Filed on behalf of:

Microsoft Corporation and Nokia 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 Nokia Inc.,

Petitioner

v.

Global Touch Solutions, LLC,

Patent Owner

IPR2015 – 01151

Patent 8,288,952

EXHIBIT 1014

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

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction & Qualifications 5

II. Materials Reviewed 7

III. The Law 9

A. Obviousness Analysis 9

B. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art 10

C. Objective Considerations 11

D. Claim Construction 11

IV. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art 12

V. Claim Construction 13

A. "the touch sensor functions" (claim 1, from which claims 2-4, 14, 16, 17, 19, and 22-24 ultimately depend) and "the touch sensing functions" (claim 26, from which claims 27 and 38-40 ultimately depend) 13

VI. Obviousness – Overview 16

VII. Obviousness - Description of Prior-Art Jahagirdar Patent 17

VIII. Obviousness – Description of Prior-Art Touch Sensor References 20

A. Schultz 20

B. Touch Sensors in the Prior Art Generally 22

IX. Summary of Obviousness Opinions 24

X. Independent Claim 1 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz 25

A. Jahagirdar taught the limitations of claim 1's preamble, "A method for implementing a user interface of a product, the product comprising a

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

power source, or a connection for a power source and at least one energy consuming load, said method including the step of" 25

B. Recitation [a] of claim 1: Jahagirdar combined with Schultz renders obvious "using an electronic module comprising an electronic circuit including a microchip and a touch sensor. . . said microchip. . . implementing the touch sensor functions" 27

C. Recitation [b] of claim 1: Jahagirdar taught "activating a visible indication . . . [to provide] information . . . on at least one… [of]: a state or condition of the product, location of the user interface, a battery power level indication." 37

XI. Dependent Claim 2 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz 39

XII. Dependent Claim 3 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz 39

XIII. Dependent Claim 4 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz 40

XIV. Dependent Claim 14 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz 42

XV. Dependent Claim 16 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz 43

XVI. Dependent Claim 17 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz 45

XVII. Dependent Claim 19 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz 46

XVIII. Dependent Claim 22 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz 47

XIX. Dependent Claim 23 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz 49

XX. Dependent Claim 24 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz 49

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

XXI. Independent Claim 26 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz 51

A. Jahagirdar taught the limitations of claim 26's preamble, "An electronic module for use with a product, the product comprising a power source or a connection for a power source, and at least one energy consuming load" 51

B. Limitation [a] of Claim 26: Jahagirdar combined with Schultz renders obvious "said module comprising . . . a microchip and a touch sensor . . . said microchip . . . implementing the touch sensing functions" 52

C. Limitation [b] of Claim 26: Jahagirdar described "activate[s] a visible indication . . . [to provide] information . . . on at least one… [of]: a state or condition of the product, a location of the user interface, a battery power level indication" 61

XXII. Dependent Claim 27 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz 63

XXIII. Dependent Claim 38 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz 64

XXIV. Dependent Claim 39 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz 65

XXV. Dependent Claim 40 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz 66

XXVI. The Challenged Claims are also invalid even if "the touch sensor functions" and "the touch sensing function" mean "functions controlled by the touch sensor" 66

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

I. Introduction & Qualifications

I, Mark N. Horenstein, declare as follows:

1. I understand that Microsoft Corporation ("Microsoft") and Nokia Inc. ("Nokia") are petitioning the Patent Office for an *inter partes* review of claims 1-4, 14, 16, 17, 19, 22-24, 26, 27, and 38-40 of U.S. Patent No. 8,288,952 ("'952 patent"). I have been retained by the Petitioners, Microsoft and Nokia, to offer technical opinions relating to the '952 patent and certain prior-art references relating to its subject matter. I understand that an *inter partes* ("between the parties") review begins with a petition for review made by third parties like Microsoft and Nokia and responded to by the owner of the patent.

2. I am a Professor of Electrical Engineering in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering at Boston University, where I have been a faculty member since 1979. I also have held various other positions at Boston University, including the Associate Dean for Graduate Programs and Research for the College of Engineering (1999-2007), Associate Chair for Undergraduate Programs for the ECE Department (1990 – 1998 and 2012 – present), as well as appointments at the rank of Associate Professor (1985-2000) and Assistant Professor (1979-1985).

3. I have a Ph.D. in Electrical Engineering from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), which I earned in 1978 while working in the

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.