

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

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

- - - - -x

LG ELECTRONICS, INC.; LG :
ELECTRONICS USA, INC.; LG :
ELECTRONICS MOBILECOMM USA, INC. : Case No.
vs. : IPR2015-01984
CORE WIRELESS : Patent No.
- - - - -x 8,434,020

LG ELECTRONICS, INC.; LG :
ELECTRONICS USA, INC.; LG :
ELECTRONICS MOBILECOMMUSA, INC. : Case No.
vs. : IPR2015-01985
CORE WIRELESS : Patent No.
- - - - -x 8,713,476

Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, September 7, 2016

Deposition of:

SCOTT DENNING

Called for oral examination by counsel for LG
Electronics, pursuant to notice, at the law
offices of Greenberg Trauig, 1750 Tysons
Boulevard, Suite 1000, McLean, Virginia, before
Denise M. Brunet, RPR, a Notary Public in and for
the Commonwealth of Virginia, beginning at
9:58 a.m., when were present on behalf of the
respective parties:

1 of executing multiple applications simultaneously,
2 typically. In a monolithic software architecture,
3 there is only one program running ever.

4 Q I believe you said in Blanchard there are
5 functions for contacts, dialing a phone and text
6 messages; is that accurate?

7 A I believe that's what I said.

8 Q And do you believe it's accurate that a
9 person of ordinary skill in the art would
10 understand that the phone in Blanchard had
11 functions for dialing the phone, sending text
12 messages and displaying contacts?

13 MR. HELGE: Object to form.

14 THE WITNESS: Well, Blanchard itself
15 never goes into details of exactly what is
16 implemented where. You can just kind of look at
17 the figures and determine some of the things that
18 he had in mind that would be implemented with this
19 invention.

20 BY MR. BROWN:

21 Q Well, if you look at figure 3, for
22 example -- actually, let's back up. Let's start

1 with figure 2. Figure 2 shows a phone, correct?

2 A Yes.

3 Q And using the phone shown in figure 2, a
4 person of ordinary skill in the art would
5 understand that you could call a phone number.

6 A Yes.

7 Q And you could receive a phone call,
8 correct?

9 A Yes.

10 Q So those would be functions available
11 within the phone in Blanchard?

12 MR. HELGE: Object to form.

13 THE WITNESS: That is correct.

14 BY MR. BROWN:

15 Q To address your counsel's objection, is
16 it correct that dialing a phone number is a
17 function available within the phone in Blanchard?

18 MR. HELGE: Object to form.

19 THE WITNESS: Yes.

20 BY MR. BROWN:

21 Q And if you look at figure 3, there's a
22 series of screens, and one of them is marked 320.

1 that particular feature.

2 Q Didn't you describe that as a
3 subroutine --

4 A As I said before --

5 Q -- in your declaration?

6 A -- I'm not willing to say that every
7 single menu item has an associated subroutine.

8 Q But you're willing to say that some of
9 them do?

10 A Certainly some of them do.

11 Q And you are willing to say that every
12 menu item has some code that is called when the
13 item is selected?

14 A Yes.

15 Q Okay. Can you explain the distinction,
16 then, between having some code that is called and
17 having a subroutine?

18 A Well, a subroutine is a very specific
19 type of code that would be called. Blanchard
20 doesn't really speak about that. And Blanchard is
21 intentionally silent about the software
22 architecture altogether.

1 example of what is done with the '020 patent.

2 Q Prior to the filing of the '020 patent,
3 were both of those options known to a person of
4 ordinary skill in the art for use in a mobile
5 telephone?

6 MR. HELGE: Object to form.

7 THE WITNESS: Yes.

8 BY MR. BROWN:

9 Q Can you explain -- well, is it correct
10 that, in your opinion, one of those options might
11 satisfy the claims of the '020 and '476 patents,
12 but the other one would not?

13 MR. HELGE: Object to form.

14 THE WITNESS: Again, is there a part of
15 my declaration that you're referring to?

16 BY MR. BROWN:

17 Q Probably many parts. Let's go to
18 paragraph 53 on page 28. You say there, "As I
19 have explained above, Blanchard fails to disclose
20 any application...."

21 Do you see that?

22 A Yes.

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.