UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.

Petitioner

v.

PERSONALIZED MEDIA COMMUNICATIONS, LLC

Patent Owner

Case No.: IPR2016-00755
Patent No.: 8,191,091
For: Signal Processing Apparatus and Methods

**DECLARATION OF ALFRED C. WEAVER, PH.D.,
IN SUPPORT OF PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Table of Contents

Page

I. Qualifications & Engagement 1
II. Materials Reviewed and Relied upon 5
III. Summary of Conclusions 6
IV. Legal Standards 8
A. Priority Date 8
B. Anticipation 8
C. Obviousness 9
D. Claim Construction 11
E. Persons of Ordinary Skill in the Art 11
V. Background Technology of the '091 Patent 12
VI. Claim Construction 14
A. "an encrypted digital information transmission including encrypted information" 14
B. "decrypting" / "encrypted" 22
C. "locate" / "locating" 42
D. "designated" 43
E. "processor" 44
F. "processor instructions" 46
VII. Priority Date 47
VIII. Gilhousen (Ground A) 83
A. Gilhousen does not qualify as prior art and is cumulative. 83
B. Gilhousen fails to disclose "receiving an encrypted digital information transmission" as recited in claims 13 and 20 84
C. Gilhousen fails to disclose "determining a fashion in which said receiver station locates a first decryption key …" or "locating said first decryption key …" as recited in claim 13. 89
D. Gilhousen fails to disclose "decrypting said encrypted information …" as recited in claims 13 and 20 or "decrypt a video portion of said programming" as recited in claims 15 and 23. 93
E. Gilhousen fails to disclose "passing said instruct-to-enable signal to a processor" as recited in claim 13. 95
F. Gilhousen fails to disclose "a first instruct-to-enable signal including first processor instructions" and "executing said first processor instructions …" or "a second instruct-to-

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

enable signal including second processor instructions" and "executing said second processor instructions …" as recited in claim 20. 96
IX. Mason (Ground B) 100
A. Mason does not qualify as prior art and is cumulative. 100
B. Mason fails to disclose "receiving an encrypted digital information transmission" as recited in claims 13 and 20. 101
C. Mason fails to disclose "decrypting said encrypted information …" as recited in claims 13 and 20 or "decrypt a video portion of said programming" as recited in claims 15 and 23). 104
D. Mason fails to disclose "determining a fashion in which said receiver station locates a first decryption key …" or "locating said first decryption key …" as recited in claim 13. 105
E. Mason fails to disclose "passing said instruct-to-enable signal to a processor" as recited in claim 13. 107
F. Mason fails to disclose "a first instruct-to-enable signal including first processor instructions" and "executing said first processor instructions …" or "a second instruct-to-enable signal including second processor instructions" and "executing said second processor instructions …" as recited in claim 20. 107
X. Frezza (Ground C) 110
A. Frezza does not qualify as prior art and is cumulative. 110
B. Frezza fails to disclose "receiving an information transmission including encrypted information" or "decrypting said encrypted information …" as recited in claim 26. 112
C. Frezza fails to disclose "detecting the presence of an instruct-to-enable signal" as recited in claim 26. 113
D. Frezza fails to disclose "automatically tuning said receiver station to a channel designated by said instruct-to-enable signal" as recited in claim 26. 115
XI. Gilhousen in view of Block (Ground D) 116
A. The Gilhousen-Block combination does not qualify as prior art and is cumulative. 116
B. Block does not teach or suggest "storing information evidencing said step of decrypting." 118
C. It would not be obvious to combine Gilhousen with Block. 121
XII. Mason in view of Block (Ground E) 125
A. The Mason-Block combination does not qualify as prior art and is cumulative 125
B. Block does not teach or suggest "storing information evidencing said step of decrypting." 125
C. It would not be obvious to combine Mason with Block. 126
XIII. Frezza in view of Block (Ground F) 128
A. The Frezza-Block combination does not qualify as prior art and is cumulative. 128

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

B. Block does not teach or suggest "storing information evidencing said step of decrypting." 129
C. It would not be obvious to combine Frezza with Block. 129
XIV. SECONDARY CONSIDERATION CONFIRM NON-OBVIOUSNESS OF THE INVENTIONS. 131
XV. CONCLUSION 132

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

I, Alfred C. Weaver, Ph.D., declare as follows:

1. I am making this declaration on behalf of Patent Owner Personalized Media Communications, LLC (hereinafter, "Patent Owner" or "PMC") in support of Patent Owner's Response to the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,191,091 ("the '091 Patent") filed by Petitioner Apple Inc. ("Petitioner").

I. Qualifications & Engagement

2. In terms of my background and experiences that qualify me as an expert in this case, I earned a Ph.D. in Computer Science in 1976 from the University of Illinois. I also obtained a Master of Science Degree in Computer Science from the University of Illinois in 1973 and a Bachelor of Science Degree in Engineering Science from the University of Tennessee in 1971.

3. My fields of experience include computer science, computer systems, computer network architecture, and Internet and electronic commerce, among others.

4. I am currently a Professor of Computer Science and Associate Chair of the Department of Computer Science at the University of Virginia ("UVa"). I have been employed at UVa continuously since 1977. I have taught more than 25 different courses at UVa, including electronic commerce, operating systems, computer networks, and various programming courses. Moreover, I have been the graduate advisor for 69 Ph.D. and master's students, all in Computer Science.

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.