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

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Table of Contents

Page

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

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

(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

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

(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

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

(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

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.