

1
2 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
3 BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

4
5

 HTC Corporation,
6 HTC America, Inc.,
7 LG Electronics, Inc.,
8 Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., and
9 Samsung Electronics America, Inc.,
10 Petitioners

11 v.

12 Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC,
13 Patent Owner

14
15

 Case No. IPR2015-01500 (Patent 7,321,368 B2)
16 Case No. IPR2015-01501 (Patent 7,777,753 B2)
17 Case No. IPR2015-01502 (Patent 7,542,045 B2)
18

19
20

 DEPOSITION OF HAROLD S. STONE, Ph.D.

21 Washington, D.C.

22 March 17, 2016

23
24 Reported by: Mary Ann Payonk

25 Job No. 105102

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

March 17, 2016
9:00 a.m.

Deposition of HAROLD S. STONE, Ph.D.,
held at the law offices of Paul Hastings LLP,
875 15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.,
pursuant to Notice before Mary Ann Payonk,
Nationally Certified Realtime Reporter and
Notary Public of the District of Columbia,
Commonwealth of Virginia, States of Maryland
and New York.

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

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER and THE WITNESS:

ALLAN SOOBERT, ESQUIRE
PAUL HASTINGS
875 15th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
- and -

JOSEPH RUMPLER, ESQUIRE
1117 South California Avenue
Palo Alto, California 94304

ON BEHALF OF PATENT OWNER:

MICHAEL McBRIDE, ESQUIRE
AHMAD, ZAVITSANOS, ANAIPAKOS,
ALAVI & MENSING
1221 McKinney Street
Houston, Texas 77010

ON BEHALF OF HTC:

JOSEPH MICALLEF, ESQUIRE
SIDLEY AUSTIN
1501 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005

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

Appearances (Cont'd):

ON BEHALF OF LG:

AIDAN SKOYLES, ESQUIRE
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER
901 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001

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

H. Stone

THE REPORTER: Appearances for the
record?

MR. McBRIDE: Michael McBride from
AZA on behalf of Parthenon Unified
Memory Architecture LLC.

MR. SOOBERT: Good morning. Allan
Soobert from Paul Hastings LLP on behalf
of the petitioner generally and the
Samsung entities more specifically, and
the witness. Along with me from Paul
Hastings is Joe Rumpler.

MR. MICALLEF: Joe Micallef, Sidley
Austin, for HTC.

MR. SKOYLES: Aidan Skoyles from
Finnegan Henderson for LG.

HAROLD S. STONE,

called as a witness, having been duly
sworn, was examined and testified as
follows:

EXAMINATION

BY MR. McBRIDE:

Q. Good morning, Dr. Stone. How are you
doing this morning?

A. Good morning. I'm fine.

1 H. Stone
 2 MR. SOOBERT: I just want to note
 3 an objection for the record. We weren't
 4 served -- petitioner was not served with
 5 a deposition notice pursuant to the
 6 Patent Office rules. We object to that
 7 and reserve any relief as appropriate
 8 under the rules.
 9 MR. McBRIDE: Okay, I'll follow up
 10 with my office. I'm not sure what
 11 happened. Are we able to proceed,
 12 though?
 13 MR. SOOBERT: Sure.
 14 BY MR. McBRIDE:
 15 Q. So I guess I'll dive into the most
 16 important issue. Are you aware of today's
 17 date?
 18 A. Yes, I am.
 19 Q. And you're aware it's St. Patrick's
 20 Day?
 21 A. Yes, I am.
 22 Q. Are you wearing green, sir?
 23 A. No, but my wife's maiden name is
 24 Murphy.
 25 Q. Okay. Well, I'll leave the

1 H. Stone
 2 aerospace industry and I went to research.
 3 That was Stanford Research Institute.
 4 Q. How long were you at Boeing?
 5 A. Oh, just a few months. I -- it was
 6 not a good match. I really was a researcher.
 7 Q. Okay. And -- and so after Boeing,
 8 you said you went where?
 9 A. Stanford Research Institute. They're
 10 in Menlo Park, California.
 11 Q. And what did you do while you were at
 12 Stanford Research Institute?
 13 A. I did research in computers of
 14 various kinds and published papers and worked
 15 on grants.
 16 Q. You said "computers of various
 17 kinds." What -- what do you mean by that?
 18 What -- what kind of computers?
 19 A. I was looking into parallel
 20 computers, computers with -- today, we would
 21 call it intelligent memory where the logic was
 22 built into the -- into the memory. Those are
 23 the two that come to mind.
 24 Q. Any others come to mind?
 25 A. Any other computers?

1 H. Stone
 2 sanctioning to your counsel to enforce during
 3 the next break. That's all right. I'm not
 4 either, so --
 5 So I'd like to -- to begin just sort
 6 of talking about -- a little bit about your
 7 background. Do you mind sort of telling me --
 8 let's start with your education, where you went
 9 to school.
 10 A. Sure. I was an undergraduate at
 11 Princeton University with a degree in
 12 electrical engineering in 1960. I graduated
 13 summa cum laude.
 14 I received a master's and Ph.D. from
 15 the University of California at Berkeley, both
 16 in electrical engineering, the master's in 1961
 17 and the doctorate in 1963.
 18 Q. Any postdoctorate education, any
 19 other degrees?
 20 A. No -- no degrees after that.
 21 Q. Let's move on to your sort of work
 22 history. Following your Ph.D. in 1963, what
 23 did you do next?
 24 A. Well, my first position was a brief
 25 one at Boeing. I decided not to stay in the

1 H. Stone
 2 Q. Or, yeah, any other --
 3 A. Any other research?
 4 Q. Yeah. Let's start with that. Well,
 5 let's start with computers. Any other
 6 computers that come to mind?
 7 A. Those were the two main things.
 8 Q. And then any other sort of fields of
 9 research that come to mind?
 10 A. I was working in what was called
 11 cellular logic, and that was a forerunner of
 12 integrated circuits.
 13 The -- the work went along a line
 14 that is very much like PL -- programmable logic
 15 arrays today. So I would say it's a forerunner
 16 of programmable logic arrays.
 17 Q. Just curious. How -- how did they
 18 differ? What was the -- what separates a
 19 programmable logic array from the cellular
 20 logic?
 21 A. Well, our -- our cellular logic was
 22 basically our -- our vision of what became
 23 programmable logic arrays. It -- it had a
 24 layout, a rectangular layout as they do.
 25 Perhaps the -- the interconnection

1 H. Stone

2 structure that we used and the means of
3 programming is -- is different from what
4 evolved. We had to visualize what the future
5 technology was like. And I don't know that we
6 got it right or wrong; we just had something
7 that's different from what evolved.

8 Q. Okay. So I have parallel computing,
9 intelligent memory, cellular logic. Anything
10 else? I guess we can keep this while you were
11 at Stanford Research Institute.

12 A. That's right, right. I did work in
13 design automation.

14 Q. And what is design automation?

15 A. Software for the development of
16 computers. My design automation software did
17 layouts for automatic wiring machines. Of
18 course, that's -- that's now obsolete, but it's
19 not -- not terribly different from the layout
20 that goes on at -- at some level of integrated
21 circuit manufacture today when you -- when you
22 lay out the wiring between transistors on a --
23 on a mask. So I was doing work that's related
24 to things that -- that happen today.

25 Q. Okay. Anything else you can think

1 H. Stone

2 of, or does that pretty much sum up in your
3 mind the -- the research projects, or at least
4 the main research projects at Stanford Research
5 Institute?

6 A. Those -- those are the ones that come
7 to mind now. There may be others. I don't --
8 don't mean to leave anything out, but those are
9 the ones that I can recall right now.

10 Q. Okay. And just -- just to fill in a
11 gap, at least in my notes, what years were you
12 at Stanford Research Institute?

13 A. 1963 to 1968.

14 Q. You mentioned that you published
15 papers. Do you recall, first off, how many
16 papers?

17 A. It would be in my vitae. I -- I
18 believe -- I can't count right now. Let's say
19 on the order of half a dozen. But don't hold
20 me to that number, please.

21 Q. I -- I won't.

22 Generally speaking, do you recall the
23 subject matter of those papers?

24 A. I do. One was on cellular logic.
25 One was called "A Logic-in-Memory Computer."

1 H. Stone

2 That was on logic and memory. One was on
3 software for a parallel computer. Those are
4 three that come to mind.

5 Q. Would it be accurate to say that your
6 papers mirror the research that you were doing
7 at the time?

8 A. It would be accurate. There may be
9 some -- some research that was not covered by
10 papers published in that time.

11 Q. Okay. Other than computer research
12 and publishing papers, I mean, would you say
13 that there was any other kind of different
14 category of thing you did at Stanford Research
15 Institute?

16 A. I wrote grant proposals.

17 Q. And what does that involve?

18 A. I responded to requests for quote
19 where typically a government agency was looking
20 for work to be done in particular areas, and I
21 was part of a team, usually the -- one or two
22 or three people would get together and write up
23 a response and bid for the work.

24 Q. Okay. So what -- what sort of work
25 were you bidding for?

1 H. Stone

2 A. I remember one grant request was from
3 NASA.

4 Q. The National?

5 A. National Aeronautics and Space
6 Administration.

7 Q. Okay, the NASA. As opposed to Nassau
8 in the Bahamas.

9 A. NASA instead of Nassau.

10 Q. What was -- just really quickly, what
11 was that -- do you recall the subject matter of
12 that work?

13 A. That subject matter had to do with
14 some high-level changeable software that
15 they -- they were interested in software for
16 spacecraft, but being able to modify it after
17 launch. I think that's -- that's what comes to
18 mind. I may not have that exactly accurate.

19 Q. Okay. Do you recall any other sort
20 of grant proposal work that you did?

21 A. I know there were several. I don't
22 recall offhand what they were.

23 Q. So at the time of Stanford Research
24 Institute between year 1963 and 1968, did any
25 of your work involve video decoding?

1 H. Stone

2 A. Indirectly, it did.

3 Q. How did it involve it indirectly?

4 A. I was working on something called the
5 fast Fourier transform.

6 Q. Would you mind taking a couple
7 minutes to describe fast Fourier transform?

8 A. Well, surely. Let's consider a
9 picture, an image, and when you represent that
10 image, you represent it as a set of numbers, as
11 an array of numbers. Each number represents a
12 color value. And for sake of argument, let's
13 suppose our image is 8 by 8, so there are 64
14 numbers.

15 It's well known in mathematics that
16 you don't need to use numbers for pixels to
17 represent that image. You can use frequencies.
18 So I'll explain it briefly, but if I can
19 transform those -- those numbers, those
20 integers of pixels into frequencies, I will get
21 exactly the same number of numbers. I will
22 have an array of 8 by 8, 64 numbers, each
23 representing a frequency.

24 Now let me explain what's happening.
25 Focus on someplace on the wall behind me, for

1 H. Stone

2 example, and you see a region. Think of that
3 as your 8 by 8 region with 64 numbers
4 representing those. Now erase that and look
5 again and look at the edges in this room. You
6 see there are edges along the walls, there are
7 edges along shadows and things like that. If
8 instead of looking at the pixels, the numbers
9 of the colors, I told you where the edges were
10 and told you where they were spaced, I could
11 reconstruct that whole picture --

12 Q. Okay.

13 A. -- just by the edges. By knowing
14 where the edges are and the relative spacing,
15 I'm telling you the frequencies that are
16 involved in that representation. So that's
17 what the -- Fourier -- fast Fourier transform
18 is a way of representing data, and I'm going to
19 use this term "edges" loosely. That's just at
20 a high level for you and me. It's more
21 accurate to say frequencies. But instead of
22 looking at the pixels themselves, I'm going to
23 tell you where the edges are and then you'll be
24 able to reconstruct the image. Okay?

25 So that's -- I was working on the

1 H. Stone

2 fast Fourier transform. And you're probably
3 wondering what that has to do with video
4 decoding, or I'm not sure if you want --

5 Q. I guess -- you're talking about like
6 video image. I -- I -- what was the -- what
7 was the project? Was it -- when you say you
8 were working on fast Fourier transform, would
9 you mind like kind of elaborating on what you
10 meant by that?

11 A. Yeah. The fast Fourier transform has
12 long been used in signal processing and image
13 processing. One of the important algorithms
14 that are widely used. I was working in
15 parallel processing. I wanted to build
16 machines or design or know how to build
17 machines that could do large amounts of
18 numerical computation.

19 The fast Fourier transform was an
20 obvious candidate to consider for such a
21 machine. So there were various algorithms to
22 do this and I was looking at algorithms and --
23 and machines that were particularly well-suited
24 to those algorithms to do things efficiently.

25 Q. Okay.

1 H. Stone

2 A. I'm not sure if I answered your
3 question about how this relates to image
4 processing.

5 Q. I think -- I think I -- I think it
6 does. I mean, I don't think I need to ask a
7 question on that. If you'd like to add
8 anything, feel free to.

9 A. I do.

10 Q. All right, go ahead.

11 A. An important aspect of image
12 processing today is compression, data
13 compression. And I've told you that if you
14 represent a number by pixels -- I mean an image
15 by pixels, you can also represent it by an
16 equal number of frequencies.

17 So by going into frequencies, you're
18 not changing the number of numbers you have,
19 but there's an important observation. If you
20 look around the room and look at adjacent
21 areas, they're all the same color more or less.
22 There are actually very few edges in an image
23 relative to the other pixels.

24 When you go into the frequency domain
25 where you use frequencies instead of pixels,

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.