

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

<i>In re</i> patent of Diaz <i>et al.</i>	§	Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review
	§	
U.S. Patent No. 5,812,789	§	Attorney Docket No.: 52959.21
	§	Customer No.: 27683
Issued: September 22, 1998	§	
	§	Real Party in Interest:
Title: Video and/or Audio	§	Apple Inc.
Decompression and/or Compression	§	
Device That Shares a Memory	§	
Interface	§	

**Declaration of Robert Colwell, Ph.D.**  
**Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68**

## Table of Contents

I. Introduction.....	4
II. Qualifications and Professional Experience.....	6
III. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	9
IV. Relevant Legal Standards.....	10
V. The '789 Patent.....	11
A. Overview.....	11
B. History of the '789 Patent.....	17
VI. Claim Construction.....	17
A. “decoder”.....	19
B. “encoder”.....	19
C. “real time”.....	20
D. “variable bandwidth”.....	22
VII. Ground I: Claims 1-5 and 12-14 are invalid under 35 U.S.C § 103 over Bowes and TMS.....	24
A. Overview of Bowes.....	24
B. Overview of TMS.....	28
C. Reasons to Combine Bowes and TMS.....	30
D. Overview of Thomas.....	34
E. Reasons to Combine Bowes, TMS, and Thomas.....	36
F. Detailed Analysis.....	41
VIII. Ground II: Claims 6 and 8 are invalid under 35 U.S.C § 103 over Bowes, TMS, Thomas, and Gove.....	68
A. Overview of Gove.....	68

B. Reasons to Combine Bowes, TMS, Thomas, and Gove .....	70
C. Detailed Analysis.....	71
IX. Ground III: Claim 7 is invalid under 35 U.S.C § 103 over Bowes, TMS, Thomas, and Ran.....	74
A. Overview of Ran.....	74
B. Reasons to Combine Bowes, TMS, Thomas, and Ran.....	75
C. Detailed Analysis.....	76
X. Ground IV: Claim 11 is invalid under 35 U.S.C § 103 over Bowes, TMS, Thomas, and Celi .....	78
A. Overview of Celi .....	78
B. Reasons to Combine Bowes, TMS, Thomas, and Celi .....	78
C. Detailed Analysis.....	80
XI. Declaration.....	85

## I. Introduction

I, Robert Colwell, Ph.D., declare:

1. I am making this declaration at the request of Apple Inc. in the matter of the *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 5,812,789 (“the ’789 Patent”) to Diaz *et al.*

2. I am being compensated for my work in this matter. I am also being reimbursed for reasonable and customary expenses associated with my work and testimony in this investigation. My compensation is not contingent on the outcome of this matter or the specifics of my testimony.

3. In the preparation of this declaration, I have studied:

- (1) The ’789 Patent, Exhibit 1001;
- (2) The prosecution history of the ’789 Patent, Exhibit 1002;
- (3) U.S. Patent No. 5,546,547 to Bowes *et al.* (“Bowes”), Exhibit 1005;
- (4) Texas Instruments, Inc., Houston, TX, “TMS320C8x System Level Synopsis,” (1995) (Literature Ref. SPRU113) (“TMS”), Exhibit 1006;
- (5) U.S. Patent No. 5,001,625 to Thomas *et al.* (“Thomas”), Exhibit 1007;
- (6) R. Gove, “The MVP: A Highly-Integrated Video Compression Chip”, IEEE 1994 (“Gove”), Exhibit 1008;

- (7) U.S. Patent No. 5,768,533 to Ran (“Ran”), Exhibit 1009;
- (8) U.S. Patent No. 5,742,797 to Celi *et al.* (“Celi”), Exhibit 1010;
- (9) Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement, *Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC v. Apple Inc.*, case no. 2:15-cv-632-JRG-RSP (Feb. 16, 2016, E.D. Tex.), Exhibit 1011; and
- (10) Decision of Institution of *Inter Partes* Review, *Samsung Elec. Co., Ltd., et al. v. Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC*, IPR2015-01944 (Paper No. 7) , Exhibit 1012.

4. In forming the opinions expressed below, I have considered:

- (1) The documents listed above,
- (2) The relevant legal standards, including the standard for obviousness provided in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398 (2007), and
- (3) My own knowledge and experience, including my work experience in the fields of electrical engineering, computer engineering, computer architectures, memory interfacing, and multimedia technologies, and my experience in working with others involved in those fields, as described below.

# 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.