paragraph 44 of your 14 0 15 declaration. 16 Are you there? 17 Yes. Α 18 Q In paragraph 44 of your 19 declaration, you write: "Goates Exhibit 1008 discloses attaching directly to the 20 21 outer cover or attaching to active fastening portions which may be located on 22 23 the face of side parts in the front area." 24 Do you see that? 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 Α Yes. EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE:

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 126 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 126 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 Q Where does Goates describe 3 that --4 MR. COLES: Strike that. 5 In Goates, where is the active Ο 6 fastening portion located? 7 MR. SPENDLOVE: Objection. Foundation, mischaracterization. 8 9 It is Column 10, line 13. Α 10 "Alternatively, at least one attachment 11 panel (not shown) may be suitably located on the diaper to which the active 12 13 fastening portions (62 and 64) of the fastening members on the ears are 14 configured to engage." 15 16 They basically did not show it, but they discussed it. So this diaper 17 18 would have a loop attachment zone in the 19 front of the diaper or one of the 20 embodiments would. 21 Ο And does the next sentence of the patent say "for example, an attachment 22 23 panel can be located on the outer cover 24 (40) "? 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 Say that again. Α EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE SOLUTION S

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 127 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 127 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	Q Does the next sentence
3	A On that paragraph?
4	Q Yes.
5	A "For example, an attachment
6	panel can be located on the outer cover
7	(40)." Correct.
8	Q Did it show any other location
9	for the attachment panel?
10	A If you look at Karami '129, they
11	are putting that attachment on the side
12	part. If you look at Shingu, they are
13	splitting that attachment zone into two
14	creating a void area in the middle where
15	it is just the outer cover. So various
16	patents described this attachment area
17	differently depending on what they are
18	trying to do. Typically it's in the outer
19	cover though.
20	Q And in this patent, it shows the
21	outer cover?
22	A Pardon me?
23	Q And in this patent, it shows the
24	outer cover; is that correct?
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) A Just mentions it on the outerEsquireSolutions.com
l	ESOURE



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 128 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 128 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 cover, correct. 3 MR. COLES: Let's take a short break to switch the tape. 4 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 5 6 1:06 p.m. on August 16, 2013. This is 7 the end of tape number three. (Thereupon, a recess was taken, 8 9 and then the proceedings continued as follows:) 10 11 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 12 1:11 p.m. on August 15, 2013. This is 13 tape number four. BY MR. COLES: 14 15 Mr. Jezzi, let's return to 0 paragraph 44 of your declaration. Let me 16 17 know when you're there. 18 Α Okay. 19 And paragraph 44 of your 0 declaration has a sentence that reads, 20 21 "One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the retaining force between 22 23 the closure means and purpose specific 24 attachment panel would be greater than the 800.211.DEPO (3376) retaining force between the closure meassure Solutions.com 25



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 129 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 129 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 and the outer cover." 3 Do you see that? 4 Α Yes. 5 Ο Why is that so? 6 Α Because the attachment panel is specifically designed, treated, what have 7 you, to provide the highest retaining 8 9 forces possible. The outer cover was not 10 designed with that in mind necessarily and that's the difference. 11 12 And would the retaining force 0 13 between the closure means and the outer cover hold the diaper on a user? 14 15 Repeat that. А 16 The mechanical closure means against the outer cover, would they hold 17 18 the diaper against -- it depends on the 19 diaper, on the hook design that is used. Again, there has been evolution of 20 21 technology in recent five, six years ago 22 or so. There are very, very aggressive 23 hooks that allow the mechanical fastener 24 to attach directly to a standard spunbond 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 laminate outer cover. Originally that Esquire Solutions.com

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 130 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 hibit 2001 Page 120 of 20

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 130 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 not the case. And that is why we have a 3 carry over of attachment panels. The other criteria that is 4 5 important as to why attachment panels are 6 still used is that they provide a target 7 zone as to where the tape, the mechanical system should go for better fit. And so 8 9 that's the evolution that is happening, 10 although we are seeing diapers changing on 11 that note for cost savings. 12 Okay. 0 13 And what's provided in the cost savings? 14 15 Α The elimination of the 16 attachment zone and attaching directly to 17 the outer cover. 18 Q Okay. 19 And Goates doesn't disclose 20 whether or not --21 MR. COLES: Strike that. 22 0 Am I correct in saying that 23 Goates does not disclose whether or not 24 the closure means would -- and the outer 800.211.DEPO (3376) cover would have sufficient retaining EsquireSolutions.com 25



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 131 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 131 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 force to hold the diaper on the user? 3 Α I don't recall having that 4 mention. 5 MR. COLES: Do you want to stop 6 for lunch? 7 MR. SPENDLOVE: Sure. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 8 9 1:13 p.m. We're going off the record. (Thereupon, a recess was taken, 10 11 and then the proceedings continued as 12 follows:) 13 AFTERNOON SESSION THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 14 We're back on the record. 15 1:53 p.m. A-R-R-I-G-O D. J-E-Z-Z-I, resumed and 16 17 testified as follows: 18 MR. COLES: I want to enter what 19 has previously been identified as Exhibit 1015. It is U.S. Patent 20 Publication 2006/0058772 to Karami. 21 EXAMINATION BY (Con't) 22 23 MR. COLES: 24 Mr. Jezzi, have you read the Q 800.211.DEPO (3376) Karami '772 reference in its entirety? EsquireSolutions.com 25



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 132 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 132 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 Α Yes. 3 Q Did you read its file history? 4 Α No. 5 And what limitations in the '788 Ο 6 Patent do you use Karami '772 for in the 7 invalidity analysis? 8 MR. SPENDLOVE: Objection. 9 Foundation, mischaracterization. 10 (Witness reviewing document) Basically we use that on Claims 11 Α 2 and 3, 8 and 9 -- 1 through 10, 14, 16 12 13 through 20. It was used quite a bit. 11, 13, 15. Including Benning. 14 21. 15 0 Okay. What elements of Claim 1 of the 16 '788 Patent do you say are found in Karami 17 18 '772? 19 MR. SPENDLOVE: Objection. 20 Foundation. 21 Basically Karami '772 teaches Α differential retention forces, and they 22 23 also teach basically an embodiment that 24 would invalidate Claim 1 because of the 800.211.DEPO (3376) higher retentive forces on the wing verEsquireSolutions.com 25



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 133 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 133 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 the outer cover. 3 Q Take a look at Karami '772, 4 Figure 6. 5 Α Okay. 6 Q Do you see the wings 130L and 7 130R? 8 Yes. Α 9 Would you agree that they extend 0 10 laterally from the diaper chasis? 11 Α Yes. 12 0 Would they agree that they are 13 integrally formed with the back sheet (130)?14 15 Α Yes, and they also constitute 16 side parts. So are these wings, 130L and 17 Q 18 130R, the side parts joined to the first and second side edges of Claim 1 of the 19 20 '788 Patent? Repeat that question. 130L and 21 Α 130R are what? 22 23 (Record read) 24 They could be interpreted as Α 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 that. EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 134 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 134 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	Q In Figure 6, where is the side
3	edge to which the first and second side
4	parts are joined?
5	MR. SPENDLOVE: Objection.
6	Foundation.
7	A Before I answer that, I need to
8	start with a preamble.
9	This is what we define as an
10	hourglass diaper, and it is the precursor
11	to diapers that have side parts. And the
12	reason diapers have side parts is to
13	duplicate this design with extended
14	lateral portions, 131, 133 or 132, and
15	134.
16	These happen to be represented
17	in this figure as an integral part of the
18	back sheet rather than attach individual
19	side parts. But in essence, to someone
20	like myself, they are pretty equivalent.
21	Q What do you mean by "they are
22	equivalent"?
23	A They basically perform the same
24	function. They have extensions in the
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) front and the back to allow folding ov @squireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 135 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 135 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 the patient or the user for attachment 3 means. 4 0 Do you have an opinion as to 5 whether it would be more or less expensive 6 to use separate side parts as opposed to 7 integral side parts? It would vary depending on the 8 Α 9 materials that are used in the side parts. 10 Typically, and it depends on the diaper 11 design, the materials that make these extensions 131 and 133 for the most part 12 13 are similar to the constituents of side 14 parts. 15 The advantage of doing it this 16 way is you have two materials so each material is lower basis weight. When you 17 18 do an individual side part, you probably 19 would have a heavier material because you 20 need the strength. So they may be 21 equivalent in total cost. You would have 22 to look at it on a one-by-one basis. 23 0 "The advantage of doing it this 24 way is you have two materials." 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 Which way is this way? EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE:

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 136 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 136 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	A This way is Figure 6, which
3	basically the side parts of this diagram
4	are made of the back sheet and the liner.
5	Q This is different than
6	individual side parts; is that correct?
7	A It can be, but not necessarily.
8	Side parts are usually made of single
9	materials, bilaminates and trilaminates.
10	Q And is that true if it is an
11	integral side part?
12	A If it is an integral side part,
13	it is possible that it would certainly
14	not well, it could be all three
15	components could possibly be done as a
16	side part depending on the design of the
17	diaper. You could have a single material
18	for the extensions or you could have a
19	bilaminate or a trilaminate. They could
20	be similar.
21	Q Is there a side edge to which
22	the side parts in Karami are joined?
23	A In Figure 6, the answer is no.
24	Through the body, I would have to review
25	that. 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 137 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 137 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 If you look at Figure 5 of 3 Karami, it appears that those side parts are separate. So I would think that 4 5 Karami in the body would discuss that. 6 Q Figure 5 of Karami, is that a 7 T-shaped diaper? 8 It could be called that. Not. Α 9 necessarily. I mean, some T-shaped 10 diapers are completely rectangular, some 11 have partial leg cutouts, so it depends. In Figure 5 of Karami, does the 12 0 13 connection means connect to --MR. COLES: Strike that. 14 15 Ο What is the difference between a 16 T-shaped diaper and an hourglass-shaped 17 diaper? 18 Α A T-shaped diaper was made where 19 the chasis was typically rectangular, and 20 from the rectangular chasis, the side 21 parts would generate a T-shape like somewhat demonstrated like Figure 5. 22 An 23 hourglass basically was the legs were cut 24 out into an hourglass design as shown in 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 Figure 6. EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 138 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 138 of 207

Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

Г

1		Jezzi
2	Q	And in the T-shaped diaper, do
3	the back s	side parts connect to each other?
4	A	They can, they cannot be; it is
5	just a va	riable.
6	Q	And let's take a look at Karami
7	Figure 7.	
8	A	Okay.
9	Q	Do you see the wings 230L and
10	230R?	
11	A	Okay.
12	Q	Would you agree that these
13	extend lat	terally from the diaper chasis?
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	Now, are these the wings
16		MR. COLES: Strike that.
17	Q	And are the wings 230L and 230R
18	what you s	say correspond to the side parts
19	joined to	the first and second side parts
20	of Claim 1	1?
21	A	They could be equivalent to
22	that, yes	
23	Q	And is there a side edge to
24	which the	se side parts are joined?
25	A	800.211.DEPO (3376) These appear to be, again, a <i>EsquireSolutions.com</i>

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 139 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 139 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	piece of the back sheet and liner design,
3	so they are an integral part of the
4	chasis.
5	Q Does the Karami '772 reference
6	show side parts in said front area as
7	required by Claim 1 of the '788 Patent?
8	A I think that if you look at
9	Figure 5, it basically shows that, yes.
10	Q And where are these side parts?
11	A Pardon me?
12	Q Where are these side parts?
13	A Basically if you look at 40,
14	there is a side part that is detached and
15	attached to the main chasis (20). And 46
16	and 48 are also side parts by my
17	definition and interpretation as someone
18	who has been looking at these for some
19	time.
20	Q And 46 and
21	MR. COLES: Strike that.
22	Q How are 46 and 48 side parts?
23	A Basically they are rectangular
24	components that are attached to the main
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) chasis, and depending on the size, the EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 140 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 140 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 basically would be -- they could 3 constitute side parts. Size is one of the 4 variables to side parts. 5 And in Figure 5, would the 0 6 connecting means on the --7 MR. COLES: Let me strike that. In Figure 5, what are the 8 0 9 mechanical closure means that cooperate 10 with said side parts at said rear area? 11 MR. SPENDLOVE: Objection. 12 Foundation. Mischaracterized prior 13 testimony. 14 MR. COLES: Let me rephrase the 15 question. 16 0 Claim 1 requires "mechanical closure means having mechanical closure 17 18 aids. Said closure means cooperating with 19 the side parts at said rear area". 20 Do you see that in Claim 1 of 21 the '788 Patent? 22 Α Where are you reading? 23 0 '788, Claim 1. 24 Α Okay. 800.211.DEPO (3376) (Witness reviewing document) EsquireSolutions.com 25

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 141 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 141 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

August 15, 2013 142

1	Jezzi
2	Okay. Basically if you look at
3	Figure 5.
4	MR. SPENDLOVE: What's the
5	question that's pending before we
6	Q My question was: Do you see
7	that?
8	A Yes, I do.
9	Q Okay.
10	Now, referring to Figure 5 of
11	Karami, do you see such a mechanical
12	closure means?
13	A Yes.
14	Q What is it?
15	A The closure means are described
16	as 41, 48, and 46.
17	Q Okay.
18	So mechanical closure means
19	MR. COLES: Strike that.
20	Q Which closure means are
21	cooperating with said side parts at said
22	rear area?
23	MR. SPENDLOVE: Objection.
24	Foundation. Mischaracterizes prior
25	testimony. 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE \$ SOLUTIONS

> Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 142 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 142 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 MR. COLES: Let me rephrase it. 3 Q In Figure 5 of Karami, do you 4 see an element that corresponds to said 5 closure means cooperating with said side 6 parts at said rear area of Claim 1 of the 7 '788 Patent? 8 Α Yes. 9 And what is that? 0 Basically the side part (40) and 10 Α 11 their opposite one have a mechanical 12 fastener (41) and those appear to be on 13 the back side of the diaper. And does that mechanical closure 14 0 15 means --16 MR. COLES: Let me strike that. 17 Q Does that mechanical closure 18 means, parts 40 and 41 --19 MR. COLES: Strike that again. 20 Is the mechanical closure means, 0 40 and 41, dimentioned for detachable 21 fastening to said outer face of said side 22 23 parts in said front area? 24 Α Yes. 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 And where is that shown? 0 EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE: SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 143 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 143 of 207

Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	A 41, mechanical fastener will be
3	attaching to the attachment zone 52 when
4	it is closed. Also because the back ears
5	of this particular embodiment have an
6	attachment loop area, item 52, the
7	retentive forces are going to be much
8	higher with the wing than it would be with
9	the outer cover, 20.
10	Q Does attachments 40 and 41
11	attach to what you call side parts 46 and
12	48?
13	A No, they could. Basically 40
14	goes against its counterpart, which is
15	only designated by a 52. They didn't put
16	a number on the opposite side part to
17	correspond with item 40.
18	Q Is that disclosed in Karami
19	'772?
20	A I believe it would be, but I
21	have to review it.
22	Q Please do.
23	(Witness reviewing document)
24	A Basically Column 4, paragraph
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) 0039, describes the fastening process EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 144 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 144 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479
1 Jezzi 2 that particular design in Figure 5. 3 And in paragraph 0039 of Karami Q 4 '772, does it disclose that the hook type 5 fasteners, 41, attach to the front portion 6 22? 7 To what portion? Α Front portion 22. 8 0 9 I'd have to find it. Α (Witness reviewing document) 10 11 MR. SPENDLOVE: What paragraph 12 is that? 13 MR. COLES: 0039. Paragraph 0048 basically makes 14 Α 15 reference that -- so that the hook water jet treater and the -- "so that the hook 16 17 type fasteners can securely engage with 18 any portion of the wings when the diaper 19 is placed on the wearer. Thus, the 20 fastening of the hook type fasteners to 21 the front portion of the diaper is not restricted to specific landing zone." 22 23 So they are mentioning the 24 possibility that it could be attached to 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 the front end of the diaper or the out Esquire Solutions.com

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 145 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 145 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1		Jezzi	
2	cover. Aga	ain, going back to some previ	ous
3	commentary,	depending on the waist of t	he
4	wearer, tha	at could attach to side part	to
5	side part c	or side part to center zone.	
6	Q I	s paragraph 0048 referring t	0
7	Figure 5?		
8	A S	Say again.	
9	Q I	is paragraph 0048, the paragr	aph
10	which you w	vere just reading from	
11	A I	don't know if it referenced	l
12	Figure 5 di	rectly. I don't think they	are
13	mentioning	a figure reference here.	
14	Q S	So you don't know?	
15	A I	don't know. It doesn't loc	ok
16	like they a	are referring to any specific	1
17	figure.		
18	Q I	In Figure 5, is there any	
19	element 131	?	
20	A N	ю.	
21	Q I	s there an element 133?	
22	A N	Jo.	
23	Q I	s there an element 150A?	
24	A N	No, not on that picture.	00.211.DEPO (3376)
25	Q 1	.50D?	EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 146 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 146 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 No, they only have five numbers Α 3 and they are all less than a hundred, 4 so --5 0 Okay. In Karami '772, which element or 6 7 elements of the patents do you say correspond to the claim closure means? 8 9 MR. SPENDLOVE: Objection. 10 Foundation. Mischaracterization of 11 testimony. 12 0 Let me take a step back. 13 In your report, in your declaration, do you identify any element 14 15 of the Karami reference as being a closure 16 means? 17 As being what? Α 18 Ο A closure means as claimed in 19 Claim 1 of the '788 Patent. 20 More than likely we do. Α Can you tell me what it is? 21 0 I don't understand your 22 Α 23 question. I mean items 41, 48, 46 -- I 24 can't read the numbers, they are not 800.211.DEPO (3376) clear -- but the ones on Figure 6 and EsquireSolutions.com 25



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 147 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 147 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 Figure 8 are all closure means. 3 Q And in your report, do you identify any element or elements of the 4 5 Karami '772 reference as corresponding to 6 the outer face of said side parts as required by Claim 1 of the '788 Patent? 7 I don't remember. I would have 8 Α 9 to review it. Go ahead. 10 0 11 (Witness reviewing document) 12 Α Now repeat the question again, 13 please. (Record read) 14 15 Α Okay. In the declaration, we did 16 disclose from Karami '772 that the outer 17 18 cover was two sided and had an outside 19 face. However, someone skilled in the 20 art, we would have to assume that the side parts would also have that because as I 21 mentioned earlier, they are two-sided 22 23 materials, and, therefore, they would have 24 an outside face and an inside face. 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 And in your report, do you 0 EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 148 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 148 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

Γ

1	Jezzi
2	identify any element or elements of the
3	Karami '772 references corresponding to
4	the side parts?
5	A I have to go through it again.
6	(Witness reviewing document)
7	We did disclose that in
8	paragraph 39.
9	Q And what elements?
10	A Basically that the Karami '772
11	disclosed that "the retaining forces
12	between mechanical closure means and the
13	outer face of the main part are lower than
14	the retaining forces between the
15	mechanical closure means and the outer
16	face of the side parts in the front area".
17	Q Okay.
18	And in Karami '772, which
19	portion, which element
20	MR. COLES: Let me rephrase it.
21	Q And in Karami '772, which
22	element is the side parts in the front
23	area?
24	A Karami '772, if you look at
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) Figure 5 and Figure 6 and Figure 7, th ∉squireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 149 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 149 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	front area of the diaper would be
3	designated by items 48 and 42. And in
4	Figure 6, it would be 130L and 130R. And
5	in Figure 7, it would be 230L and 230R
6	would be the front side parts.
7	Q And in your declaration, have
8	you identified any element or elements in
9	the Karami '772 references that correspond
10	to the main part?
11	A I think yes. Karami '772
12	teaches a stay away zone and that is
13	located in the main part of the outer
14	cover. Paragraph 40.
15	Q What is a stay away zone?
16	A A stay away zone is a zone that
17	has diminished affinity to hook retentive
18	forces or hook fasteners as by the
19	definition by Karami.
20	Q Let's look at paragraph 40 of
21	your declaration.
22	A Yes, I have it.
23	Q In paragraph 40 of your
24	declaration, you write: "This stay away
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) portion has reduced affinity to hook t yEquireSolutions.com
l	



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 150 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 150 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 fasteners, and, therefore, a lower 3 retaining force on the main part versus 4 the side parts." 5 Do you see that? 6 Α Right. 7 0 What is a "retaining force" in 8 your sentence? A retaining force -- what was 9 Α your question again? 10 11 Okay. Lower retaining force on 12 the main part versus the side parts. 13 A retaining force can be either measured in sheer or peel forces, and 14 15 those are the retaining forces, retentive forces, that are used and described in the 16 17 patents that we're talking about. 18 Q What does "stay away" mean to 19 you? 20 Pardon me? Α 21 Q What does the term "stay away" 22 mean to you? 23 Α Stay away means a -- well, by 24 the definition within Karami '772, it is 800.211.DEPO (3376) an area that has diminished affinity tEsquireSolutions.com 25

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 151 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 151 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 hook type fasteners or a lower retentive 3 force. I think that is a definition we're 4 going to have to go by. 5 And do you think a stay away 0 6 zone is intended to receive the hook type 7 fasteners? It could. The concept of stay 8 Α 9 away zone is not a new concept, so it's 10 been around the industry even with tape 11 landing zones and adhesive tapes. 12 And in the industry, does stay 0 13 away zone have a different meaning? No, not really. I mean, it 14 Α 15 depends who you talk to. But basically I 16 would have to go on -- actually, that is the first time I have heard of the stay 17 18 away zone in the diaper design was within 19 this patent, so it is not a term that is 20 used commonly. 21 0 Have you seen it used in 2.2 other --23 MR. COLES: Strike that. 24 0 Have you ever seen it used 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 elsewhere? EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 152 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 152 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 Α Yes. 3 Q Where? 4 Α In a diaper. 5 Can you tell me which diaper it 0 6 is? 7 Well, there is a previous patent Α on tape adhesive systems that have zones 8 9 with diminished affinity for fastening. 10 Now, this is an adhesive system and that 11 was done by modify the siliconization of a certain strip in the middle of a tape 12 13 landing zone, for instance, which would basically direct the user to position the 14 15 diaper a certain way. Would it position the diaper so 16 0 17 that the tapes would not be in the stay 18 away zone? 19 Α The reason that patent was 20 issued was to get around another patent, 21 but that could be the result. It is a 22 very narrow stay away zone. 23 Ο And the intention was -- and was 24 the purpose of the stay away zone to not 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 attach the adhesive there? EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE:

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 153 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 153 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 Α The reason that was developed 3 was so that -- to parallel a split tape 4 landing zone. 5 Q What does that mean? 6 Α Basically have two pieces, two 7 separate pieces of tape. 8 0 Two separate pieces of tape 9 where? 10 On the outsides, none in the Α 11 middle, so that basically you would attach the tape to the tape landing zone. 12 So it 13 was used as a way to get around that particular execution embodiment. 14 15 To get around what particular 0 16 execution embodiment? 17 MR. SPENDLOVE: Objection. 18 Outside the scope of the direct 19 testimony. 20 You can answer. 0 21 THE WITNESS: Do I have to 2.2 answer? 23 MR. SPENDLOVE: Yes. 24 Basically splitting the landing Α 800.211.DEPO (3376) zone in two, that was the design aroundesquireSolutions.com 25

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 154 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 154 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	that embodiment.
3	Q Let's take a look at Karami
4	reference, paragraph 53, 0053.
5	A Of the patent?
6	Q Of the patent. Let me know when
7	you're there.
8	A Okay.
9	Q In paragraph 53 of the Karami
10	'772 reference, there is a sentence that
11	says, "The stay away zone (160) can be
12	formed by, for example, an inner backing
13	film or backing film laminated to a
14	spunbond meltblown spunbond nonwoven
15	exposed to an opening in the back sheet
16	(130)."
17	Do you see that?
18	A Yes.
19	Q In this embodiment, would hook
20	fasteners attach to the stay away zone?
21	A Yes. The way I read that is
22	they have a fenestration in the outer
23	body, in the outer cover of the diaper,
24	and there is spunbond meltblown spunbond
25	nonwoven is exposed to through this 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 155 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 155 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	opening in the back sheet. My experience,
3	depending on the hook selection that is
4	used on SMS, which is what that material
5	is, would engage a mechanical fastener so
6	it could engage there.
7	Q And would it be sufficient to
8	hold the diaper on to the wearer?
9	A Say it again please?
10	Q Would the retention forces be
11	sufficient to hold the diaper on the
12	wearer?
13	A It depends on the hook type,
14	yes.
15	Q And in this and in the Karami
16	'772, would you know whether or not the
17	hooks would hold on to the SMS?
18	A I don't know.
19	Let me add that this material
20	that is defined as SMS could be used and
21	is described within Beckert '788 as part
22	of side part components, it could be made
23	of that same material. And these
24	materials could be varied to provide
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) different characteristics of engagementEsquireSolutions.com
I	



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 156 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 156 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 So without knowing specifics on the well. 3 material, it's hard to say. 4 Q Let's turn to your declaration. 5 Α Yes. 6 Q Let's look at paragraph 40 of 7 your declaration. 8 Okay. Α 9 And at paragraph 40, you write: 0 "Figure 8 of Karami '772 clearly shows 10 11 that the stay away zone (160) can cover the main part of the diaper so that the 12 13 retaining force of the main part of the diaper would be lower than the retaining 14 15 force on the side parts." 16 Do you see that? 17 Α Yes. 18 Q And what is the "retaining 19 force" in that sentence? 20 The retaining force is the Α engagement force of the mechanical 21 fastener on to the substrate. 22 23 0 And would the retaining force 24 between the closure means and the main 800.211.DEPO (3376) part of the diaper hold the diaper on EsquireSolutions.com 25



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 157 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 157 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 user? 3 Yes, depending on the actual Α 4 numbers, but they could be varied to do 5 that. 6 Q And in Karami '772, can you tell 7 whether the forces are sufficient? 8 No, I cannot. There is no magic Α 9 number on retentive forces working or not 10 working especially when most companies 11 have proprietary tests that measure and 12 vary from one to the other. So making a 13 correlation yes or no on numbers even that are published would be very hard to do. 14 15 Turn to paragraph 59 of your 0 16 declaration. In 59 --17 MR. COLES: Strike that. 18 Q In paragraph 59 of your 19 declaration, you write: "It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in 20 21 the art that the materials could be 22 selected to achieve the retaining forces 23 recited in Claim 2". 24 Do you see that? 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 А Yes. EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 158 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 158 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	Q Can you tell from Karami '772
3	whether or not the retaining forces in
4	Claim 2 are disclosed there?
5	A The test methodology is
6	different between that done by Karami as
7	well as Hartmann or Beckert. And so it is
8	difficult to make that correlation and I
9	cannot make that comparison.
10	My guess is that they probably
11	are, but without, you know, running the
12	same materials and the same test
13	procedure, it would not be accurate to say
14	that they were or were not.
15	Q Let's move to paragraph 63 of
16	your declaration. Let me know when you're
17	there.
18	Paragraph 63 of your
19	declaration, you refer to the Belau
20	reference as "not teaching specific
21	claimed retaining forces".
22	Do you see that?
23	A Yes.
24	Q So can you tell me whether or
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) not the retaining forces in Claim 2 ar ∉squireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 159 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 159 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 disclosed in Belau? 3 Α I do not think the specific forces described in Beckert were disclosed 4 5 in Belau. 6 Q Okay. Does your declaration cite to 7 any other reference as disclosed in the 8 9 claimed retaining forces of Claim 2? 10 No. Except for Karami '772, Α they probably wouldn't bracket that, but 11 because of the difference in testing, it 12 13 is not possible to confirm that. Let's refer to Claim 62 --14 0 15 MR. COLES: Strike that. 16 0 Refer to paragraph 62 of your 17 declaration. Let me know when you're 18 there. 19 Α Yes. 20 So in paragraph 62 of your 0 21 declaration, you write: "This range in retentive fastening forces could be 22 23 further expanded by the use of known 24 plastic film and spunbond nonwoven 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 laminates found in many back sheet EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 160 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 160 of 207

Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 applications for baby diaper and adult 3 care briefs prior to the priority date of the '788 Patent. Given the broad range of 4 5 retention forces for the limited samples shown in Karami '772 and other well-known 6 materials, one of ordinary skill in the 7 art would have found it obvious to choose 8 9 readily available materials having the 10 retention forces recited in Claim 2." 11 Do you see that? 12 Α Yes. 13 0 In this paragraph of your declaration, you don't cite to any 14 reference as disclosing a further 15 expansion; is that correct? 16 17 Α Repeat that again. I don't 18 disclose what? 19 (Record read) 20 Α I guess, yes. 21 0 Why not? 22 Α I wrote this document a long 23 time ago so I don't remember exactly why 24 we did not include that. All I can say is 800.211.DEPO (3376) that for someone skilled in the art, the source solutions.com 25

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 161 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 161 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 are existing materials that would have 3 extremely high probability will encompass 4 the ranges published in Beckert. 5 Do you know the cost of such a 0 6 material or materials? 7 Α Say it again, please. Do you know what the cost of 8 0 9 such a material or materials would be? 10 I know most of the costs, yes. Α 11 0 Would they be expensive for --MR. COLES: Strike that. 12 13 0 Would they be more or less expensive than the materials disclosed in 14 15 Beckert? 16 Α Slightly more expensive I would say; there is an extra treatment. 17 But 18 they are all mostly readily available. 19 The technology that's used in Karami '772 is known as hydraulic entangling or 20 21 hydraulic water jet entangling, and that's 22 known technology and those materials are 23 available. And in creating a diaper, is it 24 0 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 better to have a less expensive materiæsquireSolutions.com

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 162 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 162 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 than more expensive material? 3 Α It depends, okay? The answer is 4 if you get similar performance and 5 consumer responses or acceptance, of 6 course, but typically it is a balancing 7 So the exercise is where you spend act. more money, you take money from others, so 8 9 it is continuously evolving and all the 10 materials play a role in that. 11 MR. COLES: I would like to 12 enter what has previously been 13 identified as Exhibit 1011, U.S. Patent 6626881 to Shingu, et al. 14 15 BY MR. COLES: Mr. Jezzi, did you read Shingu 16 0 17 in its entirety? 18 Α Yes. 19 Q And did you read the file 20 jacket? 21 Α No. And what elements of the '788 22 0 23 Patent do you use Shingu for in your 24 invalidity analysis? 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 MR. SPENDLOVE: Objection. EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 163 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 163 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 Foundation. Mischaracterization of 3 prior testimony. 4 MR. COLES: Let me rephrase it. 5 Mr. Jezzi, do you use the Shingu 0 6 reference in your invalidity analysis of 7 the '788 Patent? 8 Α Yes. 9 And can you identify which 0 10 claims you used Shingu for in your invalidity analysis? 11 Well, without having to review 12 Α 13 the 60-page declaration, we used Shingu for a couple of reasons. 14 15 One is that it does cover the folding of the side parts or the ears, and 16 17 the Z folding. 18 Secondly, Shingu also describes 19 a separated attachment zone, item 23 in Figure 2, which basically provide 20 21 different retentive forces across the face of the diaper and the side parts of the 22 23 diaper. 24 In the Shingu reference, is 0 800.211.DEPO (3376) there an element that you have identif EsquireSolutions.com 25

ESQUIRE:

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 164 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 164 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 as corresponding to the closure means of 3 Claim 1 of the '788 Patent? 4 Α Yes, they have mechanical 5 closure means. 6 Q And which element is that? Well, we can look at Figure 1, 7 Α items 22, 21. 8 9 Have you completed your answer? 0 10 I was just going to get Α something out of the specification, which 11 12 I'm sure they describe mechanical 13 fasteners, but I think the picture shows 14 it. 15 Column 3, lines 43 to 45, "mechanical fasteners bonded thereto by 16 means of adhesive or heat sealing 17 18 techniques". 19 And in your declaration, is Q 20 there --21 MR. COLES: Let me strike that. 22 Q In your declaration, do you 23 identify an element of the Shingu 24 reference as corresponding to the outer 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 face of said side parts? EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 165 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 165 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	A I don't know if we discussed it
3	in the declaration per se and I have to
4	review that. If you want me to, I can do
5	that, or I can go into the patent and find
6	it for you.
7	Q Look in your declaration.
8	(Witness reviewing document)
9	A We used Shingu in various
10	combinations for several of the claims.
11	We did not cite specifically words on the
12	outer face material.
13	Q Do you know if Shingu does
14	disclose an element that corresponds to
15	the outer face of said side parts?
16	A I believe it does.
17	Q Can you tell me what it is?
18	A It is pretty standard so I would
19	be surprised if it didn't include it.
20	Column 3, somewhere around line
21	40, they talk about the outer cover
22	construction, and, you know, they refer to
23	nonwoven fabric layers. They also talk
24	about liquid impervious back sheet in the
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) claims. And we used Shingu as one of EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 166 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 166 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 folding patterns on the side parts. 3 Q And in your declaration, do you 4 identify in any element of the Shingu 5 Patent as corresponding to the outer faces of the main part? 6 7 I think I may have done that. Α Shingu disclosed a diaper when the side 8 9 parts in the front and/or the rear area 10 have reinforcing means. So we did discuss 11 the side parts with the reinforcement member, and then it was mentioned in 12 13 various of the claims, but we did not pull specific language out of Shingu in those 14 15 claims, but considered it as a whole. 16 0 Does the Shingu Patent describe 17 an element that you say corresponds to the 18 outer face of the main part? 19 MR. SPENDLOVE: Objection. 20 Foundation. Mischaracterizes the 21 prior testimony. 22 MR. COLES: Can you read back 23 the question. 24 (Record read) 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 MR. COLES: Let me rephrase EsquireSolutions.com

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 167 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 167 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	Q Does the Shingu Patent describe
3	an element that corresponds to the outer
4	face of said main part?
5	A The only reference they make to
6	an outer cover or back sheet is in Column
7	3, and they describe some of the materials
8	that are used such as nonwoven fabric
9	layers, and they use that as part of the
10	side parts as well.
11	Q Let's go to paragraph 39 of your
12	declaration. Let me know when you're
13	there.
14	A Okay.
15	Q So in paragraph 39 of your
16	declaration, you write that Shingu
17	discloses "that the retaining forces
18	between mechanical closure means and the
19	outer face of the main part are lower than
20	the retaining forces between the
21	mechanical closure means and the outer
22	face of said side parts in the front
23	area."
24	Do you see that?
25	AUh-huh.800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 168 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 168 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 Q Where does the Shingu reference 3 show this? 4 Α It probably doesn't mention it 5 specifically, but for someone skilled in 6 the art like myself, looking at this, I 7 can basically tell you that when you have targeted attachment zones, 23, as opposed 8 9 to a nonwoven back sheet, number 3, those 10 forces will exist. 11 0 Okay. 12 And can we --13 MR. COLES: Let's stop. We have 14 to switch tapes. Let's take a break. 15 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 2:49 p.m. on August 15, 2013. 16 This is 17 the end of tape number four. 18 (Thereupon, a recess was taken, 19 and then the proceedings continued as 20 follows:) 21 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 2:54 p.m. on August 15, 2013. 22 This is 23 tape number five. 24 BY MR. COLES: 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 Mr. Jezzi, let's look at 0 EsquireSolutions.com

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 169 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 169 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 paragraph 39 of your declaration. 3 Α Okay. 4 Q Let me know when you're there. 5 Α Okay. 6 Q Paragraph 39 of your 7 declaration, you write that Shingu discloses that "the retaining forces 8 9 between the mechanical closure means and 10 the outer face of the main part are lower 11 than the retaining forces between the said 12 mechanical closure means on the said outer 13 face of the side parts in the front area." Do you see that? 14 15 Α Yes. 16 Ο Where does the Shingu reference 17 show this? 18 Α Repeat that again. 19 Where does the Shingu reference Q show this? 20 21 Α Again, you know, there are six 22 patents, seven patents there. When you 23 look at them as an aggregate, when you 24 look at them, someone skilled in the art 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 knowing the material construction, EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 170 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 170 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 basically those patents and the 3 embodiments that are described would basically have those characteristics. 4 5 As I mentioned, Shingu was the 6 last example of that. 7 Q Okay. So does Shingu show the 8 9 retaining forces between the mechanical closure means and the outer face of the 10 11 main part are lower than the retaining 12 forces? 13 Α They don't describe that, but when you look at the pictures and knowing 14 the material types that have been 15 16 described and used, they would generate 17 that. 18 Ο Okay. 19 And which picture are you 20 referring to? 21 I think if you look at Shingu Α 22 and you look at the Figure 2 where you 23 have two separate zoned attachments, 24 targeted attachments, those two spots and 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 basically they cover the side parts, wEsquireSolutions.com

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 171 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 171 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 have a much higher retentive force than the center portion, which is the outer 3 4 cover material. 5 Q Okay. 6 And do we know --MR. COLES: Strike that. 7 And can the hooks connect to the 8 0 9 center portion that you're talking about? 10 It depends again on the girth of Α 11 the wearer. And in this particular construction, the probability is that it 12 13 could, that it would. So they are using that 14 separation probably for two reasons. 15 One is to target the loop material or the hook 16 material to these areas, as well as to 17 18 perhaps save material by eliminating some 19 portion in the middle. 20 Safe material? 0 21 Α Say it again. You said "safe material"? 2.2 0 23 Α No, what I'm saying is -- there 24 is a space right here in between 23, and 800.211.DEPO (3376) basically that's the outer cover that EsquireSolutions.com 25



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 172 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 172 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	there, and not knowing their intention,
3	but one of the possibilities is rather
4	than having a continuous piece, they saved
5	some material making it less expensive by
6	taking out a portion of it.
7	Q And can we tell from the Shingu
8	reference whether or not the hooks would
9	be retained by the space between the two
10	elements 23?
11	A It all depends on the material
12	and the type of nonwoven that is used, and
13	also on the type of hook that is used.
14	Right now there are some hooks that are
15	extremely aggressive and attach themselves
16	to most types of unwovens in these type of
17	applications.
18	Q But from this reference, you
19	can't tell?
20	A I can't tell.
21	MR. COLES: I want to take a
22	quick break. I want to check my
23	notes. I think I may have a few more
24	questions, but I need to spend a few
25	minutes looking at my notes. 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 173 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 ibit 2001 Page 173 of 20

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 173 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 MR. SPENDLOVE: Yeah, no 3 problem. 4 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 5 2:58 p.m. We're going off the record. 6 (Thereupon, a recess was taken, and then the proceedings continued as 7 follows:) 8 9 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 3:15 p.m. We're back on the record. 10 11 BY MR. COLES: Mr. Jezzi, does the Benning 12 0 13 reference disclose the claim element of Claim 1 that "the retaining forces between 14 said mechanical closure means as an outer 15 face is the mean part of lower than 16 retaining forces between said mechanical 17 18 closure means and said outer face of said 19 side parts in the front area"? 20 May I ask you to repeat the Α 21 question? It was pretty lengthy. Does the Benning reference 2.2 0 23 disclose the claim element of '788 Claim 1 24 that recites that "the retaining forces 800.211.DEPO (3376) between said mechanical closure means #squireSolutions.com 25



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 174 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 174 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 said outer face of said main part are 3 lower than retaining forces between said mechanical closure means and said outer 4 5 face of said side parts in said front 6 area"? 7 Α Okay. We basically use Benning 6496 8 9 for the folded ear. They do mention, you 10 know, side parts in their application. Ι 11 do not recall that they have retentive forces mentioned in their application 12 13 though. However, the diaper design is not that different from Beckert '788, so I 14 15 would think that it would be probably 16 similar. 17 Q In the Benning reference --18 MR. COLES: Let me strike that. 19 Does the Benning reference 0 20 disclose connecting the connecting means 21 to the front of the diaper? 2.2 Α If you look at Figure 4, and, 23 again, this is based on experience in the 24 industry in the category, when you look at 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 Figure 4, you look at the diaper havin Fsquire Solutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 175 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 175 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 been constructed with four side parts. In 3 its application, this diaper design that's shown in Figure 4 could have the 4 5 capability of having the side attachment 6 means, 42, 44, either hit the back counterpart, side part or the outer cover, 7 or even the front side parts, depending on 8 9 the girth of the individual wearing the 10 product. 11 So it basically, in my opinion, 12 covers a diaper design which has side 13 parts and attachment means to it. Is there any way to know from 14 0 15 the Benning reference what the retaining forces are for the -- between the 16 connection means and the side parts? 17 18 Α As someone skilled in the art 19 looking at the description of the materials that they use for the side 20 21 parts, for the outer cover, and then for the selection of these materials, and 22 23 knowing the performance of the various 24 hooks against these materials, I would 800.211.DEPO (3376) venture to say that it would probably besquireSolutions.com 25

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 176 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 176 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 very similar to what they are claiming in 3 Beckert. 4 0 And why do you say that? 5 Because basically the side Α 6 panels, 34, I believe they describe the 7 material sections attached to the main body portion are preferably a nonwoven 8 9 material, specifically a spunbond or an SMS or SM material. Then I wouldn't be 10 11 surprised whether they are describing the outer cover as either being a film 12 13 laminate, again, which would be, again, described in Beckert. 14 15 So knowing that those materials are similar with a mechanical fastener 16 type, you should be able to get similar 17 18 results of what they have been claiming 19 before -- or afterwards I should say. 20 Is there any way to tell what 0 the retaining forces are for the outer 21 2.2 cover? 23 Α I think this is a variable, and 24 the reason I say that is a nonwoven by 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 itself will generate a certain retenti @squireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 177 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 177 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

Г

1	Jezzi
2	force. A laminate of a nonwoven and a
3	film would probably generate a slightly
4	reduced force.
5	If you have a back sheet that
6	has a we call it fenestration adhesive
7	pattern, which means you only glue the
8	outside, which has been done in the
9	industry, and you have a loose nonwoven,
10	that even though it is a laminate with a
11	film back sheet, you still would have
12	higher retaining forces.
13	So without really seeing the
14	specific embodiment, it's hard to say
15	which way it would go. More than likely
16	it would generate retentive forces at
17	those levels.
18	Q But from reading the Benning
19	records, you can't tell?
20	A Specifically from the
21	specification, they do not mention
22	numbers, but, again, from someone
23	experienced in the art, knowing these
24	materials and their performances, you
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) would probably say pretty good assuran@squireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 178 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 178 of 207

Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi
2	that they more than likely would fall
3	within those ranges. But, again, it is my
4	opinion based on my experience.
5	Q But you would say that reading
6	Benning that is not disclosed there?
7	MR. SPENDLOVE: Objection.
8	Asked and answered.
9	Q You can answer.
10	A I don't believe they mentioned
11	retentive forces in Benning.
12	Q Okay.
13	In the Belau reference
14	MR. COLES: Let me strike that.
15	Q In your opinion, does Belau
16	disclose "the retaining forces between
17	said mechanical closure means and said
18	outer face of said main part are lower
19	than retaining forces between said
20	mechanical closure means and said outer
21	face of said side parts in said front
22	area" as required by Claim 1 of '788
23	Patent?
24	A Again, I think we discussed that
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) before, I don't think that specific EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 179 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 179 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 language is included in the specification 3 of Belau. Specifically, however, it 4 5 certainly is implied by the design of the construction of the -- we'll call it 6 targeted acquisition, targeted engagement 7 material that they describe, and the 8 9 implication that by varying the embossed 10 patterns, they can vary the properties of 11 that material. 12 And from reading the Belau 0 13 reference, can you tell whether or not the connection means will connect to the side 14 15 parts and retain the diaper on the wearer? Without knowing specifically the 16 Α embossed patterns that are used for these 17 18 side parts, the ones that are extended, 76B and -- 76B, it is hard to determine 19 20 exactly what those retentive forces are. 21 However, when you read the patent as a 22 whole, what it is telling someone that's 23 skilled in the art is by varying the embossed definition of this material, you 24 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 can vary that force. EsquireSolutions.com

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 180 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 180 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479
1	Jezzi			
2	So whether this particular			
3	embodiment meets that or not, their			
4	teaching basically says that you can			
5	modify that and get those retentive forces			
б	to be different.			
7	Q In your opinion, does the Goates			
8	reference disclose "the retaining forces			
9	between said mechanical closure means and			
10	said outer face of said main part are			
11	lower than the retaining forces between			
12	said mechanical closure means and said			
13	outer face of said side parts in the front			
14	area" as required by '788 Patent, Claim 1?			
15	A In the declaration, we use			
16	Goates to anticipate Beckert '788. And as			
17	I learned, it did not include all the			
18	types of descriptions of that particular			
19	patent.			
20	However, when you look at Goates			
21	in combination with the other patents we			
22	cited, it becomes obvious that those			
23	combinations of patents would basically			
24	predict the claims that are made in 800.211.DEPO (3376)			
25	Beckert '788. EsquireSolutions.com			

SESQUIRE SUCCESS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 181 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 181 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

Γ

Jezzi
Q Are you saying that Goates in
and of itself does not show that claim
element of '788 Patent, Claim 1?
A I mentioned Goates does not
include specific retention forces, but I
think covers most every other
characteristic that was described in
Beckert.
Q Is there anything about your
testimony you want to change, correct or
amplify?
A No, not really.
MR. COLES: Okay. I have no
more questions. Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MR. SPENDLOVE: I have just a
couple of follow-up questions,
Mr. Jezzi.
EXAMINATION BY
MR. SPENDLOVE:
Q First of all, we appreciate your
being here. I know that Mr. Coles has
asked you a wide range of very specific
800.211.DEPO (3376) questions that has tested your memory æsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 182 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 182 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi			
2	your ability to hunt and find in the			
3	patents, and we appreciate the work that			
4	you have done on those. I would like to			
5	follow up on a couple of things.			
6	First of all, I would like to			
7	look at the Goates patent, if we could.			
8	and We talked about			
9	previously here today, we talked about			
10	your declaration in paragraph 44. If you			
11	could pull that open as well, please.			
12	A Okay.			
13	Q One of the things you talk about			
14	in paragraph 44 that Goates discusses is			
15	the active fastening portions.			
16	Do you recall discussing those?			
17	A Okay.			
18	Q Would one of skill, in your			
19	opinion, would one of ordinary skill in			
20	the art understand that those active			
21	fastening portions could be placed on the			
22	side parts of the diaper?			
23	A Yes. And I think I have said			
24	that repeatedly through the deposition,			
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) that the degree of overlap that occurs EsquireSolutions.com			

SESQUI RE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 183 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 183 of 207

Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

Γ

1	Jezzi				
2	from the side parts or the ears or side				
3	panels on a diaper is completely dependent				
4	on the child or the patient or the wearer.				
5	And so depending on the correct size or				
6	fit, it is very possible that these may				
7	overlap and go against themselves, and in				
8	many cases people do that.				
9	Q So if we look at Column 10 of				
10	the Goates patent, if you would, please.				
11	If you look at we're looking about line				
12	15. The last sentence in the paragraph				
13	there on line 15, it says, "For example,				
14	an attachment panel can be located on the				
15	outer cover."				
16	Do you see that?				
17	A Excuse me, Column 10, line 15?				
18	Q Yes, line 15.				
19	A "Alternatively at least one				
20	attachment panel not shown."				
21	Is that the line?				
22	Q 913.				
23	A 913.				
24	Q Right. Column 10, line 15. It				
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) should say, "For example, an attachmentEsquireSolutions.com				
	-				



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 184 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 184 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 can be located on the outer cover." 3 Α This one here? 4 Ο Yes. 5 Did you find the sentence I'm 6 talking about there? 7 Α Okay. "Alternatively at least one attachment panel not shown. 8 May 9 suitably be located on the diaper, 20, to 10 which the active fastening portions, 62 11 and 64, of the fastening members, 60 or 61, on the ears, 34, 134, are confirmed to 12 13 engage. For example, an attachment panel can be located on the outer cover." 14 15 See that? 16 Ο Your understanding of that 17 sentence that says, "For example, an 18 attachment panel can be located on the 19 outer cover", as one of ordinary skill in the art, would they take that to mean that 20 21 an attachment panel can only be located on 22 the outer cover? 23 MR. COLES: Objection. Form. No, not really. Based on other 24 Α 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 publications, the attachment panel can Esquire Solutions.com

ESQUIRE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 185 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 185 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 located either on the outer cover or even 3 on the side parts. 4 Q We can turn to the Karami --5 Specifically, you know, Karami Α 6 demonstrates that as well as Shingu. 7 Q Okay. If we can turn to the Karami 8 9 '772 application, this is the one that was marked as Exhibit 1015. If we could turn 10 to using, for example, Figure 7. 11 12 Okay. Α 13 0 And we discussed this previously if you remember today, and there are 14 15 several parts here. There is a 230L. 16 Do you see that? 17 Yes. Α 18 Q And what is that? What is that 19 in this figure? MR. COLES: Objection to form. 20 21 0 Go ahead and answer. 22 Α I can answer? 23 0 Yes. 24 Basically that is an equivalent Α 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 of a side part that is made to stick EsquireSolutions.com



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 186 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 186 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 beyond the main core area of the chasis. 3 Ο And would one of ordinary skill in the art understand that that could be a 4 5 separate side part? 6 Α Yes. And if you look, there is a 7 0 number 220 there at the top there. 8 9 What is that part of the 10 drawing? 11 Α That is basically considered the central portion of the chasis, which would 12 13 contain the absorbent core. And in this drawing, there is a 14 0 15 line between that 220 and 230. 16 Do you know who that line 17 represents? 18 Α Well, it is in the chart. Ιt 19 could mean a couple of things. 20 One, there could be another material that is the whole length of the 21 central absorbent core that forms that 22 23 line; it could be the leg cuffs; or it 24 could be the fact that the side parts, 231 800.211.DEPO (3376) and 232, are adhered to that main chas Esquire Solutions.com 25

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 187 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 187 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 central core. 3 0 So given what one of ordinary 4 skill in the art would understand, would 5 one of ordinary skill in the art 6 understand that it would be possible to have a side part that was attached to the 7 main body, for example, along that line? 8 9 MR. COLES: Objection to form. It is possible, yes. 10 Α 11 0 If we could turn to the Belau That's Belau '404, it is an 12 patent. 13 application, and it is marked as Exhibit 1005. 14 15 We've discussed this patent at length today also. If I could get you to 16 turn to Figure 6B, which I believe we 17 18 discussed earlier; is that correct? 19 Α Yes. In Figure 6B, looking at that 20 0 with the understanding of one of ordinary 21 skill in the art, if the rear side part or 22 23 ear, whatever is number 74 there --24 Α Yeah. 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 -- if that were pressed againesquireSolutions.com 0

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 188 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 188 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 the portion 76, the side part, would that 3 attach to portion 76? 4 MR. COLES: Objection to form. 5 Basically the mechanical hook Α 6 component of the side part, 74, more than likely, depending on the hook design 7 that's used, could attached to 76B. 8 9 Would one of ordinary skill in 0 10 the art understand how to choose materials 11 so that it would attach? 12 Α Basically there is a variety of 13 hook geometries and compositions with varied performance characteristics that 14 you could choose from, as well as you 15 could modify 76A and 76B with the various 16 embossed definitions that were discussed 17 18 in the patent to vary that property as 19 well. 20 0 There were a couple of times 21 throughout the day where Mr. Coles asked 22 you a question about what you had used a 23 reference for in your declaration. And in 24 response to a number of those, you replied 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 that the primary use was and then expanded and the spart of the second s

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 189 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 189 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 that primary use. 3 Do you remember those questions 4 and answers? 5 Α Yes. 6 Q When you said that the primary use was for, and then the explanation you 7 gave, did you mean that that was 8 9 exclusively what that patent taught or 10 could there --11 Α No. Basically --12 MR. COLES: Wait. Objection to 13 form. You have to give me a second to object. 14 15 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. 16 MR. COLES: You can answer the 17 question. 18 Basically many of these patents Α 19 covered a lot of the separate grounds and 20 separate claims that were covered in 21 Beckert '788. And we tried to combine them where they made more sense for 22 23 obviousness. So they covered various 24 parts of the Beckert '788, and all the 800.211.DEPO (3376) different independent as well as the 2 (EsquireSolutions.com 25



Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 190 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 190 of 207

Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 dependent claims. 3 0 And so for some of those other 4 parts, are those opinions set forth in 5 your declaration? 6 Α Repeat the question again so I can understand it. 7 8 For the additional elements that 0 9 you just talked about that may be shown in 10 these references, are those additional elements set forth in your declaration? 11 12 Are they additional? Α 13 MR. SPENDLOVE: Just strike that. That's fine. 14 15 One of the things that we 0 discussed today is the various cost of 16 17 materials. 18 What are the factors that go 19 into deciding which materials to use in a 20 diaper? Basically you have to look at 21 Α the overall cost of the product and how 22 23 you want to market it, and target price 24 the product, and what can the market bear, 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 consumer acceptance and performance. AsopuireSolutions.com

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 191 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 191 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1	Jezzi		
2	typically it is a juggling act as to where		
3	you decide to emphasize taking cost out or		
4	putting cost in. And that's why when Mr.		
5	Coles asked me the question, it basically		
6	varies and it basically varies by product		
7	developers as well as company.		
8	In some cases, you put more on		
9	with the side parts by making them, for		
10	instance, elastic, and take out cost by		
11	reducing the width of the main chasis or		
12	reducing the absorbent core.		
13	Other companies believe that		
14	absorbency is the most important property		
15	and they basically down gauge, reduce		
16	basis weights, therefore costs, on some of		
17	the other side components.		
18	So it really varies, and it is		
19	looked at on a case-by-case basis.		
20	MR. SPENDLOVE: I think that's		
21	all I have.		
22	MR. COLES: I want to follow up		
23	with a few questions.		
24	EXAMINATION BY		
25	MR. COLES: 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com		

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 192 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 192 of 207

Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

Γ

1	Jezzi			
2	Q Talking about the Karami '772			
3	reference.			
4	Are you there?			
5	A Yes.			
6	Q Mr. Spendlove referred you to			
7	Figure 7.			
8	A Okay.			
9	Q And he asked if the side parts,			
10	230L and 230R, could be adhered to the			
11	chasis.			
12	Do you remember that?			
13	A Yes.			
14	Q Okay.			
15	Does the Karami reference show			
16	the side parts being adhered to the			
17	chasis?			
18	A I would have to review it. I			
19	don't recall whether it does specifically			
20	talk about potentially attaching those			
21	side parts.			
22	Again, from someone skilled in			
23	the art, and this is I don't know if it			
24	is the right word to use extrinsic			
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) evidence, but there are patents that EsquireSolutions.com			

SESQUERE SOLUTIONS

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 193 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 193 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 Jezzi 2 describe attaching configurations like 3 this to the central core. And the rationale, if I recall those patents, is 4 5 that they basically interleave the right 6 and the left so that when they do the 7 cutout, you basically do not generate any waste material at all. And then you 8 9 attach actually the side panels not too 10 differently than is shown here after that 11 process of separating from a single web to 12 reduce waste. 13 So to someone like myself when I look at that and I'm asked whether it is 14 possible, the answer is yes, I think it is 15 16 possible, and that's how I answered the 17 question. 18 Whether Karami specifically 19 describes that, I would have to review it 20 carefully again, but I don't recall that it did. 21 22 Q Okay. 23 And Mr. Spendlove asked you a 24 question about the Belau patent. 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 Uh-huh. Α EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE: S O L U T F O N S

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 194 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 194 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

Г

1	Jezzi
2	Q I believe he asked you if the
3	closure means were pressed against the
4	element 76B, would it stick; is that
5	correct?
6	A Correct.
7	Q Is there anything in Belau that
8	would let you know whether or not the
9	retaining forces would be sufficient to
10	hold the hooks?
11	A I don't think they discuss that
12	in Belau, which was specifically retentive
13	forces. All I can say is, again, you
14	know, someone skilled in the art, looking
15	at this and what it teaches, I could
16	basically from obviousness make some
17	changes to what they are teaching and have
18	the hooks definitely engaged to those
19	portions.
20	MR. COLES: I have no further
21	questions. Thank you very much, Mr.
22	Jezzi.
23	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is
24	3:40 p.m. on August 15, 2013. This is
25	800.211.DEPO (3376) the end of tape number five and th EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 195 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 195 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

ARRIGO D. JEZZI August 15, 2013 MEDLINE INDUSTRIES v. HARTMANN AG 196 1 Jezzi 2 concludes the videotaped deposition of 3 Mr. Arrigo Jezzi. 4 5 6 7 ARRIGO D. JEZZI 8 9 Subscribed and sworn to 10 before me this day , 2013. 11 of 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com 25 ESQUIRE

> Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 196 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 196 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

BOO211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

ARRIGO D. JEZZI August 15, 2013 MEDLINE INDUSTRIES v. HARTMANN AG Jezzi ----- I N D E X ------WITNESS EXAMINATION BY PAGE ARRIGO D. JEZZI MR. COLES MR. SPENDLOVE MR. COLES)ESQUIRE

1		
2	CERTIFICATE	
3	STATE OF NEW YORK)	
4	: SS	
5	COUNTY OF NEW YORK)	
6	I, Adrienne M. Mignano, the	
7	reporter before whom the foregoing	
8	deposition was taken, do hereby certify that	
9	the witness whose testimony appears in the	
10	foregoing deposition was sworn by me; that	
11	the testimony of said witness was taken by	
12	me in machine shorthand and thereafter	
13	transcribed by computer-aided transcription;	
14	that said deposition is a true record of the	
15	testimony given by said witness; that I am	
16	neither counsel for, related to, nor	
17	employed by any of the parties in the action	
18	in which this deposition was taken; and	
19	further that I am not a relative or employee	
20	of any counsel employed by the parties	
21	hereto, or financially or otherwise	
22	interested in the outcome of this action.	
23	ADRIENNE M. MIGNANO	
24 25	Notary Public, State of New York, County of Suffolk. My Commission expires June 25, 2017. ID Number: 01M14968440	800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 198 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 198 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1 2 DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET 3 Our Assignment No. 336516 4 Case Caption: MEDLINE V HARTMANN Case IPR2013-00173 5 Patent U.S. 8,152,788 б 7 DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY 8 I declare under penalty of perjury 9 that I have read the entire transcript 10 of my deposition taken in the captioned 11 matter or the same has been read to me, 12 and the same is true and accurate, save 13 and except for changes and/or corrections, 14 if any, as indicated by me on the 15 DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET hereof, with the 16 understanding that I offer these changes 17 as if still under oath. 18 19 SIGNATURE DATE: 20 ARRIGO D. JEZZI 21 22 Subscribed and sworn to on the ____ day of _____, 20___ before me, 23 Notary Public, 24 in and for the State of 800.211.DEPO (3376) 25 EsquireSolutions.com

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 199 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 199 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1				
2	DEPOS	SITION ERRA	TA SHEET	
3	Page NoI to:	ine No	Change	
4	Reason for			
5	change:			
6	Page NoI	ine No	Change	
7	to: Reason for			
8	change:			
9	Page NoI to:			
10	Reason for change:			
11				
12	Page NoI to:		Change	
13	Reason for change:			
14				
15	Page NoI to:			
16	Reason for change:			
17				
18	Page NoI	ine No	Change	
19	Reason for change:			-
20				
21	Page NoI to:		Change	
22	Reason for change:			
23				
24	SIGNATURE:			
25		GO D. JEZZ	T	800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com
	FSOU			

ESQUIRE

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 200 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 200 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

1		
2	DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET	
3	Page NoLine NoChange	
4	to:	
5	Reason for change:	
6		
7	Page NoLine NoChange to:	
8	Reason for change:	
9		
10	Page NoLine NoChange to:	
11	Reason for change:	
12		
13	Page NoLine NoChange to:	
14	Reason for change:	
15 16 17	Page NoLine NoChange to: Reason for change:	
18 19 20	Page NoLine NoChange to: Reason for change:	
21		
22	Page NoLine NoChange to:	
23	Reason for change:	
24 25	SIGNATURE:DATE: ARRIGO D. JEZZI	800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com
	ESQUIRE	

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 201 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 201 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

ARRIGO D. JEZZI August 15, 2013 MEDLINE INDUSTRIES v. HARTMANN AG 199 1 DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET 2 3 Our Assignment No. 336516 4 Case Caption: MEDLINE v HARTMANN Case IPR2013-00173 Patent U.S. 8,152,788 5 6 7 DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY 8 I declare under penalty of perjury 9 that I have read the entire transcript 10 of my deposition taken in the captioned 11 matter or the same has been read to me, 12 and the same is true and accurate, save 13 and except for changes and/or corrections, 14 if any, as indicated by me on the 15 DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET hereof, with the 16 understanding that I offer these changes 17 as if still under oath. 18 19 09-11-2013 SIGNATURE DATE: 20 21 Subscribed and sworn to on the // 22 day of MBER, 20/3 before me 23 THEEVER IMBERI Notary Public, PA COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA in and for the State 24 of Notarial Seal Kimberly A. Sheevers, Notary Public Lower Merion Twp., Montgomery County My Commission Expires Aug. 13, 2017 IEMBER, PENNSYLVANIA ASSOCIATION OF NOTARIES 25 800.211.DEPO (3376)

> Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 202 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 202 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

EsquireSolutions.com

Г

1		
2	DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET	
3	Page No. <u>15</u> Line No. <u>9</u> Change to: "converter, against Kimberly Clark, Kueppe	٣॥
4	Reason for change: correct misspelling of name	-
5	change. <u>correct minipperring of name</u>	
6	Page No. <u>32</u> Line No. <u>7</u> Change to: "And there is an airlaid paper"	
7	Reason for	
8	change: correct misspelling	
9	Page No. <u>34</u> Line No. <u>11</u> Change to: "project in new airlaid nonwoven"	
10	Reason for	
11	change: correct misspelling	
12	Page No. 34 Line No. 16 Change	
13	to: <u>"airlaid nonwoven technology?"</u> Reason for	
14	change: <u>correct misspelling</u>	
15	Page No. 34 Line No. 18 Change	
16	to: <u>"And what was this new airlaid"</u> Reason for	
17	change: correct misspelling	
18	Page No. 34 Line No. 21 Change	
19	to: <u>"below it. It was an airlaid again using"</u> Reason for	
20	change: correct misspelling	
21	Page No. 40 Line No. 16 Change	
22	to: <u>"different geometry holes to creat</u> e a" Reason for	
23	change: correct mistranscription/misstatement	
24	SIGNATURE: Mine D. Logge DATE: 04-11-2013	
25	ARRIGO D. JEZZI	
	ESQUIRE	800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 203 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 203 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

August 15, 2013 201

1 2 DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET 3 Page No. 41 Line No. 16 Change to: "transferred back up to Neenah, Wisconsin as" 4 Reason for 5 change: correct place name 6 Page No. 42 Line No. 13 Change 7 to: "tape landing zone non-woven transfer layer" Reason for change: correct mistranscription/misstatement 8 9 Page No. 48 Line No. 9 Change 10 to: "A <u>Paragon Trade Brands implode</u>d" Reason for change:correct mistranscription/misstatement 11 12 Page No. 50 Line No. 13 Change 13 to: "with Procter & Gamble, which Kimberly" Reason for 14change: correct name spelling 15 Page No. 51 Line No. 15 Change to: "infringement and invalidity. We did write freedom" 16 Reason for change: correct mistranscription/misstatement 17 18 Page No. 68 Line No. 7 Change "and the sides of the web that bracket the Z 19 to: Reason for direction of the web, the top and bottom of that" change: clarification 20 21 Page No. 72 Line No. 21 Change to: "A 22 The quote is basically Datta." Reason for change: correct mistranscription 23 24 SIGNATURE: 0734 DATE: 09-11-2-13 ARRIGO D 25 ESOUIRE 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

> Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 204 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 204 of 207

Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

August 15, 2013 201 (cont.1)

1 2 DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET 3 Page No. 72 Line No. 22 Change to: "Q When you say "Datta", you mean a 4 Reason for change: correct mistranscription 5 6 Page No. 85 Line No. 12 Change 7 to: "combination with the hook that is specified, so" Reason for 8 change: correct mistranscription/misstatement 9 Page No. 89 Line No. 21 Change 10 to: "specification, were on the main body. But" Reason for change: correct mistranscription 11 12 Change Page No. 107 Line No. 6 13 to: "pattern on spunbond to make it the loop" Reason for change: correct mistranscription 1415 Page No. 107_Line No. 21_Change 16 to: <u>"number 5858515, paragraph 009."</u> Reason for change: correct mistranscription/misstatement 17 18 Page No. 132 Line No. 4 Change to: "mentioned." 19 Reason for change: correct mistranscription 20 21 Page No. <u>139</u> Line No. <u>4</u> Change to: <u>"A They can, they cannot; it is</u>" 22 Reason for change:correct mistranscription/misstatement 23 24 SIGNATURE: Amicel Contraction DATE: 09-11-2013 ARRIGO D. JEZZI 25 ESOUIRE 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

> Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 205 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 205 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

August 15, 2013 201(cont.2)

1		
2	DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET	
3		
4	Page No. <u>144</u> Line No. <u>13</u> Change to: <u>"A No, but they could. Basically</u> 40"	
5	Reason for change: clarification/correct mistranscription	
6		
7	Page No. <u>153</u> Line No. <u>11</u> Change to: <u>"was done by modifying the silicon</u> ization o	fa"
8	Reason for change: <u>correct mistranscription/misstatement</u>	
9		
10	Page No. <u>160</u> Line No. <u>11</u> Change to: <u>"they probably would bracket that,</u> but"	
11	Reason for change: clarification/correct mistranscription	
12	Dens No. 1 to 1 to 2 the	
13	Page No. <u>162</u> Line No. <u>2</u> Change to: <u>"are existing materials that will have</u> "	
14	Reason for change: clarification/correct misstatement	
15	Dece No. 100 Line No. o. Charges	
16	Page No. <u>162</u> Line No. <u>3</u> Change to: <u>"extreme probability to encompass"</u> Reason for	
17	change: clarification/correct misstatement	
18	Dage No. 162 Line No. 9 Change	
19	Page No. <u>163</u> Line No. <u>8</u> Change to: <u>"more money, you take money from Reason for or places in the product, so"</u>	other materials
20	change: <u>clarification</u>	
21	Page No. 166 Line No. 11 Change	
22	to: <u>"We did not cite specific words on</u> the" Reason for	
23	change: correct mistranscription/misstatement	
24	SIGNATURE: Amira Bite: 9/1/2	
25	ARRIGO D. JEZZI	
	A ECOUDE	
{		300.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 206 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 206 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479

ARRIGO D. JEZZI MEDLINE INDUSTRIES v. HARTMANN AG	August 15, 2013 201(cont.3
1	
2 DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET	
3	
Page No. <u>167</u> Line No. <u>8</u> Change 4 to: <u>"Shingu disclosed a diaper where the side"</u>	
Reason for 5 change: <u>correct mistranscription</u>	
6	
Page No. <u>189</u> Line No. <u>8</u> Change 7 to: <u>"that's used, could attach to 76B.</u> " Reason for	
8 change: correct mistranscription	
9	
Page NoLine NoChange 0 to:	
Reason for 1 change:	
2	
Page NoLine NoChange to: Reason for	
change:	
5	
Page NoLine NoChange to: Reason for	
/ change:	
3	
Page NoLine NoChange to: Reason for	
change:	
Page NoLine NoChange	
Reason for change:	
SIGNATURE: <u>Miel</u> DATE: <u>09-11-1</u> 613 ARRIGO D. JEZI	
	0.211.DEPO (3376) quireSolutions.com

Paul Hartmann AG Exhibit 2005, Page 207 Medline v. Hartmann Case IPR2013-00173 A COLLEGE

ļ,

HARTMANN Exhibit 2001 - Page 207 of 207 Attends Healthcare v. HARTMANN - IPR2020-01479