

Filed on behalf of:

Microsoft Corporation and Microsoft Mobile Inc.

By: Daniel J. Goettle
John F. Murphy
Sarah C. Dukmen
Baker & Hostetler LLP
2929 Arch Street
Cira Centre, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Microsoft Corporation and Microsoft Mobile Inc.,

Petitioner

v.

Global Touch Solutions, LLC,

Patent Owner

IPR2015 – 01149

Patent 7,329,970

EXHIBIT 1012

DECLARATION OF MARK N. HORENSTEIN, PH.D., P.E.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|-------|--|----|
| I. | Introduction & Qualifications..... | 6 |
| II. | Materials Reviewed | 9 |
| III. | The Law | 10 |
| | A. Obviousness Analysis..... | 10 |
| | B. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art..... | 11 |
| | C. Objective Considerations..... | 12 |
| IV. | Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art | 12 |
| V. | Claim Construction..... | 14 |
| | A. “does not form a serial link” (claim 1 from which claims 3-5, 10-14, 19, 48, 49, and 51 ultimately depend) and “is not a serial link” (claim 52)..... | 14 |
| | B. “not connected to a mains supply” (claim 1 from which claims 3-5, 10-14, 19, 48, 49, and 51 ultimately depend) | 15 |
| VI. | Obviousness – Overview | 16 |
| VII. | Obviousness - Description of Prior-Art Jahagirdar Patent..... | 17 |
| VIII. | Obviousness – Description of Prior-Art Touch Sensor References..... | 24 |
| | A. Schultz..... | 24 |
| | B. Touch Sensors in the Prior Art Generally | 26 |
| IX. | Summary of Obviousness Opinions | 28 |

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| X. | Independent Claim 1 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz | 29 |
| | A. Jahagirdar taught the limitations of claim 1’s preamble, “An electronic module for use with a product comprising an energy consuming load and a power source or a connection to a power source, said module comprising a microchip, and a switch;” | 29 |
| | B. Recitation [a] of claim 1: Jahagirdar described “said switch being a user interface and does not form a serial link in a circuit that transfers power from the power source to power the load” | 31 |
| | C. Recitation [b] of claim 1: Jahagirdar taught “and said microchip controlling a luminous visible location indicator that is not the load” | 32 |
| | D. Recitation [c] of claim 1: Jahagirdar taught “a) wherein the visible indicator at least indicates a condition of the product upon receiving a signal from the user interface switch, and wherein the switch is a touch sensor type switch;” | 34 |
| | E. Recitation [d] of claim 1: Jahagirdar taught “b) wherein the visible indicator is activated at least to indicate an activation signal from the switch when the load is not activated;” | 43 |
| | F. Recitation [e] of claim 1: Jahagirdar taught “and c) wherein the visible indicator is also used to indicate a power level of the power source when the load is switched off and the product is not connected to a mains supply.” | 45 |
| XI. | Dependent Claim 3 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz | 48 |
| XII. | Dependent Claim 4 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz | 49 |
| XIII. | Dependent Claim 5 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz | 50 |

| | |
|--|----|
| XIV. Dependent Claim 10 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz | 53 |
| XV. Dependent Claim 11 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz | 54 |
| XVI. Dependent Claim 12 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz | 54 |
| XVII. Dependent Claim 13 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz | 55 |
| XVIII. Dependent Claim 14 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz | 56 |
| XIX. Dependent Claim 19 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz | 57 |
| XX. Dependent Claim 48 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz | 59 |
| XXI. Dependent Claim 49 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz | 60 |
| XXII. Dependent Claim 51 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz | 61 |
| XXIII. Independent Claim 52 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz | 62 |
| A. Jahagirdar taught the limitations of claim 52’s preamble, “A method of operating a product which includes a visible luminous indicator, an energy consuming load and a power source for powering the load, the method including the steps of” | 62 |
| B. Recitation [a] of claim 52: Jahagirdar described “operating a user interface switch, that is a touch sensor type switch which is not a serial link | |

in a circuit from the power source to the load to power the load, to control the operation of a microchip,”64

C. Recitation [b] of claim 52: Jahagirdar described “using the microchip to control the connection of the power source to the load and the activation of the indicator,”67

D. Recitation [c] of claim 52: Jahagirdar described “activate the indicator to show at least one of the following when the load is not activated: a condition of the product, an activation of the switch, and a power level of the power source.”68

XXIV. The Challenged Claims Would Have Been Obvious Under the Construction of “Energy Consuming Load” Advanced by Apple71

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.