UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ZTE (USA) Inc., HTC Corporation, and HTC America, Inc.,

Petitioner

v.

Evolved Wireless LLC,

Patent Owner

DECLARATION OF PAUL S. MIN, PH.D

Case No. IPR2016-00757



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction & Summary of Opinions					
II.	Background/Qualifications					
III.	Documents and Materials Considered					
IV.	Legal Principles					
V.	Challenged Claims of 236 Patent					
VI.	Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art					
VII.	State of the Art					
VIII.	Prior Art References					
	A.	Prior	Art Specifications	23		
	B.	Ericsson 46824				
IX.	Clain	aim Construction2				
X.	Invalidity Analysis of 236 Patent					
	A.	Claims 1-6 are obvious based on the prior art specifications25				
		1.	Independent claim 1 is obvious	27		
		2.	Dependent claim 2 is obvious.	50		
		3.	Dependent claim 3 is obvious.	52		
		4.	Dependent claim 4 is obvious.	55		
		5.	Dependent claim 5 is obvious.	56		
		6.	Dependent claim 6 is obvious.	58		
		7.	Skilled artisans would have combined the teachings of the 300 and 321 references.	59		

Min Declaration

	B.	Claims 7-10 and 12-13 are obvious based on the prior art specifications and the Ericsson patent				
		1.	Independent claim 7 is obvious	61		
		2.	Dependent claim 8 is obvious.	67		
		3.	Dependent claim 9 is obvious.	71		
		4.	Dependent claim 10 is obvious.	72		
		5.	Dependent claim 12 is obvious.	72		
		6.	Dependent claim 13 is obvious.	73		
		7.	Skilled artisans would have combined the prior art specifications' teachings with the Ericsson patent's teachings.	73		
XI.	Public Availability of Prior Art References					
	A.	The 300 reference (Exhibit 1002) was available to members of the general public as of at least March 11, 2008, without any restrictions.				
	B.	The 321 reference (Exhibit 1003) was available to members of the general public as of at least June 15, 2008, without any restrictions84				

Min Declaration ii IPR2016-00757



I. Introduction & Summary of Opinions

- 1. My name is Paul Min. I submit this declaration on behalf of ZTE (USA) Inc., HTC Corporation, and HTC America, Inc. ("Petitioner"), which I understand are challenging the validity of claims 1-10 and 12-13 ("the challenged claims") of U.S. Patent No. 7,881,236 ("the 236 patent") in a petition for *inter partes* review.
- 2. I have been asked to provide an opinion on the validity of the challenged claims. In my opinion, for the reasons in the following sections, the challenged claims are invalid on the following grounds:
 - (1) Claims 1-6 are obvious in view of the 321 reference (Exhibit 1003) and the 300 reference (Exhibit 1002); and
 - (2) Claims 7-10 and 12-13 are obvious in view of the 321 reference (Exhibit 1003), the 300 reference (Exhibit 1002), and the Ericsson patent (Exhibit 1004).
- 3. I have also been asked to provide an opinion on whether Exhibits 1002 and 1003 to the petition were available to interested members of the public before August 11, 2008, which is the claimed priority date of the 236 patent. In my opinion, for the reasons in the following sections:
 - (1) Exhibit 1002 (the 300 reference) was available to members of the general public, including interested members of the public,



- without restriction as of at least March 11, 2008; and
- (2) Exhibit 1003 (the 321 reference) was available to members of the general public, including interested members of the public, without restriction as of at least June 15, 2008.

II. Background/Qualifications

- 4. Appendix A to this declaration is my curriculum vitae, which sets forth my qualifications.
- 5. I received a B.S. degree in Electrical Engineering in 1982, an M.S. degree in Electrical Engineering in 1984, and a Ph.D. degree in Electrical Engineering in 1987 from the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor. I received several academic honors, including my B.S. degree with honors, a best graduate student award and a best teaching assistant award during my M.S. study, and a best paper award from a major international conference for reporting results from my Ph.D. thesis.
- 6. After receiving my Ph.D., I worked at Bellcore in New Jersey from August 1987 until August 1990. At Bellcore, I was responsible for evolving the public switched telephone network (POTS) into a multi-services voice and data network that incorporated packet switches, optical technologies, and wireless technologies.
 - 7. In September 1990, I joined the faculty at Washington University in

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.

