

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.

Petitioners

v.

PERSONALIZED MEDIA COMMUNICATIONS LLC

Patent Owner

Case No.: IPR2016-01520

Patent No.: 8,559,635

For: Signal Processing Apparatus and Methods

DECLARATION OF ALFRED WEAVER, PH.D.

PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.68

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
I. Qualifications & Engagement.....	1
II. Materials Reviewed and Relied upon	7
III. Summary of Conclusions	8
IV. Legal Standards	10
A. Anticipation	10
B. Obviousness.....	10
C. Claim Construction	13
D. Applicability of Claim Construction to Priority and Validity	14
E. Persons of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	15
V. Background Technology of the '635 Patent	15
VI. Claim Construction	17
A. “decrypting” terms	17
(a) The '490 Patent and '635 Patent Specifications Distinguish Decrypting from Descrambling	20
(b) The Applicants Disclaimed Descrambling from the Ambit of “Decrypting” During Prosecution of the Application Leading to the '635 Patent	24
(c) The Applicants Disclaimed Decrypting from Descrambling During Other Proceedings Including Reexamination	26
(d) In 1981, A POSITA Understood Decrypting to be Distinct from Descrambling.....	27

(e)	Tribunals Including The BPAI and District Courts Have Construed Decrypting to Exclude Descrambling	28
(f)	Petitioner’s Expert Agrees that Decrypting is Different from Descrambling	30
(g)	The Paragraph that the Board Relies Upon Does Not Describe Decrypting as the same as Descrambling	33
(h)	The District Court, Having Reviewed The Very Same Paragraph That The Board Cites To, Rejected Petitioner’s Argument And Found Decrypting To Be Distinct From Descrambling	35
B.	“receiving an encrypted digital information transmission ... unaccompanied by any non-digital information transmission”	37
C.	“executable instructions”	40
D.	“processor”	41
VII.	Each of the Challenged Claims of the ’635 Patent is Entitled to the November 3, 1981 Priority Date	48
A.	Overview of Exemplary Relevant Embodiments in the November 3, 1981 Patent Application (“the ’490 Patent”)	52
B.	Claim 3	57
(a)	“programming”	61
(b)	“communicating said control signal to said remote transmitter station.”	71
C.	Claims 4 and 7	73
D.	Claim 13	79
(a)	“executable instructions”	83
E.	Claims 18, 20, 32 and 33	89

(a)	“receiving at least one encrypted digital information transmission, wherein the at least one encrypted digital information transmission is unaccompanied by any non-digital information transmission,”	90
(b)	“Code” and “Downloadable Code”	105
(c)	The ’490 Patent Provides Written Description Support For The Remaining Limitations Of Claims 18, 20, 32 And 33.....	108

VIII. The Challenged Claims are Patentable Over the Prior Art.....121

A.	Claim 3 Is Patentable over Campbell.....	121
(a)	Campbell Does Not Qualify As Prior Art.....	122
(b)	“receiving at said remote transmitter station one or more second instruct signals which operate at the subscriber station to identify and decrypt said unit of programming or said one or more first instruct signals, said remote transmitter station transferring said one or more second instruct signals to said transmitter”	124
(c)	“receiving a control signal which operates at the remote transmitter station to control the communication of a unit of programming and one or more first instruct signals and communicating said control signal to said remote transmitter station”	126
(d)	“receiving a code or datum identifying a unit of programming to be transmitted by the remote transmitter station, said remote transmitter station transferring said unit of programming to a transmitter”	128
B.	Claims 4 and 7 Are Patentable over Seth-Smith.....	137
(a)	Seth-Smith Does Not Qualify As Prior Art	137
(b)	Claim 4.....	138

(c)	Claim 7	141
C.	Claim 33 is Patentable over Chandra in view of Nachbar	141
(a)	Chandra and Nachbar Do Not Qualify As Prior Art.....	143
(b)	Chandra, in view of Nachbar, fails to teach or suggest every limitation of Claim 33	144
D.	Claims 13, 18, 20, 32 Are Patentable over Chandra	152
(a)	Chandra Does Not Qualify As Prior Art.....	152
(b)	Claim 18.....	153
(c)	Claim 20.....	156
(d)	Claim 32.....	156
(e)	Claim 13.....	157
IX.	Secondary Considerations Confirm The Non-Obviousness Of The Inventions	160
X.	CONCLUSION	160

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.