IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the *Inter Partes* Review of: Trial Number: To Be Assigned

U.S. Patent No. 8,191,091

Filed: June 7, 1995

Issued: May 29, 2012

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 ANTHONY J. WECHSELBERGER UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.68 IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF <u>U.S. PATENT NO. 8,191,091</u>



Table of Contents

I.	Introduction1					
II.	Background and Qualifications					
III.	Understanding of Patent Law					
IV.	Background					
	A.	Background of the Field Relevant to the '091 Patent				
		1.	NTSC Television Transmission Technology	15		
		2.	Embedded Digital Information in NTSC Television Transmissions	18		
		3.	Pay TV and Content Protection	26		
		4.	Decryption and Descrambling	30		
	B.	Summary of the '091 Patent				
	C.	Summary of the Prosecution History32				
V.	Leve	l of Or	dinary Skill in the Pertinent Art	40		
VI.	Broadest Reasonable Interpretation					
		1.	"decrypting"	41		
		2.	"an encrypted digital information transmission including encrypted information"	41		
		3.	"processor"	41		
		4.	"processor instructions"	42		
VII.	Background on Prior Art References					
	A.	Background on Gilhousen43				
	B.	Background on Mason45				
	C.	Background on Frezza46				



	D.	Background on Kelly4				
	E.	Background on Block				
VIII.	Claims 13-16, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, and 30 Are Invalid					
	A.	Claims 13-15, 18, 20, 23, and 24 Are Anticipated By Gilhousen				
		1.	Claim 13 Is Anticipated By Gilhousen	50		
		2.	Claim 14 Is Anticipated By Gilhousen	61		
		3.	Claim 15 Is Anticipated By Gilhousen	64		
		4.	Claim 18 Is Anticipated By Gilhousen	65		
		5.	Claim 20 Is Anticipated By Gilhousen	66		
		6.	Claim 23 Is Anticipated By Gilhousen	74		
		7.	Claim 24 Is Anticipated By Gilhousen	74		
	B.	Claims 16 and 21 Are Obvious Over Gilhousen In View of Block				
		1.	Claim 16 Is Obvious In View of Gilhousen and Block	75		
		2.	Claim 21 Is Obvious In View of Gilhousen and Block	76		
		3.	Combining Gilhousen and Block	76		
	C.	Claims 13-15, 18, 20, 23, and 24 Are Anticipated By Mason		79		
		1.	Claim 13 Is Anticipated By Mason	79		
		2.	Claim 14 Is Anticipated By Mason	92		
		3.	Claim 15 Is Anticipated By Mason	94		
		4.	Claim 18 Is Anticipated By Mason	95		
		5.	Claim 20 Is Anticipated By Mason	96		
		6.	Claim 23 Is Anticipated By Mason	.104		



		7.	Claim 24 Is Anticipated By Mason	104		
	D.	Clair	ns 16 and 21 Are Obvious Over Mason In View of Block	104		
		1.	Claim 16 Is Obvious In View of Mason and Block	105		
		2.	Claim 21 Is Obvious In View of Mason and Block	105		
		3.	Combining Mason and Block	106		
	E.	Clair	ns 26 and 30 Are Anticipated By Frezza	108		
		1.	Claim 26 Is Anticipated by Frezza	108		
		2.	Claim 30 Is Anticipated by Frezza	114		
	F.	Clair	m 27 Is Obvious Over Frezza In View of Block	115		
		1.	Claim 27 Is Obvious In View of Frezza and Block	115		
		2.	Combining Frezza and Block	116		
	G.	Clair	ns 26 and 30 Are Obvious Over Kelly	118		
		1.	Claim 26 Is Obvious Over Kelly	119		
		2.	Claim 30 Is Obvious Over Kelly	128		
	H.	Clair	m 27 Is Obvious Over Kelly In View of Block	129		
		1.	Claim 27 Is Obvious In View of Kelly and Block	129		
		2.	Combining Kelly and Block	129		
IX.	Seco	ndary	Considerations of Non-Obviousness	132		
X.	Conclusion1					



I, Anthony J. Wechselberger, 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. 8,191,091 ("the '091 patent"). I am being compensated for my time in connection with this IPR at my standard consulting rate of \$350 per hour. My compensation is not affected by the outcome of this matter.
- 2. I have been asked to provide my opinions regarding whether Claims 13-16, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, and 30 of the '091 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 '091 patent issued on May 29, 2012, from U.S. Patent Appl. No. 08/485,507 ("the '507 application"), filed on June 7, 1995. (Ex. 1003 at 1.) The '091 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. That application alleges to be a continuation-in-part of a series of applications dating back to U.S. Patent Appl. No. 06/317,510 filed November 3, 1981, now U.S. Patent No. 4,694,490.

DOCKET

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.

