

EXHIBIT 13

DECLARATION OF MELODY DRUMMOND HANSEN IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT'S
RESPONSIVE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

Case No. 5:15-CV-02008-EJD

1 GEORGE A. RILEY (S.B. #118304) griley@omm.com
2 LUANN L. SIMMONS (S.B. #203526) lsimmons@omm.com
3 MELODY DRUMMOND HANSEN (S.B. #278786) mdrummondhansen@omm.com
4 O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
5 Two Embarcadero Center, 28th Floor
6 San Francisco, California 94111-3823
7 Telephone: (415) 984-8700
8 Facsimile: (415) 984-8701

9 RYAN K. YAGURA (S.B. #197619) ryagura@omm.com
10 XIN-YI ZHOU (S.B. #251969) vzhou@omm.com
11 BRIAN M. COOK (S.B. #266181) bcook@omm.com
12 KEVIN MURRAY (S.B. #275186) kmurray2@omm.com
13 O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
14 400 South Hope Street
15 Los Angeles, California 90071-2899
16 Telephone: (213) 430-6000
17 Facsimile: (213) 430-6407

18 Attorneys for Defendant
19 **APPLE INC.**

20 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
21 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
22 **SAN JOSE**

23 OpenTV, Inc., Nagravision, SA, and Nagra
24 France S.A.S.,

25 Plaintiffs,

26 v.

27 Apple Inc.,

28 Defendant.

Case No. 5:15-CV-02008-EJD

**DECLARATION OF STEPHEN
MELVIN, PH.D. IN SUPPORT OF
APPLE INC.'S RESPONSIVE CLAIM
CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

1 I, Stephen Melvin, hereby declare as follows:

2 **I. INTRODUCTION**

3 1. I have prepared this Declaration in connection with Apple Inc.'s Responsive Claim
4 Construction Brief, which is to be filed concurrently with this Declaration.

5 2. In the course of preparing this Declaration, I reviewed the '169 Patent, its prosecution file
6 history, Plaintiffs' Opening Claim Construction Brief (ECF 81), the Declaration of Dr. Kevin
7 Almeroth (ECF 81-15), as well as other documents discussed in this Declaration.

8 3. I have been retained by Apple Inc. ("Apple") as an expert in the fields of computer
9 science, computer communications, and related technologies. I am being compensated at my
10 normal consulting rate of \$445 per hour for my time. My compensation is not dependent on and
11 in no way affects the substance of my statements in this Declaration.

12 **II. QUALIFICATIONS**

13 4. I received a Ph.D. in Computer Science from the University of California at Berkeley in
14 1991 and a B.S. in Electrical Engineering and Computer Science from the University of
15 California at Berkeley in 1982. I have more than 30 years of experience in computer science and
16 computer engineering. I am an inventor on over 45 patents, and I am a registered patent agent
17 before the USPTO.

18 5. My Ph.D. research areas included high-performance computer architecture and
19 microarchitecture and microcode-based system performance analysis tools. From September
20 2001 through April 2002, I was a Visiting Scholar at the University of Texas, Austin, where I
21 directed graduate students in research in the area of high-performance computer architecture.

22 6. In May 2001, I co-founded and was the Chief Architect of Flowstorm, Inc., a start-up
23 company based in Silicon Valley, where I defined and guided the overall chip architecture for a
24 multithreaded packet processor. From March 2000 through May 2001, I worked as the Senior
25 CPU Architect at Clearwater Networks, where I was involved in defining the architecture and
26 microarchitecture of Clearwater's CNP810S multithreaded network processor.

27 7. From August 1983 to the present, I have been the President of Zytek Communications
28 Corporation ("Zytek"). Zytek is an engineering, consulting, and small-scale manufacturing

1 company that currently provides intellectual property consulting services as well as services
2 related to the design, implementation, and testing of embedded systems. Zytek's general areas of
3 activity have included industrial control and measurement, Internet-related services, hard disk
4 analysis and file recovery, and computer engineering research services. Through my work at
5 Zytek, I have designed numerous microprocessor-based embedded systems, including analog and
6 digital circuit design, firmware development for embedded microcontrollers, and software
7 development for host interfacing, product development, and debugging.

8 8. I am a member of the following professional organizations: The Institute of Electrical and
9 Electronics Engineers (IEEE); The Association for Computing Machinery (ACM); The American
10 Intellectual Property Law Association (AIPLA); The Intellectual Property Owners Association
11 (IPO); and The National Association of Patent Practitioners (NAPP).

12 9. I served as General Chair of the 45th Annual International Symposium on
13 Microarchitecture (Micro-45), held in Vancouver in December of 2012. I also served as co-chair
14 of the 29th Annual International Symposium on Microarchitecture (Micro-29), held in Paris in
15 December of 1996.

16 10. For further details regarding my employment and academic history, please refer to my
17 curriculum vitae, attached to this Declaration.

18 **III. RELEVANT LAW**

19 11. I have been informed and understand that claim construction is a matter of law and that
20 the final claim constructions for this proceeding will be determined by the Court.

21 12. I am not an attorney. For the purposes of this Declaration, I have been informed about
22 certain aspects of the law that are relevant to my opinions. Some of those understandings of the
23 law are summarized below.

24 13. I understand that claim terms are generally given their plain and ordinary meaning to one
25 of skill in the art when read in the context of the specification and the prosecution history.

26 14. I have been informed and understand that a claim is indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2
27 if it fails to "inform those skilled in the art about the scope of the invention with reasonable
28 certainty." *Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.*, 134 S. Ct. 2120, 2129-30 (2014).

1 15. I have been informed and understand that, for means-plus-function limitations, the court
2 must determine the claimed function and then identify the structure in the written description that
3 clearly links or associates that structure to the function recited in the claim. *Noah Sys., Inc. v.*
4 *Inuit Inc.*, 675 F.3d 1302, 1311-12 (Fed. Cir. 2012). I have also been informed and understand
5 that the disclosure of the corresponding structure must be adequate—the patent’s specification
6 must provide an adequate disclosure showing what is meant by the claim language—and thus a
7 means-plus-function clause is indefinite if a person of ordinary skill in the art would be unable to
8 recognize the structure in the specification and associate it with the corresponding function in the
9 claim. *Id.* at 1312. Finally, I have been informed and understand that, where a general purpose
10 computer or microprocessor is claimed for specialized functions that cannot be accomplished
11 absent specialized programming, sufficient structure must be disclosed in the form of computer
12 algorithms. *Id.* at 1311-18.

13 16. I have been informed and understand that a dependent claim must further limit the subject
14 matter claimed. 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 4.

15 **IV. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART**

16 17. Based on my review of the ’169 Patent and my background and experience in the field of
17 computer science, it is my opinion that one of ordinary skill in the art as of the priority date would
18 be someone with a bachelor’s degree in computer science, computer engineering, or the
19 equivalent, plus approximately two years of experience in the field of computer engineering or
20 software development, or an equivalent amount of relevant work and/or research experience.

21 18. I have been informed and understand that claim construction is viewed from the
22 perspective of a person of ordinary skill in the art in question at the time of the claimed invention.
23 The ’169 Patent was filed on April 21, 2003 and claims priority to a provisional application filed
24 on April 19, 2002. I have been informed that Plaintiffs may claim an invention date as early as
25 June 2001. I have been asked to assume for purposes of this Declaration that this is the time of
26 the claimed invention the ’169 Patent. However, the opinions I expressed in this report would be
27 the same if I applied a priority date of April 19, 2002 (the provisional filing date of the ’169
28 Patent) or April 21, 2003 (the actual filing date of the ’169 Patent).

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.