

Page 2

1 A P P E A R A N C E S

2 On behalf of the Plaintiff and the witness:

3 FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

4 111 Huntington Avenue

5 Boston

6 MA 02199-7610

7 Tel: 617.502.3214

8 Fax: 617.342.4001

9 e-mail: mhenschke@foley.com

10 BY: MARC N. HENSCHKE, ESQ.

11 On behalf of the Defendant,

12 Sierra Wireless America, Inc.:

13 NIXON PEABODY LLD

14 2 Palo Alto Square, Suite 500

15 3000 El Camino Real

16 Palo Alto

17 California 94306

18 Tel: 650.320.7700

19 Fax: 650.320.7701

20 e-mail: jenhayes@nixonpeabody.com

21 BY: MS. JENNIFER HAYES, ESQ.

22 On behalf of the Defendant,

23 Enfora: Novatel Wireless Solutions, Inc.:

24 K&L GATES, LLP

25 1601 K Street, NW

 Washington

 DC 20006-1600

 Tel: 202.778.9212

 e-mail: eric.rusnak@klgates.com

 BY: ERIC C. RUSNAK, ESQ.

 On behalf of the Defendant,

 Cinterion Wireless Modules GmbH and NAFTA:

 MAYER BROWN, LLP

 1999 K Street, N.W.

 Washington

 DC 20006-1101

 Tel: 202.263.3483

 e-mail: bwasserman@mayerbrown.com

 BY: BRYON T. WASSERMAN, ESQ.

Page 4

1 I N D E X

2

3 Deponent Page

4 DR. EVELINE WESBY-van-SWAAY

5 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. HAYES 7

6 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. RUSNAK 131

7 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WASSERMAN 159

8 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. WU 225

9 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. LOEWENSTEIN 237

10 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. HENSCHKE 301

11 FURTHER EXAMINATION BY MR. LOEWENSTEIN 306

12 FURTHER EXAMINATION BY MR. WASSERMAN 309

13 FURTHER EXAMINATION BY MS. WU 311

14 FURTHER DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. HENSCHKE 314

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 3

1 A P P E A R A N C E S, continued

2

3

4 On behalf of the Defendant,

5 Kowatec Corporation:

6 ANOVA LAW GROUP, PLLC

7 21351 Gentry Drive, Suite 150

8 Sterling

9 VA 20166

10 Tel: 703.430.5759

11 Fax: 703.865.6569

12 e-mail: sherry.wu@anovawlaw.com

13 BY: SHERRY WU, ESQ.

14 On behalf of the Defendants,

15 Motorola & Telit:

16 PEARL COHEN ZEDEK LATZER BARATZ LLP

17 1500 Broadway

18 New York

19 NY 10036

20 Tel: 646.878.0806

21 e-mail: DLoewenstein@PearlCohen.com

22 BY: DAVID A. LOEWENSTEIN, ESQ.

23

24 Alena Onis

25 Videographer

 In attendance:

 Philip Wesby

 Corporate representative of M2M Solutions

 Liz Dawson (Afternoon only)

 Partner

 Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer Baratz UK LLP

 * * *

Page 5

1 E X H I B I T I N D E X

2 Exhibits Marked During This Deposition:

3 Exhibit No. Description Page

4 1: Nokia Card Phone 1.0 57

5 2: Mobile phone 64

6 3: U.S. Patent 8,094,010 66

7 4: M2M Solutions LLC's First 89

8 Supplemental Responses and

9 Objections to Defendant's First

10 Set of Collective

11 Interrogatories to Plaintiff

12 regarding ownership and

13 inventorship

14 5: Plaintiff M2M Solutions, LLC's 115

15 Supplemental Responses and

16 Objections to Defendant's First

17 Set of Common Interrogatories

18 (Nos. 6-10)

19 6: Siemens M20/M20 Terminal 208

20 Cellular Engine. Bates Number

21 DEPPRIORART 002494 to 2690

22 7: Bates Number M2M0004918 to 4919 220

23

24

25

Page 6

1 VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now on the
 2 record in the matter of M2M Solutions, LLC versus
 3 Enfora, Inc. et al.
 4 Today's date is Tuesday,
 5 21st January, 2014 and the time is 9:12.
 6 This is the video recorded deposition
 7 of Mrs. Eveline Wesby-van-Swaay being taken at the
 8 offices of K&L Gates, LLP, One New Change, London,
 9 EC4M 9AF.
 10 I'm the camera operator. My name is
 11 Alena Onis in association with Alderson Reporting.
 12 The court reporter is Thelma Harries also in
 13 association with Alderson Reporting.
 14 Will all the attorneys please
 15 identify themselves and the parties they represent
 16 beginning with the party noticing this proceeding.
 17 MR. HENSCHKE: Good morning. I'm
 18 Marc Henschke here on behalf of the plaintiff,
 19 M2M Solutions, LLC, and I also have with me here in
 20 the deposition this morning the corporate
 21 representative of M2M Solutions, Mr. Philip Wesby.
 22 MS. HAYES: Jennifer Hayes from Nixon
 23 Peabody for Sierra Wireless.
 24 MR. RUSNAK: Eric Rusnak for Enfora,
 25 Inc. and Novatel Wireless, Inc.

Page 7

1 MR. LOEWENSTEIN: David Loewenstein
 2 for the Telit parties and Motorola.
 3 MR. WASSERMAN: Bryon Wasserman for
 4 the Cinterion defendants.
 5 MS. WU: Sherry Wu for Kowatec
 6 Corporation.
 7 VIDEOGRAPHER: Will the court reporter
 8 please administer the oath.
 9 (Witness sworn)
 10 VIDEOGRAPHER: Please proceed.
 11 DR. EVELINE WESBY-van-SWAAY
 12 having been duly sworn
 13 was examined and did testify
 14 as follows:
 15 CROSS-EXAMINATION
 16 BY MS. HAYES:
 17 Q Good morning.
 18 A Good morning.
 19 Q Can you please state your name for
 20 the record?
 21 A My name is Eveline Wesby-van-Swaay.
 22 Q And may I call you Dr. Wesby?
 23 A Yes, please.
 24 Q Can you please state your address for
 25 the record?

Page 8

1 A The address is Camden House, which is
 2 in School Lane in Tiddington, Stratford-upon-Avon
 3 in the UK.
 4 Q Thank you. So you understand that
 5 you're under oath today?
 6 A I do.
 7 Q And your testimony in this deposition
 8 will have the same legal effect as testimony in a
 9 trial?
 10 A Yes, I do.
 11 Q And you understand that your
 12 testimony in this deposition may be read to the
 13 jury or used in other proceedings in this lawsuit?
 14 A Yes.
 15 Q Thank you.
 16 I will be asking you a series of
 17 questions and, for purposes of the transcript and
 18 the court reporter, we ask that you, please, make
 19 your responses verbal, so, instead of nodding,
 20 actually saying yes or no.
 21 A Yes, I understand.
 22 Q And if you don't hear a question that
 23 I ask you, please ask me to repeat it, and, if you
 24 don't understand a question, please ask me to
 25 rephrase it.

Page 9

1 A Okay.
 2 Q Please also wait until I finish my
 3 question before answering, and I will also wait for
 4 you to answer before I ask my next question.
 5 From time to time your attorney may
 6 object to a question that I ask. For the record,
 7 you'll be required to answer the question unless
 8 your attorney directs you to not answer the
 9 question.
 10 A Okay.
 11 Q And if, for some reason, you realise
 12 that an answer that you gave earlier in the
 13 deposition is not correct or you feel like there's
 14 additional information that you need to provide,
 15 please let me know so that we can discuss that.
 16 A I will.
 17 Q Is there any reason that you are not
 18 able to participate in the deposition to your
 19 fullest advantage today?
 20 A No, there is no reason.
 21 Q Thank you.
 22 Dr. Wesby, you did not invent GSM,
 23 correct?
 24 A Could you repeat that question?
 25 Q You did not invent GSM, correct?

Page 10

1 A That is correct.
 2 Q You did not invent GPRS, correct?
 3 A That is correct.
 4 Q You did not invent SMS, correct?
 5 A That's correct.
 6 Q You did not invent CDMA, correct?
 7 A That's correct.
 8 MR. HENSCHKE: I'm going to object
 9 and instruct the witness not to answer these
 10 questions any further.
 11 These questions, clearly, address the
 12 issue of inventorship, which was already covered at
 13 the previous deposition in August of 2012, and,
 14 according to the Court's scheduling order, the
 15 defendants are not permitted today to return to the
 16 same topics that were previously covered.
 17 Inventorship, obviously, was the main
 18 topic covered at that time. These questions are,
 19 therefore, duplicative of inventorship topics and
 20 the witness will not answer any further questions
 21 of this nature, and I'm instructing her as such.
 22 MS. HAYES: We disagree with that
 23 statement. We believe that these questions are
 24 relevant to what existed in the prior art and are
 25 unrelated to inventorship. We believe that these

Page 11

1 questions are appropriate.
 2 MR. HENSCHKE: Your questions are
 3 being directly phrased in terms of what Dr. Wesby
 4 invented. You could not possibly be more clearly
 5 asking questions about inventorship and, if the
 6 questions are going to be anything along those
 7 lines, she's going to be instructed not to answer.
 8 MR. LOEWENSTEIN: I'll just kick in.
 9 I don't know if you can hear me. But these
 10 questions are related to invalidity, which is
 11 different than what we talked about last time which
 12 related to inventorship.
 13 So you can instruct her not to
 14 answer, but she'll be back in Delaware pretty soon.
 15 MR. HENSCHKE: The question is -- is
 16 directly a question as to whether she invented
 17 something and, clearly, is a question on
 18 inventorship. And if it's going to be put in those
 19 terms, she's not going to answer the questions or
 20 any other like those.
 21 MR. LOEWENSTEIN: Well, you can do
 22 what you want. I guess we'll just press ahead.
 23 BY MS. HAYES:
 24 Q Dr. Wesby, you did not invent CDMA,
 25 correct?

Page 12

1 MR. HENSCHKE: Instruct the witness
 2 not to answer.
 3 BY MS. HAYES:
 4 Q Dr. Wesby, CDMA was known prior to
 5 the filing date of your Programmable Communicator
 6 patent, correct?
 7 A That's correct.
 8 Q And, for the record, you agree that
 9 the Programmable Communicator patent is US Patent
 10 Number 8,094,010, correct?
 11 MR. HENSCHKE: If you need to see the
 12 document, please ask for it.
 13 THE WITNESS: Can -- can you repeat
 14 the question in full, please?
 15 BY MS. HAYES:
 16 Q You agree that the Programmable
 17 Communicator patent is US Patent Number 8,094,010,
 18 correct?
 19 A Yes.
 20 Q Okay. Dr. Wesby, you did not invent
 21 GPS, correct?
 22 MR. HENSCHKE: Objection. Instruct
 23 the witness not to answer.
 24 BY MS. HAYES:
 25 Q Dr. Wesby, GPS was known prior to the

Page 13

1 filing date of your Programmable Communicator
 2 patent, correct?
 3 A Correct.
 4 Q Dr. Wesby, you did not invent the use
 5 of GPS in wireless communications, correct?
 6 MR. HENSCHKE: Objection. Instruct
 7 the witness not to answer.
 8 BY MS. HAYES:
 9 Q Dr. Wesby, the use of GPS in wireless
 10 communications was known prior to the filing of
 11 your Programmable Communicator patent, correct?
 12 MR. HENSCHKE: If you know, you can
 13 answer.
 14 THE WITNESS: Yes, it was.
 15 BY MS. HAYES:
 16 Q Dr. Wesby, you did not invent
 17 packet-switched data networks, correct?
 18 MR. HENSCHKE: Objection. Instruct
 19 the witness not to answer.
 20 BY MS. HAYES:
 21 Q You did not invent packet-switched
 22 data networks?
 23 MR. HENSCHKE: Objection. Instruct
 24 the witness not to answer.
 25

Page 14

1 BY MS. HAYES:
 2 Q Dr. Wesby, packet-switched data
 3 networks were known prior to the filing of your
 4 Programmable Communicator patent, correct?
 5 A That's correct.
 6 Q Dr. Wesby, you did not invent coded
 7 numbers, correct?
 8 MR. HENSCHKE: Objection. Instruct
 9 the witness not to answer.
 10 BY MS. HAYES:
 11 Q Dr. Wesby, coded numbers were known
 12 prior to the filing of your Programmable
 13 Communicator patent, correct?
 14 A That's correct.
 15 Q Dr. Wesby, you did not invent the use
 16 of coded numbers in wireless communications,
 17 correct?
 18 MR. HENSCHKE: Objection. Instruct
 19 the witness not to answer.
 20 BY MS. HAYES:
 21 Q Dr. Wesby, the use of coded numbers
 22 in wireless communications was known prior to the
 23 filing of your Programmable Communicator patent --
 24 MR. HENSCHKE: Objection.
 25 BY MS. HAYES:

Page 15

1 Q -- correct?
 2 MR. HENSCHKE: Instruct the witness
 3 not to answer.
 4 That question was -- exact question
 5 was asked in the prior day's deposition. That's
 6 a duplicative topic. I instruct the witness not to
 7 answer.
 8 MS. HAYES: I disagree. Can you
 9 please point out where in the deposition transcript
 10 that exact question was asked?
 11 MR. HENSCHKE: If you want to go off
 12 the record, I can find the reference for you. And
 13 it's not relevant whether the exact question was
 14 asked. The issue that's relevant is whether that
 15 topic was covered, and Dr. Wesby has already been
 16 asked whether she was aware of the use of coded
 17 number authentication with wireless devices in the
 18 previous day's deposition.
 19 MS. HAYES: I disagree with that.
 20 I believe we're entitled to ask this question. It
 21 was not asked before, and we have the right to get
 22 a clear answer on the record to this question.
 23 MR. HENSCHKE: Again, the issue is
 24 not whether the exact question was asked before.
 25 The issue is whether the topic was covered before,

Page 16

1 and the topic of whether Dr. Wesby knew whether or
 2 not coded numbers and authentication were used
 3 with wireless devices was directly covered at the
 4 August 2012 deposition, as that written record will
 5 reflect. And, accordingly, Dr. Wesby's being
 6 instructed not to answer that question, which is
 7 clearly duplicative.
 8 MS. HAYES: We disagree with your
 9 instruction. We reserve the right to go to the
 10 Court and seek our travel costs and fees in
 11 reimbursement.
 12 MR. HENSCHKE: You're welcome to do
 13 that.
 14 BY MS. HAYES:
 15 Q Dr. Wesby, you did not invent the use
 16 of passwords in wireless communications, correct?
 17 MR. HENSCHKE: Objection. Instruct
 18 the witness not to answer.
 19 BY MS. HAYES:
 20 Q Dr. Wesby, passwords in wireless
 21 communications were known prior to the filing of
 22 your Programmable Communicator patent, correct?
 23 MR. HENSCHKE: Objection.
 24 (To the witness) Only if you know.
 25 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

Page 17

1 BY MS. HAYES:
 2 Q Dr. Wesby, you did not invent the use
 3 of PIN codes in wireless communications, correct?
 4 MR. HENSCHKE: Objection. Instruct
 5 the witness not to answer.
 6 BY MS. HAYES:
 7 Q Dr. Wesby, the use of PIN codes in
 8 wireless communications was known prior to the
 9 filing of your Programmable Communicator, correct?
 10 A That's correct.
 11 Q Dr. Wesby, you did not invent PUK
 12 codes, correct?
 13 MR. HENSCHKE: Objection. Instruct
 14 the witness not to answer.
 15 BY MS. HAYES:
 16 Q Dr. Wesby, PUK codes were known prior
 17 to the filing of your Programmable Communicator --
 18 MR. HENSCHKE: Objection. Instruct
 19 the witness not to answer. The questions about PUK
 20 codes and her knowledge of it in the prior art were
 21 asked at the previous August deposition.
 22 Therefore, this a duplicative topic.
 23 MS. HAYES: We disagree. And I also
 24 ask that you please wait for me to finish my
 25 question before objecting.

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.