

Declaration of W. Leo Hoarty
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of Patent No. 8,611,404

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

DISH Network L.L.C.,
Petitioner

v.

TQ Delta LLC,
Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 8,611,404
Filing Date: May 6, 2013
Issue Date: December 17, 2013

Title: Multicarrier Transmission System with Low Power Sleep Mode and Rapid-On
Capability

**DECLARATION OF W. LEO HOARTY IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR
INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,611,404**

Inter Partes Review No. _____

Declaration of W. Leo Hoarty
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of Patent No. 8,611,404

I.	INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS	5
A.	Engagement Overview	5
B.	Summary of Opinions	5
C.	Qualifications and Experience	6
2.	Career	7
3.	Publications	13
4.	Curriculum Vitae.....	14
D.	Materials Considered.....	14
II.	LEGAL PRINCIPLES USED IN THE ANALYSIS	18
A.	Person Having Ordinary Skill in the Art (“POSITA”)	18
B.	Prior Art.....	20
C.	Broadest Reasonable Interpretations.....	21
D.	Legal Standards for Anticipation & Obviousness.....	21
III.	TECHNOLOGY TUTORIAL	31
A.	Introduction: From Dial-up to Broadband	31
B.	Challenges of High-Speed Data over the POTS Network	33
C.	Overview of ADSL-High-Speed Data over Copper Twisted-Pair Cables.....	36
D.	Technology Specifics of ADSL	40
E.	Initialization and Synchronization of an ADSL Link	45
F.	Some Detail for Understanding Initialization and Synchronization.....	49
G.	Crosstalk in ADSL	52
H.	Bit Loading, Bit Allocation Tables and Bit Swapping	55
I.	Bit Allocation and Power Cut Back	58
J.	Power Management and Sleep Mode.....	60
K.	Summary	65
IV.	THE ‘404 PATENT.....	67
A.	Overview of the ‘404 Patent.....	67

Declaration of W. Leo Hoarty
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of Patent No. 8,611,404

B.	The Claims of the ‘404 Patent.....	69
C.	Interpretation of Claim Limitations in the ‘404 Patent.....	70
D.	The Priority Claim of the ‘404 Patent.....	71
V.	OVERVIEW OF THE PRIOR ART.....	71
A.	Overview of Bowie.....	71
B.	Overview of Vanzieleghem.....	74
C.	Overview of the 1995 ADSL Standard.....	75
D.	Bowie, Vanzieleghem and the 1995 ADSL Standard Are Analogous Art.....	76
VI.	GROUND 1 – CLAIMS 6, 11, 16 AND 20 ARE RENDERED OBVIOUS BY BOWIE IN VIEW OF THE 1995 ADSL STANDARD AND VANZIELEGHEM UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A).....	77
A.	Independent claim 6.....	77
1.	Claim element 6[b].....	77
2.	Claim element 6[c].....	80
3.	Claim element 6[d].....	84
4.	Claim element 6[e].....	88
5.	Claim element 6[f].....	96
6.	Claim element 6[g].....	99
B.	Independent claim 11.....	101
1.	Claim element 11[a].....	101
2.	Claim element 11[b].....	102
3.	Claim element 11[d].....	103
4.	Claim element 11[g].....	103
C.	Dependent claim 20.....	103
VII.	NO SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS EXIST.....	110
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	111

1. I, W. Leo Hoarty, declare as follows:

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated in this declaration, and could and would testify to these facts under oath if called upon to do so.

I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS

A. Engagement Overview

3. I have been retained by counsel for DISH Network L.L.C. (“Petitioner” or “DISH”) in this case as an expert in the relevant art. I am being compensated for my work at the rate of \$545 per hour. No part of my compensation is contingent upon the outcome of this petition.

4. I was asked to study U.S. Patent No. 8,611,404 (“the ‘404 patent”), its prosecution history, and the prior art and to render opinions on the obviousness or non-obviousness of certain ones of the claims of the ‘404 patent in light of the teachings of the prior art, as understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art in the 1998 time frame. I understand that the claims being challenged in the Petition are claims 6, 11, 16 and 20 (“the challenged claims”).

B. Summary of Opinions

5. After studying the ‘404 patent, relevant excerpts of its prosecution history, and the prior art, and considering the subject matter of the claims of the ‘404 patent in light of the state of technical advancement in the area of power conservation in multicarrier communication systems in the 1998 time frame, I

reached the conclusions discussed herein.

6. In light of these general conclusions, and as explained in more detail throughout this declaration, it is therefore my opinion that each of the challenged claims of the '404 patent addressed in this declaration are invalid as they were anticipated and/or obvious in the 1998 time frame in light of the knowledge of skill in the art at that time and the teachings, suggestions, and motivations present in the prior art. This declaration, and the conclusions and opinions herein, provide support for the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of the '404 patent filed by Petitioner. I have reviewed the Petition in its entirety as well as its corresponding exhibits.

C. Qualifications and Experience

7. I possess the knowledge, skills, experience, and training to form an expert opinion and testimony in this matter. I have over 40 years of experience in the field of computer systems and networking, including distributed software systems and streaming media technology. I also have deep experience in cable television systems and consumer electronics, including the hardware and software design of media set-top and mobile devices. I have practiced and researched in the field of Digital Signal Processing and Computer Science for approximately 35 years.

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.