

3  
4 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
5 BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES  
6

7  
8 Patent Interference 105,394 MPT  
9 Technology Center 1600  
10

11  
12 PAOLO PEVARELLO, MARIO VARASI,  
13 PATRICIA SALVATI and CLAES POST,  
14

15 Patent 6,306,903,  
16 Junior Party,  
17

18 v.  
19

20 NANCY C. LAN, YAN WANG,  
21 and SUI XIONG CAI,  
22

23 Application 10/429,764,  
24 Senior Party.  
25

26  
27 *Before: FLEMING, Chief Administrative Patent Judge, McKELVEY,*  
28 *Senior Administrative Patent Judge, and SCHAFER, HANLON, LANE and*  
29 *TIERNEY, Administrative Patent Judges.*  
30

31 *McKELVEY, Senior Administrative Patent Judge.*  
32

33 **MEMORANDUM OPINION and ORDER**

34 The interference is before an expanded panel for consideration of a  
35 portion of LAN MOTION 1 TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE (Paper 67). The  
36 portion of the MOTION before us involves objections to the admissibility of  
37 evidence based on alleged violations of the Cross Examination Guidelines.

1 Objections based on other grounds are before the motions panel (Judges  
2 Hanlon, Lane and Tierney).

3 Lan suggests that "the Patent Bar needs clarification as to whether \*\*\*  
4 [certain action] falls inside or outside \*\*\* the Guidelines." Lan Motion 1,  
5 page 10. We agree and take this opportunity to address practice under the  
6 Guidelines. We also address issues associated with testimony related to how  
7 direct testimony affidavits are created and signed.

8  
9

### **A. Historical perspective**

10

#### 1. Rules

11 Patent interferences have been part of patent practice since the 1800's.  
12 For a long time, direct testimony was by deposition. See, e.g., 37 CFR  
13 § 1.272(a) (1984); Rivise & Caesar, Interference Law and Practice, Vol. 3,  
14 § 408 (1947) (Patent Office rules provide that the testimony of witnesses in  
15 this country may be taken by deposition); Rivise, Interference Practice,  
16 § 128 (1932) (testimony is taken in the form of deposition). Cross  
17 examination occurred at the deposition. Affidavit testimony could be used  
18 only by agreement of the parties. 37 CFR § 1.272(c) (1984).

19 In 1984, the rules were amended to permit the party presenting  
20 testimony to elect to present direct testimony by deposition or affidavit.  
21 37 CFR § 1.672(b) (1985). If direct testimony was presented in affidavit  
22 form, cross examination was authorized. *Id.*

23 In 1995, the rules were again amended and for the first time required  
24 that direct testimony be presented by affidavit. 37 CFR § 1.672(a). The  
25 only exception was testimony which is compelled by subpoena under  
26 35 U.S.C. § 24. Cross-examination of testimony presented in affidavit form  
27 was authorized. 37 CFR § 1.672(d) (1995).

1           The practice adopted in 1995 was recodified in 2004 as 37 CFR  
2 § 41.157(a) (2005). *See* 69 Fed. Reg. 49960, 50017 (Aug. 12, 2004).

3  
4                   2. Experience with presentation of direct testimony

5           Experience with affidavit testimony has convinced us that it is the  
6 most efficient way to have direct testimony presented to the Board. It is true  
7 that occasionally "live" testimony occurs in special circumstances when  
8 requested by the Board. However, from a practical point of view testimony  
9 is generally presented via affidavits and deposition transcripts, *i.e.*, on  
10 "paper."

11           When a motion is filed, the moving party must serve all of its  
12 evidence in support of the motion. The evidence may include one or more  
13 affidavits. Before the opponent determines whether cross examination  
14 would be appropriate, the opponent has before it all of the moving party's  
15 evidence. An opponent has complete "discovery" of the case-in-chief of the  
16 moving party, a luxury an opponent ordinarily would not enjoy in a trial in a  
17 court. Additionally, the opponent chooses the order in which witnesses are  
18 cross examined. 37 CFR § 41.157(c)(2) (2006). Since the opponent has the  
19 entire case-in-chief on any given motion before cross examination begins,  
20 numerous objections have been avoided compared to when testimony was  
21 presented in piece-meal deposition fashion. One example of an objection  
22 rarely raised is relevancy based on a "lack of foundation" *e.g.*, when a first  
23 witness is testifying about a test run by a second witness who has not yet  
24 testified.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Fed. R. Evid. 104(b).

1 Pre-1998 experience with deposition transcripts involving both direct  
2 testimony or cross examination showed that often considerable discussion  
3 about the objection took place. The objections and discussion made it very  
4 difficult to consider a deposition transcript on its merits. Often by the time  
5 one sifted through the objections and associated discussion one lost track of  
6 what question was asked. Additionally, there is little doubt from our point  
7 of view that through the objection and subsequent discussion process,  
8 "witness coaching" was alive and well in pre-1998 interferences.

9  
10 3. Establishment of the guidelines

11 Some time after creation of the Trial Section in 1989, an opinion came  
12 to our attention which had been authored by the late U.S. District Judge  
13 Robert S. Gawthrop, III of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of  
14 Pennsylvania. *Hall v. Clifton Precision, a Division of Litton Systems, Inc.*,  
15 150 F.R.D. 525 (E.D. Pa. 1993). In his opinion, Judge Gawthrop  
16 summarizes difficulties with deposition practice. As a result, an order  
17 was entered in *Hall* setting out guidelines governing future depositions.  
18 150 F.R.D. at 531-532.

19 Despite differences in practice before the Board in interference cases  
20 and practice under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Judge Gawthrop's  
21 deposition experience in large measure mirror ours. Rather than reinvent a  
22 set of guidelines, the Trial Section adopted seven guidelines relying heavily  
23 on those adopted by Judge Gawthrop, taking into account of course  
24 differences in practice between interferences and civil actions. Our  
25 guidelines are essentially those which appear in *Hall*. We recommend that  
26 the practicing bar read Judge Gawthrop's opinion because the deposition  
27 philosophy expressed in his opinion was adopted by the Trial Section—now

1 the Trial Procedures Section of the Trial Division. Many questions  
2 which the bar may have are answered in Judge Gawthrop's opinion.  
3 Fundamentally, however, it should be remembered that a deposition is an  
4 opportunity for an opposing counsel to have a conversation with the witness:  
5 "A deposition is meant to be a question-and-answer conversation between  
6 the deposing lawyer and the witness. There is no proper need for the  
7 witness's own lawyer to act as an intermediary, interpreting questions,  
8 deciding which questions the witness should answer and helping the witness  
9 to formulate answers." 150 F.R.D. at 528, col. 1.

10  
11 **B. Application of the Guidelines to the facts of this case**

12 A review of the transcripts of the cross examination depositions of  
13 Dr. Stephen G. Waxman (Ex 1026 and Ex 1027) and Dr. Sergio Mantegani  
14 (Ex 1077) reveals at least the following.

15  
16 (1) Stipulation with respect to objections

17 Counsel stipulated that "failure to state the basis for \*\*\* [an] objection  
18 does not constitute a waiver of that objection \*\*\*." Ex 1026:4:16-18. *See*  
19 *also* Ex 1027, page 4:2-5.

20 The stipulation is contrary to Guideline [3]. Any objection to the  
21 admissibility of evidence during cross examination must be stated concisely  
22 and in a non-argumentative and non-suggestive manner and *must include the*  
23 *legal basis for the objection.*

24 A first reason for a requirement for a legal basis for an objection is to  
25 permit the deposing lawyer to ask additional questions or rephrase a question  
26 to overcome the objection. A second reason is to make it efficient for the  
27 Board to consider and resolve any objection which is renewed in a motion to

1 exclude filed pursuant to 37 CFR § 41.155(c) (2006). If no legal basis is  
2 given at the time a "blanket" objection is made, then the objecting lawyer  
3 may be able to prevail on a motion to exclude if there is any reason to  
4 exclude. An ability to present multiple grounds for a blanket objection in a  
5 motion to exclude burdens both the opponent and the Board and is  
6 inconsistent with a just, speedy and inexpensive resolution of the  
7 interference. 37 CFR § 41.1(b) (2006).

8         It may be that counsel in this case felt that the stipulation was  
9 necessary to avoid even an appearance of witness coaching. However,  
10 Guideline [3] expressly requires that a legal basis be stated. Any legal basis  
11 for an objection must be based on the rules governing admissibility of  
12 evidence for contested patent cases, including the Federal Rules of  
13 Evidence. 37 CFR §§ 41.151-41.153 (2006).

14         Examples of suitable objections with a legal basis include:

- 15                 Objection, hearsay.<sup>2</sup>
- 16                 Objection, document not authenticated.<sup>3</sup>
- 17                 Objection, leading.<sup>4</sup>
- 18                 Objection, beyond the scope of the direct testimony.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Fed. R. Evid. 802.

<sup>3</sup> Fed. R. Evid. 901.

<sup>4</sup> Fed. R. Evid. 611(c). Leading questions ordinarily are permitted on cross examination. Leading questions ordinarily are not permitted on re-direct. Since direct testimony is presented by affidavit, issues concerning leading questions on direct do not arise in interference cases.

<sup>5</sup> Fed. R. Evid. 611(b). Counsel for Lan properly followed the Guidelines on re-direct during the deposition of Pevarello's witness Dr. Sergio Mantegani: "Objection. It's beyond the scope of cross examination." Ex 1077, page 72:10-11.

1 Following the objection, there is no need for an explanation by the  
2 questioning lawyer as to why an objection lacks merit. What is important is  
3 that the questioning lawyer be made aware why an objection has been made.  
4 The time and place to explain why an objection lacks merits is in an  
5 opposition to a motion to exclude. 37 CFR § 41.155(c) (2006) (motion to  
6 exclude); 37 CFR § 41.122(a) (2006) (opposition to motions). Obviously, if  
7 a motion to exclude is never filed a discussion becomes unnecessary.

8  
9 (2) Blanket objections

10 During the depositions, "blanket" objections stating no basis for the  
11 objection were made to questions by the questioning lawyer. Motions to  
12 exclude based on blanket objections will not be considered because blanket  
13 objections during a deposition fail to comply with Guideline [3].

14 Examples of blanket objections include the following.

15 1.

16 [By counsel for Lan]: Other than your declaration that's been  
17 submitted in this interference as Exhibit 2003, can you recall every testifying  
18 about sodium channel blockers in written testimony.

19 [By counsel for Pevarello]: Objection. Ex 1026, page 14:24 through  
20 page 15:2.

21  
22 2.

23 [By counsel for Lan]: Are there any other documents that you recall  
24 thinking about in connection with this interference?

25 [By counsel for Pevarello]: Objection. Ex 1026, page 21:14-17.

26  
27 3.

28 [By counsel for Lan]: Can you think of any other specific documents?

1 [By counsel for Pevarello]: Objection.

2 [Witness]: None that come to mind. Ex 1026, page 23:4-8.

3

4 4.

5 [By counsel for Lan]: Well you said well what I would do is X. And  
6 I'm wondering if there are other ways that what you would do?

7 [By counsel for Pevarello]: Objection.

8 [Witness]: Sure. Ex 1026, page 52:22 through page 53:2.

9

10 5.

11 [By counsel for Pevarello on redirect]: Yes, in addition to the  
12 information presented in the LAN applications, what further information  
13 would you need in order to be able to say that a person skilled in the art  
14 would believe that the component would be likely to be useful as a local  
15 anesthetic?

16 [By counsel for Lan]: Objection. Ex 1027, page 29:16-22.

17

18 6.

19 [By counsel for Lan]: Did you arrive at the Maastricht conference on  
20 Sunday?

21 [By counsel for Pevarello]: Objection. Ex 1077, page 49:15-17.

22

23

24 (3) Improper objections and discussion

25 During the course of the depositions, improper objections and  
26 associated discussion occurred.

27 Examples include the following.

28

29 1.

1 [By counsel for Lan]: I'm simply trying to learn what your  
2 understanding of a patent interference is?

3 [Witness]: I'm not trying to be vague.

4 [By counsel for Pevarello]: Objection. Was there a question there?  
5 Ex 1026, page 25:14-18.

6  
7 It is up to the witness, not opposing counsel to ask for a clarification.  
8 See Guideline [1]. The record in this case shows that a witness is capable of  
9 asking for clarification: "Excuse me. Could you rephrase your question?"  
10 Ex 1077, page 112:22-23.

11  
12

2.

13 [By counsel for Lan]: Did you ever correspond with Newron's  
14 attorneys via e-mail?

15 [Witness]: No.

16 [By counsel for Lan]: Via fax?

17 [Witness]: No.

18 [By counsel for Pevarello]: When you are asking Newron's attorneys,  
19 I'm not sure if—I'm not sure it's clear exactly what you're talking about.  
20 Ex 1026, page 44:23 through page 45:5.

21  
22

23 Counsel for Pevarello may have been confused about a question  
24 which was asked. But, it is not up to counsel for Pevarello to note any  
25 confusion. It is up to the witness to indicate that the witness is confused.  
26 See Guideline [1]. As hard as it may be for defending counsel to believe it,  
27 sometimes when counsel is confused the witness is not. Reproduced in  
footnote 1 of the Guidelines is an observation by Judge Gawthrop:

1 I also note that a favorite objection or interjection of lawyers is,  
2 "I don't understand the question, therefore the witness doesn't  
3 understand the question." This is not a proper objection. If the  
4 witness needs clarification, the witness may ask the deposing  
5 lawyer for clarification. A lawyer's purported lack of  
6 understanding is not a proper reason to interrupt a deposition.  
7 In addition, lawyers are not permitted to state on the record  
8 their interpretations of questions, since those interpretations are  
9 irrelevant and often suggestive of a particularly desired answer.

10  
11 150 F.R.D. at 530 n.10. There can be no objection under the contested cases  
12 rules or the Federal Rules of Evidence that a question is ambiguous, not  
13 clear or vague. Furthermore, by clarifying what is perceived as a vague  
14 question, the defending lawyer may help the questioning lawyer make out a  
15 case for the questioning lawyer's client! Often the less said the better. If a  
16 vague question is asked, any answer may be entitled to little, or no, weight if  
17 at the end of the day the question cannot be understood by the trier of fact.

18 3.

19 [By counsel for Lan]: I'm trying to understand what you mean when  
20 you say the general concept of developing a new sodium channel blocker  
21 that would be useful for the treatment of pain.

22 [By counsel for Pevarello]: Objection.

23 [By counsel for Lan]: That wasn't the question.

24 [By counsel for Pevarello]: That was my objection. Ex 1026,  
25 page 51:14-21.

26  
27 It is hard to imagine why the objection was made.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

4.

[By counsel for Lan]: So is it fair to say that there are multiple ways of developing a new sodium channel blocker that would be useful for treatment of pain?

[By counsel for Pevarello]: Objection

[Witness]: It's fair and unfair. And by that what I mean is there are multiple ways, but some of them are not feasible in our society.

[By counsel for Lan]: Can I ask you what the basis of your objection is?

[By counsel for Pevarello]: Yeah, I think it's ambiguous when you're talking about developing new sodium channel and also linking that with the issue of usefulness. It's not clear whether you're talking just developing the chemical as opposed to determining its usefulness. I think it's ambiguous as to exactly what you are asking when you are saying developing it that would be useful. Ex 1026, page 53:18 through page 54:10.

\*\*\*

[By counsel for Lan]: Did you consider any other dates in formulating the opinions that are set forth in your declaration?

[By counsel for Pevarello]: Objection.

[By counsel for Lan]: Mr. Baker, may I ask you why you're objecting.

[By counsel for Pevarello]: Yeah, when you said did you consider any other dates, it wasn't clear whether you meant other than 1998 or other than the two dates referred to in paragraph 22 that you've been asking him about. The paragraph talks both about '97 and '98. It was ambiguous when

1 you said other dates, what you meant by other. Other than what? Ex 1026,  
2 page 71:15 through page 72:8.

3 \*\*\*

4 [By counsel for Lan]: The question was: In your opinion, does a  
5 person skilled in the art, as you've used that phrase in paragraph 43 of your  
6 declaration, differ from a person of ordinary skill in the art?

7 [By counsel for Pevarello]: Objection.

8 [By counsel for Lan]: May I ask the basis for your objection?

9 [By counsel for Pevarello]: Yeah. When you're asking about a person  
10 of ordinary skill in the art, it's not clear whether you are talking about in  
11 general or as he's used that second phrase somewhere else in some other  
12 paragraph in the declaration. Ex 1026, page 90:22 through page 91:8.

13  
14 Here we have three examples of a first error compounded by a second  
15 error re-compounded by a third error. *First*, there should not have been a  
16 blanket objection; rather a legal basis must accompany an objection.  
17 *Second*, consistent with the stipulation (as discussed earlier, the stipulation  
18 itself is yet another error) counsel for Lan should not have asked counsel for  
19 Pevarello the basis for the objection. *Third*, as pointed out earlier, what is  
20 ambiguous to counsel for Pevarello is irrelevant—the witness must state that  
21 the witness is confused. All the discussion by counsel for Pevarello as to  
22 why the questions are supposedly ambiguous was unnecessary and contrary  
23 to the Guidelines.

24  
25

5.

26 [By counsel for Lan]: Would you like to clarify this point in your  
27 declaration by modifying --.

1 [Witness]: Well I mean another way of saying it and perhaps a clearer  
2 way of saying it is an expert in this field would have required evidence  
3 and—so if that's clearly, certainly that's—that's what I mean.

4 [By counsel for Lan]: Is it clearer to you? It's your declaration. I --.

5 [By counsel for Pevarello]: I –

6 [By counsel for Lan]: Please don't coach the witness. Please --.

7 [By counsel for Pevarello]: You are trying to encourage the witness  
8 to change his declaration.

9 [By counsel for Lan]: I'm asking the witness if he would like to  
10 change his declaration.

11 [By counsel for Pevarello]: He doesn't need to change his declaration  
12 just to suit you. If he feels he needs to, he can do that.

13 [By counsel for Lan]: I'm asking him if he feels he needs to.

14 [By counsel for Pevarello]: Then ask him. Ex 1026, page 74:9  
15 through 75:4.

16  
17 In this instance, counsel for Lan is attempting to determine if there is  
18 something in the declaration of the witness which the witness would like to  
19 change or clarify. However, at the point where counsel for Pevarello  
20 says "I –", counsel for Pevarello is "side tracking" the deposition, and  
21 probably coaching the witness.

22 The response by counsel for Pevarello that you're trying to get the  
23 witness to change his direct testimony is out of order. *First*, there is nothing  
24 wrong on cross examination to inquire into whether a witness would like to  
25 reconsider and possibly change or otherwise clarify direct testimony. It  
26 happens all the time. A witness with an open mind is often willing to  
27 change or clarify direct testimony. If a witness be so advised, change or

1 clarification is to be encouraged. *Second*, the remark by counsel for  
2 Pevarello that the witness does not have to change his declaration "just to  
3 suit you" is not appropriate. Apart from being a violation of the Guidelines,  
4 it crossed the line of the decorum rule. 37 CFR § 41.1(c) (2006). The  
5 contest is *Pevarello v. Lan*, not *Counsel for Pevarello v. Counsel for Lan*.  
6 The whole discussion was a side show apart from the main event—the main  
7 and possibly the only event being an opportunity for counsel for Lan to have  
8 a discussion with the witness.

9  
10

6.

11 [By counsel for Lan]: I would like to make sure that something on the  
12 transcript appears correctly. Earlier I had asked you do you mean an expert.  
13 And the transcript reads: You need to be an expert to do it right. Is that  
14 what you said?

15 [Witness]: If it says it on the transcript, then I said it.

16 [By counsel for Lan]: Is that your testimony?

17 [By counsel for Pevarello]: Well let me clarify when he said that, he  
18 was posing as a hypothetical. I think it should have a question mark at the  
19 end of that statement.

20 [Witness]: I don't --.

21 [By counsel for Pevarello]: Rather than a hypothetical. Rhetorical. I  
22 suppose it's a rhetorical question he was asking himself in answering your  
23 question. Ex 1026, page 77:19 through 78:10.

24

25 When a defending lawyer attempts to clarify what the witness said,  
26 the defending lawyer has determined that the Board's Guidelines do not  
27 apply. The lawyer takes over control of the case from the Board. However,

1 it is the Board which controls proceedings before it—not the parties or their  
2 lawyers. We cannot efficiently administer a case management process  
3 whereby our rules and established procedures, such as the Guidelines, are  
4 jettisoned to serve some interest of a lawyer. Fortunately, Dr. Waxman—an  
5 independent expert hired by Pevarello—deserves considerable credit for his  
6 ability to have stayed above the fray instigated by counsel for Pevarello.

7  
8

7.

9 [By counsel for Lan]: Earlier when I asked you what you meant by  
10 viable therapeutic window, you stated in part, so you want the window to be  
11 such that there's room for little bit of variation or error without getting you  
12 patients in trouble.

13 [Witness]: Certainly as you move toward the clinical world, you need  
14 to do that. Now ...

15 [By counsel for Pevarello]: I'm going to object because there's no  
16 question pending. Ex 1026, page 117:16-25.

17

18 The objection is highly inappropriate. "I'm going to object because  
19 there's no question pending" translated into plain English means "Do not say  
20 anything more." If ever there was an example of improper coaching, this is  
21 it. There was a question pending and apparently the witness was not done  
22 answering the question when counsel, in effect, told the witness to "Shut  
23 up!" It is perfectly appropriate *prior to* a deposition to prepare a witness and  
24 to remind the witness "Answer just the question which is asked and do not  
25 volunteer." Once the deposition starts, the defending lawyer can no longer  
26 "prepare" the witness for the deposition. After the "derailment" when

1 testimony resumed, it seems as though the witness again was able to stay  
2 above the fray.

3  
4

8.

5 [By counsel for Lan]: Is it your understanding the PDR [Physician's  
6 Desk Reference] includes relevant warnings, hazards, contraindications, side  
7 effects and precautions for prescription drugs?

8 [By counsel for Pevarello]: Objection.

9 [Witness]: That is my understanding.

10 [By counsel for Lan]: What is the basis for the objection? Did I  
11 misread something?

12 [By counsel for Pevarello]: No. It's a question of whether the PDR is  
13 complete including all information about the items you mentioned or are you  
14 asking whether it's supposed to –

15 [By counsel for Lan]: I didn't say "all." I said includes relevant  
16 warning, hazards.

17 [By counsel for Pevarello]: I think you said "any relevant warnings,  
18 hazards," et cetera.

19 [By counsel for Lan]: Transcript says, I believe, "it's supposed to  
20 include that information."

21 [By counsel for Pevarello]: Because it wasn't clear, that was the basis  
22 of my objection. Ex 1027, page 14:21 through page 15:19.

23  
24

25 The exchange is precisely the kind of exchange which the Guidelines  
26 seek to keep out of deposition transcripts. The objection by counsel for  
27 Pevarello based on alleged vagueness was not proper. After the witness  
answered the question asked by counsel for Lan, the "What is the basis for



1 [By counsel of Lan]: You don't remember that. And just so I  
2 understand, you don't remember that, but you remember specific questions  
3 asked at a poster presentation ten years ago; is that correct?

4 [By counsel for Pevarello]: Objection. Ex 1077, page 105:17-22.

5  
6 Given the surrounding context (not reproduced in this opinion) in  
7 which these "Objections" were made one reasonably could determine that  
8 witness coaching took place.

9  
10 (4) Objections to the form of the question

11 In the second deposition of Dr. Stephen Waxman, counsel "stipulated  
12 that all objections are reserved until the time of trial, except those objections  
13 as are directed to the form of the question." Ex 1027, page 4:2-5.

14 We have already addressed the need for a reason to be stated when an  
15 objection is made during a deposition. There are two other concerns we  
16 have concerning the stipulation quoted above.

17 *First*, "until the time of trial" makes no sense in the context of an  
18 interference. Cross-examination during a deposition is the "trial" in an  
19 interference. After the deposition, there is no subsequent trial where a  
20 witness is further cross examined "live" as might occur in a Federal court.  
21 An objection is either made during the deposition or it is waived—period.

22 *Second*, in patent interference practice before the Board, there is no  
23 such thing as an objection to the form of the question. We recognize from  
24 our law school days and from reading transcripts of depositions and trials in  
25 cases before Federal and State courts that objections to the "form of the  
26 question" may be made in at least some of those courts. However, whatever  
27 the practice in Federal and State courts, there is no objection under our rules

1 or the Federal Rules of Evidence based on the "form of the question." An  
2 objection to the form of the question should not be made in patent  
3 interference cases.

4  
5 (5) Re-occurring objections and disagreements during depositions

6 Judge Gawthrope notes in *Hall*:

7 They [, i.e., counsel,] should comport themselves accordingly;  
8 should they be tempted to stray, they should remember that this  
9 judge is but a phone call away.

10 150 F.R.D. at 531, col. 1.

11 The administrative patent judge assigned to manage an interference  
12 also is "but a phone call away."

13 When redirect and recross of Dr. Sergio Mantegani took place, a  
14 dispute arose as to whether a certain line of testimony was beyond the scope  
15 of both direct and cross examination. Many objections based on questions  
16 being leading were also made. Ex 1077, page 68:22 (starting at 13:11 hours)  
17 through page 92:16 (ending at 13:45 hours). The situation is a classic  
18 example of when a deposition should be suspended and a phone call placed  
19 to the judge. Guideline [2]; STANDING ORDER, ¶ 10.5 (Jan. 3, 2006).  
20 Any phone conversation involving counsel and the judge can be made of  
21 record during the deposition since a court reporter is available.

22  
23 **C. Cross examination concerning preparation of direct testimony**

24 At the beginning of cross examination of Dr. Stephen Waxman and  
25 Dr. Sergio Mantegani, attempts were made by counsel for Lan to inquire  
26 into the "details" of how the Waxman and Mantegani direct declaration  
27 testimony came into existence.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

(1) Waxman declaration

What follows are paraphrases of questions asked of Dr. Waxman.

Who wrote the Waxman declaration? Ex 1026, page 38:10.

Approximately how many versions of the declaration were reviewed?

Ex 1026, page 38:18.

Did you suggest changes to the declaration as submitted to you?

Ex 1026, page 38:20-21.

Did the attorney suggest changes? Ex 1026, page 38:23-24.

Do you have any drafts of your declaration? Ex 1026, page 39:1-2.

Do you recall specific changes made to your declaration? Ex 1026,

page 39:21-22.

Do you recall changes suggested by the attorney? Ex 1026,

page 41:6-7.

Can you give me an example of what you say is the attorney's

phraseology? Ex 1026, page 42:15-16 and page 43:9-10.

Were there any topics which the attorneys suggested be included in

your declaration? Ex 1026, page 44:12-13.

How many meetings did you have with the attorneys? Ex 1026,

page 44:15-22.

Did you correspond with the attorneys? Ex 1026, page 45:8.

Did you have telephone discussions with the attorney about drafts of

your declaration? Ex 1026, page 47:12-18.

Did you ever e-mail the attorneys? Ex 1026, page 48:6.

(2) Mantegani declaration

What follows are paraphrases of questions asked of Dr. Mantegani.

Who wrote your declaration? Ex 1077, page 35:8.

1 Did you have a discussion with your attorney before a draft of the  
2 declaration was prepared? Ex 1007, page 35:10-11.

3 Did you make any changes to any language of any draft declaration?  
4 Ex 1077, page 36:15-16.

5 How was the declaration sent to you? Ex 1077, page 41:25 through  
6 page 42:2.

7  
8 (3) Discussion

9 The questions set out above generally are a waste of time, both for the  
10 witness and the Board.

11 *First*, it does not matter how a declaration for direct testimony is  
12 prepared, who suggested what, what changes were made, how drafts and the  
13 final declaration were transmitted to a witness for signature, etc. If a witness  
14 signed a declaration, a good starting point is to presume that the witness  
15 agrees with the content of the declaration apart from who wrote it and how  
16 many changes were made or why they were made. We can advise the bar  
17 that (1) we assume that ordinarily an attorney prepares at least the first draft  
18 of a declaration after discussion with the witness, (2) the witness is probably  
19 paid for time involved in testifying, either because the witness is an outside  
20 expert or is employed by the real party in interest, (3) drafts, possibly  
21 numerous drafts, are created and revised through discussions between the  
22 witness and the attorneys and (4) ultimately a draft is agreed to which is  
23 signed. We have no problem whatsoever with the process.

24 *Second*, a tension exists between (1) an inquiry into details of how a  
25 direct testimony declaration came to be prepared, on the one hand, and  
26 (2) both the attorney work product doctrine and attorney-client privilege, on  
27 the other hand. An attorney needs to be able to freely talk with a client

1 witness or a non-client witness to formulate a litigation strategy (or even to  
2 see if there is a case to present). After-the-fact cross examination inquiries  
3 into declaration preparation tend to chill an inquiry an attorney might  
4 initially make into what the facts are and who should testify concerning  
5 particular facts.

6 *Third*, what matters is what is said on the merits, *e.g.*,  
7 (1) identification of credentials, (2) explanation of an invention,  
8 (3) explanation of prior art, (4) explanation why an invention would not be  
9 expected to "work," (5) an underlying basis for opinions stated by experts  
10 and (6) events related to conception, diligence and actual reduction to  
11 practice. Cross examination to inquire into whether the witness has a basis  
12 for facts asserted and opinions stated in a declaration is fair game. Indeed,  
13 inquiry into facts and opinions should be the focus of cross examination.  
14 Obviously there will be cases where qualification of a witness and possible  
15 witness bias may need to be addressed and inquiry into these subjects is also  
16 fair game for cross examination. Cross examination which "sticks" to the  
17 relevant technical facts will shorten cross examination time and will  
18 probably be more effective in helping a party establish its position on a  
19 particular point.

20 We acknowledge that a majority of the Federal courts have apparently  
21 determined that under the Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2) documents and  
22 information disclosed to an expert in connection with the expert's testimony  
23 are discoverable by the opposing party. *See, e.g., In re Pioneer Hi-Bred*  
24 *Int'l, Inc.*, 238 F.3d 1370, 1375, 57 USPQ2d 1658, 1661 (Fed. Cir. 2001).  
25 An August 2006 report of the American Bar Association points out why an  
26 amendment to Rule 26(a)(2) to limit discovery would be in the public  
27 interest. See "Report" available at:

1 <http://www.abanet.org/litigation/standards>

2 then search for 120a.report. The Fed. R. Civ. P. do not apply in interference  
3 cases before our Board. Among reasons given in the Report for an  
4 amendment to limit discovery of expert communications with counsel are  
5 (1) counsel should be free to explore different theories and options in  
6 preparing a case, (2) an expert should be able to arrive at a carefully  
7 considered opinion by testing different hypotheses, permutations and  
8 calculations, (3) there is no evidence, empirical or otherwise which shows  
9 that discovery of work product information improves the quality of justice  
10 and (4) disclosure imposes unnecessary costs on the litigation process and  
11 advantages the well-heeled litigant who can afford two experts. All of these  
12 reasons are consistent with a limitation in patent interference cases for not  
13 permitting inquiry into how a direct testimony declaration was prepared and  
14 with the underlying philosophy governing contested cases. 37 CFR  
15 § 41.1(b) (2006).

16 In the future, absent a compelling reason, we counsel against any  
17 attempt to inquire on cross-examination into how direct testimony  
18 declarations came to be prepared.

19  
20 **D. Order**

21 Upon consideration of the record as set out above, and for the reasons  
22 given, it is

23 ORDERED that the interference is remanded to the panel for  
24 such action as it deems appropriate.

25

1	<u>/ss/ Michael R. Fleming</u>	)	
2	MICHAEL R. FLEMING	)	
3	<i>Chief Administrative Patent Judge</i>	)	
4		)	
5	<u>/ss/ Fred E. McKelvey</u>	)	
6	FRED E. MCKELVEY	)	
7	<i>Senior Administrative Patent Judge</i>	)	
8		)	
9	<u>/ss/ Richard E. Schafer</u>	)	
10	RICHARD E. SCHAFFER	)	
11	<i>Administrative Patent Judge</i>	)	
12		)	BOARD OF
13	<u>/ss/ Adriene Lepiane Hanlon</u>	)	PATENT
14	ADRIEN LEPIANE HANLON	)	APPEALS
15	<i>Administrative Patent Judge</i>	)	AND
16		)	INTERFERENCES
17	<u>/ss/ Sally Gardner Lane</u>	)	
18	SALLY GARDNER LANE	)	
19	<i>Administrative Patent Judge</i>	)	
20		)	
21	<u>/ss/ Michael P. Tierney</u>	)	
22	MICHAEL P. TIERNEY	)	
23	<i>Administrative Patent Judge</i>	)	
24		)	
25		)	
26		)	

1 cc (electronic filing):

2

3 Counsel for PEVARELLO:

4

5 Daniel M. Becker, Esq.

6 DECHERT LLP

7 1117 California Avenue

8 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1106

9 Daniel.becker@dechert.com

10 Ann.pease@dechert.com

11

12 Counsel for Lan:

13

14 Eldora L. Ellison, Esq.

15 STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC

16 1100 New York Avenue, N.W.

17 Washington, DC 20005-3934

18 eellison@skgf.com

19 jcovert@skgf.com

20