

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEALS BOARD

APPLE INC.
Petitioner

v.

PERSONALIZED MEDIA COMMUNICATIONS, LLC
Patent Owner

Case No.: IPR2016-00755
Patent No.: 8,191,091

**DECLARATION OF ANTHONY J. WECHSELBERGER
IN SUPPORT OF
PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE &
PETITIONER'S OPPOSITION TO PATENT OWNER'S CONTINGENT
MOTION TO AMEND**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Opinions In Support of Petitioner’s Reply.....	2
A.	PMC and Dr. Weaver’s Arguments Regarding Frezza.....	2
B.	PMC and Dr. Weaver’s Arguments Regarding Block.....	3
II.	Substitute Claims Are Not Supported By The ’507 Application	5
A.	Substitute Claims 32-36 Are Not Supported by the ’507 Application	5
B.	Substitute Claims 37-40 Are Not Supported by the ’507 Application	9
C.	Substitute Claims 41-43 Are Not Supported by the ’507 Application	10
III.	Substitute Claims 32-43 Are Unpatentable Over Guilhousen	12
A.	Substitute Claim 32 Is Obvious Over Gilhousen	12
B.	Substitute Claim 33 Is Obvious Over Gilhousen	17
C.	Substitute Claim 37 Is Obvious Over Gilhousen In View of Campbell	17
D.	Substitute Claims 34 and 39 Are Obvious Over Gilhousen	21
E.	Substitute Claims 35 and 38 Are Obvious Over Gilhousen	21
F.	Substitute Claims 36 and 40 Are Obvious Over Gilhousen	21
IV.	Substitute Claims 32-43 Are Unpatentable Over Seth-Smith.....	22
A.	Substitute Claim 32 Is Obvious Over Seth-Smith	22
B.	Substitute Claim 33 Is Obvious Over Seth-Smith	29
C.	Substitute Claim 37 Is Obvious Over Seth-Smith	30
D.	Substitute Claims 34 and 39 Are Obvious Over Seth-Smith.....	35
E.	Substitute Claims 35 and 38 Are Obvious Over Seth-Smith.....	36
F.	Substitute Claims 36 and 40 Are Obvious Over Seth-Smith.....	36
G.	Substitute Claim 41 Is Obvious Over Seth-Smith	37
H.	Substitute Claim 42 Is Obvious Over Seth-Smith	39
I.	Substitute Claim 43 Is Obvious Over Seth-Smith	40

V. Conclusion40

I, Anthony J. Wechselberger, do hereby declare as follows:

1. I previously prepared and executed a declaration (Ex. 1001) in IPR2016-00755. I submit this declaration in support of Petitioner Apple's opposition to Patent Owner PMC's Contingent Motion to Amend (Paper 21). This declaration also responds to arguments raised in PMC's Patent Owner Response (Paper 20) and Dr. Weaver's declaration (Ex. 2022).
2. In preparing this declaration, I reviewed and considered the following:
 - The Board's Decisions Instituting *Inter Partes* Review (Paper 14)
 - PMC's Patent Owner Response (Paper 20)
 - Declaration of Dr. Weaver (Ex. 2022)
 - Deposition Testimony of Dr. Weaver (Ex. 1054)
 - Declaration of Dr. Dorney (Ex. 2130)
 - Deposition Testimony of Dr. Dorney (Ex. 1052)
 - Additional prior art and materials discussed in Sections II-IV

This material is in addition to the material I reviewed and considered while preparing my original declaration.

I. OPINIONS IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER’S REPLY

A. PMC and Dr. Weaver’s Arguments Regarding Frezza

3. Dr. Weaver argues that Frezza does not describe “detecting” an initialization program in the BOOT ROM because “retrieving data from its known ‘correct location’ does not require any ‘detecting.’” (Ex. 2022 ¶ 228.) Dr. Weaver goes on to explain that “A POSITA would understand ‘detect’ to mean ‘to discover or identify the presence or existence of’ something ... which necessarily involves searching for and discovering the unknown.” (Ex. 2022 ¶ 228.)
4. That is nonsense. Nothing in the ’507 Application, PMC’s proposed construction of “detecting,” or what one of ordinary skill in the art would generally understand limits detection to those instances in which the thing being detected “was previously unknown.”
5. Dr. Weaver also argues that the initialization program described by Frezza *might not* designate the described “booter channel” because “[i]t is entirely possible that the initialization program ... simply invokes a hardwired function which in turn operates the frequency agile FM receiver 18 in Frezza’s system.” (Ex. 2022 ¶ 230.)
6. That is simply not how a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand the teachings of Frezza, which clearly describes that the “initialization

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.