

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the *Inter Partes* Review of:

Trial Number: To Be Assigned

U.S. Patent No. 7,752,649

Filed: May 24, 1995

Issued: July 6, 2010

Inventor(s): John Christopher Harvey, James  
William Cuddihy

Assignee: Personalized Media  
Communications, LLC

Title: Signal processing apparatus and methods    Panel: To Be Assigned

---

Mail Stop *Inter Partes* Review  
Commissions for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**DECLARATION OF CHARLES NEUHAUSER UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.68 IN  
SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF  
U.S. PATENT NO. 7,752,649**

## Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Background and Qualifications .....	3
III.	Understanding of Patent Law .....	7
IV.	Background.....	9
	A. Summary of the '649 Patent.....	9
	1. Claim 39 .....	12
	2. Claim 54.....	13
	3. Claim 62.....	14
	4. Claim 67 .....	15
	B. Background of the Field Relevant to the '649 Patent .....	15
	C. Summary of the Prosecution History .....	23
V.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art.....	28
VI.	Broadest Reasonable Interpretation.....	30
	A. “digital television signals” .....	30
	B. “processor” .....	31
	C. “digital video signals” .....	31
	D. “cadence information” .....	32
VII.	Background on Prior Art References .....	33
	A. Background on Mustafa .....	33
	B. Background on Iijima.....	33
	C. Background on Campbell.....	34
	D. Background on Widergren .....	35

VIII. Claims 39, 54, 62, and 67 Are Invalid Over Mustafa .....	36
A. Independent Claims 39, 54, 62, and 67 are Obvious Based on Mustafa in View of the Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	37
1. Claim 39 is Obvious Over Mustafa in View of the Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	37
2. Claim 54 is Obvious Over Mustafa in View of the Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	55
3. Claim 62 is Obvious Over Mustafa in View of the Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	66
4. Claim 67 is Obvious Over Mustafa in View of the Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	70
IX. Claims 39, 54, 62, and 67 Are Invalid Over Mustafa In View Of Iijima.....	75
A. Iijima.....	75
B. The Combination of Mustafa and Iijima.....	77
C. Mustafa in view of Iijima Renders Claims 39, 54, 62, and 67 Obvious .....	81
1. Claim 39.....	82
2. Claim 54.....	83
3. Claim 62.....	84
4. Claim 67.....	85
X. Claims 39, 54, 62, and 67 Are Invalid Over Campbell.....	85
A. Independent Claims 39, 54, 62, and 67 are Obvious Based on Campbell in View of the Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	86
1. Claim 39 is Obvious Over Campbell in View of the Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	86

2.	Claim 54 is Obvious Over Campbell in View of the Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	109
3.	Claim 62 is Obvious Over Campbell in View of the Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	119
4.	Claim 67 is Obvious Over Campbell in View of the Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	123
XI.	Claims 39, 54, 62, and 67 Are Invalid Over Campbell In View Of Widergren .....	132
A.	Widergren .....	132
B.	The Combination of Campbell and Widergren.....	135
C.	Campbell in view of Widergren Renders Claims 39, 54, 62, and 67 Obvious .....	141
1.	Claim 39 .....	142
2.	Claim 54 .....	143
3.	Claim 62 .....	144
4.	Claim 67 .....	145
XII.	Secondary Considerations of Non-Obviousness .....	146
XIII.	Conclusion .....	149

I, Charles Neuhauser, Ph.D., do hereby declare as follows:

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1. I have been retained as an expert witness on behalf of Apple, Inc. (“Apple”) for the above-captioned Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (“IPR”) of U.S. Patent No. 7,752,649 (“the ’649 patent”). I am being compensated for my time in connection with this IPR at my standard consulting rate of \$400 per hour. My compensation is not affected by the outcome of this matter.
2. I have been asked to provide my opinions regarding whether or not Claims 39, 54, 62, and 67 of the ’649 patent (“the Challenged Claims”) are invalid as anticipated or would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the alleged invention.
3. The ’649 patent issued on July 6, 2010, from U.S. Patent Appl. No. 08/449,097 (“the ’097 application”), filed on May 24, 1995. (Ex. 1002 at cover). The ’649 patent alleges to be a continuation of a series of applications dating back to U.S. Patent Appl. No. 07/096,096 filed on September 11, 1987, now U.S. Patent No. 4,965,825 (“the ’096 Application”). The ’096 Application alleges to be a continuation-in-part of a series of applications dating back to U.S. Patent Appl. No. 06/317,519, now U.S. Patent No. 4,694,490 (“the ’519 Application”).

# 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.