

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

DR. SAYFE KIAEI
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC. AND DISH) Case IPR
NETWORK, LLC, et al.,) 2016-01006
) Patent No.
Petitioners,) 7,835,430
)
vs.) Case IPR
) 2016-01007
TQ DELTA, LLC,) Patent No.
) 8,432,956
Patent Owner.)
) Case IPR
) 2016-01008
) Patent No.
) 8,238,412
)
) Case IPR
) 2016-01009
) Patent No.
) 8,238,412

DEPOSITION OF DR. SAYFE KIAEI

Phoenix, Arizona
June 26, 2017
8:44 a.m.

JOB NO. 125980
REPORTED BY:
Janice Gonzales, RPR, CRR
AZ Certified Court
Reporter No. 50844

1 DR. SAYFE KIAEI
2 DEPOSITION OF DR. SAYFE KIAEI
3 commenced at 8:44 a.m. on June 26, 2017, at Snell &
4 Wilmer, LLP, 400 East Van Buren Street, One Arizona
5 Center, Suite 1900, Phoenix, Arizona 85004, before
6 Janice Gonzales, RPR, CRR, Arizona Certified Court
7 Reporter No. 50844.

8 * * *

9 APPEARANCES:

10 For the Petitioners:

11 HAYNES AND BOONE

12 By: John Russell Emerson, Esq.

13 Gregory Huh, Esq.

14 2323 Victory Avenue

15 Dallas, Texas 75219

16 DUANE MORRIS

17 By: Corey Manley, Esq.

18 1075 Peachtree Street, NE

19 Atlanta, Georgia 30309

20 COOLEY

21 By: Stephen McBride, Esq.

22 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

23 Washington, DC 20004

24 (via telephone)

1 DR. SAYFE KIAEI

2 I N D E X

3 Name	Examination By	Page
4 DR. SAYFE KIAEI		
	MR. CHIPLUNKAR	5
	MR. EMERSON	173
	MR. CHIPLUNKAR	174

6 E X H I B I T S

7 Exhibit	Description	Page
8 Exhibit 2009	ITU-T G.992.1	47

1 DR. SAYFE KIAEI
2 APPEARANCES CONTINUED:
3 For the Patent Owner:
4 McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY
5 By: Raj Chiplunkar, Esq.
6 Thomas Wimbiscus, Esq.
7 500 West Madison Street
8 Chicago, Illinois 60661

1 DR. SAYFE KIAEI

2 DR. SAYFE KIAEI,

3 called as a witness herein, having been first duly
4 sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

5 EXAMINATION

6 BY MR. CHIPLUNKAR:

7 Q. Could you please state your name for the
8 record again.

9 A. Good morning. My name is Sayfe Kiaei.

10 Q. So, Dr. Kiaei, I'll refer to you as
11 Dr. Kiaei or simply Doctor or sir. Is that okay?

12 A. Yes, Counsel.

13 Q. Okay. Some housekeeping. You've done
14 this before. I'll take a break maybe every hour or
15 so. Feel free to ask for a break whenever you think
16 you need a break. Just complete answering the
17 question. Speak audibly so she can get your answers
18 down. So let's get started.

19 A. Thank you, Counsel.

20 Q. You previously submitted separate
21 declarations in each of IPR 2016-01006, IPR
22 2016-1007, IPR 2016-1008, and IPR 2016-1009. Is that
23 correct?

24 A. Yes, Counsel.

25 Q. I will collectively refer to these IPRs

DR. SAYFE KIAEI

as the diag mod IPRs or simply the IPRs and the patents that they challenge as the diag mod patents. So would that be okay with you?

A. Yes, Counsel.

Q. Okay. I will refer to U.S. Patent No. 7,835,430 as the '430 patent, U.S. Patent No. 8,238,412 as the '412 patent, and U.S. Patent No. 8,432,956 as the '956 patent. Would that be okay with you?

A. Yes, Counsel.

Q. And for the record, can you please confirm that you are petitioner Cisco's expert declarant for each of these IPRs?

A. Yes, Counsel.

Q. There are additional parties that have joined some of these IPRs. Are you aware of that?

A. Additional parties?

Q. Parties, yeah. Other than Cisco, a few other parties have joined some of these IPRs. Are you aware of that?

A. No.

Q. Okay. So I take it, then, you had no communications with any other parties except Cisco and Cisco's counsel?

DR. SAYFE KIAEI

A. I have only had communications with the counsels.

Q. Okay. And can you confirm that you previously submitted a declaration in each of these IPRs in support of Cisco's petition for IPRs?

A. Yes, Counsel, I have.

Q. You also submitted a CV or a resume with your prior declaration. Are there any changes in that resume? Any major changes?

A. No major changes. Two or three publications may have come up, but no, no major changes.

Q. Okay. And you submitted a single declaration that was filed with petitioners' reply in each of these IPRs?

A. Yes, Counsel.

Q. And for the record, this second declaration has already been marked Petitioners' Exhibit 1100. Can you confirm that?

A. I believe that's the correct number, but if you have a copy of it, I can confirm that.

Q. I will refer to your declaration as your reply declaration, and you will understand that this is the declaration that you submitted with Cisco's

DR. SAYFE KIAEI

reply. Is that okay with you?

A. Yes, Counsel.

Q. Okay. And the opinion in this declaration, these are your own opinions?

A. Yes, Counsel, they're my opinions.

Q. Can you confirm for the record that for these opinions you rely for support on several new exhibits?

A. The list of exhibits I have is in the declaration I submitted. So I have to look at it and see which ones are new, but...

Q. Do you agree that there are declarations that you cite that are documents that you cite to in this present declaration that you didn't cite to in your prior declaration?

A. I don't quite exactly remember. There may have been one or two of them, yes.

Q. So there were one or two new references that you cite to in your present declaration?

A. There were one or two references in reply to Mr. Chrissan's declaration. To answer those, I may have added one or two additional ones, from what I remember, but I have to look at my declaration to be firm about it.

DR. SAYFE KIAEI

Q. Okay. Fair enough. For the record, petitioner submitted with their reply declaration exhibits that have already been marked 1100 through 1111.

You prepared for this declaration, Dr. Kiaei, in advance of this deposition?

A. Yes, Counsel, I did.

Q. Did you meet with counsel?

A. Yes, Counsel, I did.

Q. Did you review Dr. Chrissan's deposition testimony?

A. Dr.?

Q. Chrissan.

A. Dr. Chrissan, yes. Yes, I did.

Q. His declaration?

A. I reviewed his declaration, yes.

Q. Your prior declaration?

A. I focused mostly on the recent declaration I've given. I did not look at my prior declaration.

Q. So you did not look at your prior declaration?

A. No.

Q. Okay. Did you review the new references

1 DR. SAYFE KIAEI

2 that you cite to in your second declaration?

3 A. Yes, I did.

4 Q. How many hours did you take preparing for
5 this deposition?

6 A. I didn't add the hours. The last couple
7 of weeks I've been working on this.

8 Q. Couple of weeks?

9 A. Yeah, the last two weeks here and there.
10 Not every day, but hours here and there, so...

11 Q. Okay. Fair enough. So you already
12 stated that you reviewed the declaration of
13 Dr. Chrissan in preparing this declaration and in
14 preparing for this deposition. Were you aware that
15 Dr. Chrissan was deposed on his declaration?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Did you attend Dr. Chrissan's deposition?

18 A. Yes, I did. That's the one in Chicago,
19 right?

20 Q. Yes.

21 A. Yeah, I was there.

22 Q. Did you help petitioners' counsel prepare
23 for the deposition of Dr. Chrissan?

24 A. What do you mean by "help"?

25 Q. Did they consult with you prior to

1 DR. SAYFE KIAEI

2 Dr. Chrissan's deposition?

3 A. I don't recall that. Primarily I
4 attended to -- to hear what he has to say.

5 Q. Okay. Do you recall the attorney for
6 petitioner who deposed Dr. Chrissan?

7 A. Yes, I believe that was Russ, yes. That
8 would be the gentleman here.

9 Q. Mr. Emerson. And like I previously
10 stated, you cited to several books in your second
11 declaration. One of these is Exhibit 1101 that I'll
12 refer to as the Abe publication. Do you recall
13 looking at this book?

14 A. Yes, Counsel, I have looked at this book.

15 Q. Okay. Who identified -- who identified
16 this book? Your Counsel?

17 MR. EMERSON: Object to the form.

18 THE WITNESS: I don't actually remember.

19 BY MR. CHIPLUNKAR:

20 Q. Do you have this book in your possession?

21 A. Yes, I have a copy of this book in my
22 possession.

23 Q. Okay.

24 A. Yeah.

25 Q. You did not rely on this book in your

1 DR. SAYFE KIAEI

2 first declaration; is that correct?

3 A. No, I did not. As I said, this was in
4 reference to the reply to Dr. Chrissan's statements
5 in his declaration.

6 Q. Is it your understanding that this book
7 represents a person of ordinary skill in the art's
8 understanding or the understanding of a person of
9 ordinary skill in the art?

10 A. Pertaining to materials I discussed here,
11 yes.

12 Q. Okay. Is it your understanding then that
13 the author of this book is a person of ordinary skill
14 in the art?

15 A. I don't know Dr. Abe. I presume it's
16 Dr. Abe -- George Abe, but I believe so, yes. I
17 believe so.

18 Q. So you think he's a doctor?

19 A. I don't know that.

20 Q. Okay.

21 A. I don't know.

22 Q. But you presume he's a doctor?

23 A. I don't know that either. I take that
24 statement back.

25 Q. Okay. So you already answered this

1 DR. SAYFE KIAEI

2 question, but I'm going to ask it. So during
3 Dr. Chrissan's deposition, Mr. Emerson asked
4 Dr. Chrissan the following question: "Are you
5 familiar with this book? Are you familiar with this
6 book in any way?"

7 Same question to you. Prior to this --
8 prior to this deposition and prior to you preparing
9 your declaration, were you familiar with this book?

10 A. I knew it existed, yeah. I was aware of
11 the book, yeah. It was one of the books at the time
12 that was available on the subject, yeah. I don't
13 recall exactly how detailed I read it at the time,
14 but I was aware of it.

15 Q. And in your declaration that you
16 submitted with the petition -- and I'm just going to
17 quote for the record. You stated at paragraph 36 of
18 Exhibit 1009, "In my opinion, the level of a POSITA
19 needed to have the capability of understanding
20 multicarrier communications and engineering
21 principles applicable to the '956 patent is (1) a
22 master's degree in electrical or computer engineering
23 or equal while in training, and approximately five
24 years of experience working in digital
25 communication."

1 DR. SAYFE KIAEI

2 If I told you Mr. Abe's qualifications
3 are a BA in mathematics and an MS in business
4 qualitative matters, would you consider him a POSITA?

5 A. I don't know Mr. Abe's background and
6 resume. I think that -- first of all, I'd like to
7 look at my declaration to see what I said for a
8 POSITA. If you don't mind, hand me a copy of my
9 declaration.

10 Q. I don't have your 1009 declaration.
11 That's why I just quoted it for the record.

12 A. Oh, I see. Can you read that again?

13 Q. "In my opinion, the level of a POSITA
14 needed to have the capability of understanding
15 multicarrier communications and engineering
16 principles applicable to the '956 patent is (1) a
17 master's degree in electrical and/or computer
18 engineering or equal valid training, and (2)
19 approximately five years of experience working in
20 digital telecommunications."

21 Under this definition, would a person
22 with a BA in mathematics and an MS in business
23 qualitative matters qualify as a POSITA?

24 MR. EMERSON: I'm going to object to the
25 form and I'm going to object as beyond the scope.

1 DR. SAYFE KIAEI

2 THE WITNESS: First of all, in the POSITA
3 I said that it was a master's in electrical
4 engineering and computer engineering or equivalent.
5 Number 2, I don't have Mr. Abe's -- Mr. Abe's resume
6 in front of me, but in general, a person with a
7 background in mathematics and statistics would, and
8 having a background in other areas related to that
9 would understand some of the concepts that are
10 discussed here.

11 BY MR. CHIPLUNKAR:

12 Q. So are you changing your definition of a
13 POSITA then?

14 A. No, I'm not. I said equivalent.

15 Q. So you're supplementing your definition
16 of a POSITA then?

17 A. No, I'm not, Counsel.

18 Q. So bachelor's in mathematics is
19 equivalent to a degree in electrical engineering?

20 A. As I said, I need to look at his resume
21 and his publications. Having published -- having
22 published this book which is a second edition of a
23 book in residential broadband and having read what I
24 have read here, I have to look at his resume.

25 Q. Okay. Let's turn to page 4 of the Abe

1 DR. SAYFE KIAEI

2 reference, the third full sentence. Can you read
3 that into the record.

4 A. On the first paragraph?

5 Q. Yes.

6 A. You're talking about "Frequency,
7 amplitude" sentence? The third sentence under
8 "Discrete Multitone"?

9 Q. No, page 4, the last page.

10 A. Oh, page 4 of the book, not page 4 of the
11 document.

12 Q. The last page of what you printed out.

13 A. Oh, I see. Last page with the figure?

14 Q. Yes, which has a graph on it.

15 A. Yeah.

16 Q. That would be page 69 of the Abe
17 reference, the third full sentence. Could you please
18 read that into the record.

19 A. The third full sentence is "One of the
20 noisiest debates" you're talking about?

21 The first sentence is "Multicarrier
22 techniques have a latency." The second sentence is
23 "In the DMT case for ADSL."

24 Q. Now, the third sentence.

25 A. The third sentence is "So no bit can

1 DR. SAYFE KIAEI

2 travel faster than allowed by 4 kilohertz even if the
3 line was perfectly clean."

4 Q. Can you explain to me what it means when
5 you say "no bit can travel faster than allowed by
6 4 kilohertz"?

7 MR. EMERSON: Object to the form.

8 THE WITNESS: This is outside -- first of
9 all, what he's talking about here is that the delays
10 -- because of the fact that each one of the subbands
11 have a limited bandwidth, the delays of transmitting
12 data is limited to this 4 kilohertz's bandwidth.
13 That's what my understanding and a POSITA's
14 understanding of this is. The data rate for each one
15 of these subbands is limited. The bandwidth of this
16 is limited to 4 kilohertz.

17 BY MR. CHIPLUNKAR:

18 Q. So the maximum bandwidth of 80 SL is
19 4 kilohertz?

20 MR. EMERSON: Object to the form.

21 BY MR. CHIPLUNKAR:

22 Q. I'll rephrase that. Is it your
23 understanding that the maximum bandwidth of 80 SL is
24 4 kilohertz?

25 A. No, that's not what it's talking about.

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.