

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Cisco Systems, Inc.,
Petitioner

Case IPR2016-_____

U.S. Patent No. 8,611,404

**DECLARATION OF DR. SAYFE KIAEI, UNDER
37 C.F.R. § 1.68 IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR
INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,611,404**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....3

II. Background and Qualifications5

III. Understanding of Patent Law7

IV. The '404 Patent.....10

 A. Overview10

 B. Prosecution History14

V. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art.....16

VI. Broadest Reasonable Interpretation.....18

 A. “store/storing, in a low power mode” (claims 6, 11, 16)18

 B. “synchronization signal” (claims 6, 11, 16).....20

VII. Detailed Invalidity Analysis21

 A. Background on Prior Art References23

 1. Background on Bowie23

 2. Background on Yamano26

 3. Modem States in Bowie and Yamano28

 4. Background on ANSI T1.413-1995.....32

 B. Claims 6, 10, 11, 15, 16, and 20 are Obvious over Bowie,
 Yamano, and ANSI T1.41334

 1. Reasons to Combine Bowie and Yamano34

 2. Reasons to Combine Bowie/Yamano with ANSI T1.41337

 C. Analysis of Claims38

VIII. Conclusion79

I, Sayfe Kiaei, do hereby declare as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I have been retained as an independent expert witness on behalf of Cisco Systems, Inc. (“Cisco”) for the above-captioned Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (“IPR”) of U.S. Patent No. 8,611,404 (“the ’404 patent”). I am being compensated at my usual and customary rate of \$400 per hour for the time I spend in connection with this IPR. My compensation is not affected by the outcome of this IPR.

2. I have been asked to provide my opinions regarding whether claims 6, 10, 11, 15, 16, and 20 (“the Challenged Claims”) of the ’404 patent are unpatentable as they would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art (“POSITA”) at the time of the alleged invention. It is my opinion that all of the limitations of these claims would have been obvious to a POSITA after reviewing the Bowie, Yamano, and ANSI T1.413 references, as discussed further below.

3. The ’404 patent issued on December 17, 2013, from U.S. Patent Appl. No. 13/152,558, filed Jun. 3, 2011, now U.S. Pat. No. 8,437,382, which is a continuation of U.S. Patent Appl. No. 12/615,946, filed Nov. 10, 2009, now U.S. Pat. No. 7,978,753, which is a continuation of U.S. Patent Appl. No. 11/425,507, filed Jun. 21, 2006, now U.S. Pat. No. 7,697,598, which is a continuation of U.S.

Patent Appl. No. 11/289,516, filed Nov. 30, 2005, which is a continuation of U.S.

Patent Appl. No. 11/090,183, filed Mar. 28, 2005, which is a continuation of U.S.

Patent Appl. No. 10/778,083, filed Feb. 17, 2004, which is a continuation of U.S.

Patent Appl. No. 10/175,815, filed Jun. 21, 2002, which is a continuation of U.S.

Patent Appl. No. 09/581,400, filed Jun. 13, 2000, now U.S. Pat. No. 6,445,730,

which is a 371 of International Application No. PCT/US99/01539, filed Jan. 26,

1999, which claims the benefit of and priority to U.S. Application No. 60/072,447,

filed Jan. 26, 1998.

4. The face of the '440 patent names John A. Greszczuk, Richard W. Gross, Halil Padir N., Michale A. Tzannes, as the inventors. Further, the face of the '404 patent identifies TQ Delta, LLC, as the assignee of the '404 patent.

5. In preparing this Declaration, I have reviewed:

- a) the '404 patent, Ex. 1001;
- b) the file history of the '404 patent, Ex. 1002; and
- c) the prior art references discussed below: Ex. 1005 (Bowie), Ex. 1006 (Yamano), and Ex. 1007 (ANSI T1.413), and
- d) prior art relevant DSL technology: Ex. 1009 (Fosmark).

6. In forming the opinions expressed in this Declaration, I have relied upon my education and experience in the relevant field of art, and have considered the viewpoint of a POSITA, as of January 26, 1998. I have also considered:

- a) the documents listed above,
- b) the additional documents and references cited in the analysis below,
- c) the relevant legal standards, including the standard for obviousness provided in and any additional authoritative documents as cited in the body of this declaration, and
- d) my knowledge and experience based upon my work in this area as described below.

7. I understand that claims in an IPR are given their broadest reasonable interpretation in view of the patent specification and the understandings of a POSITA. I further understand that this is not the same claim construction standard as one would use in a District Court proceeding.

II. BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS

8. My qualifications are set forth in my curriculum vitae, a copy of which is included as Exhibit 1004. As set forth in my curriculum vitae:

9. I earned my B.S. in Computer and Electrical Engineering from Washington State University-Northeastern in 1982, a M.S. in Electrical and Computer Engineering from Washington State University in 1984, and a PhD. in Electrical and Computer Engineering from Washington State University in 1987.

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.