

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the *Inter Partes* Review of:

Trial Number: To Be Assigned

U.S. Patent No. 8,559,635

Filed: May 24, 1995

Issued: October 15, 2013

Inventor(s): John Christopher Harvey, James  
William Cuddihy

Assignee: Personalized Media  
Communications, LLC

Title: Signal Processing Apparatus and  
Methods

Panel: To Be Assigned

---

Mail Stop *Inter Partes* Review  
Commissions for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**DECLARATION OF ANTHONY J. WECHSELBERGER UNDER 37 C.F.R.  
§ 1.68 IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF  
U.S. PATENT NO. 8,559,635**

## Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Background and Qualifications .....	3
III.	Understanding of Patent Law .....	11
IV.	Background.....	14
A.	Background of the Field Relevant to the '635 Patent .....	14
1.	NTSC Television Transmission Technology.....	15
2.	Embedded Digital Information in NTSC Television Transmissions.....	18
3.	Pay TV and Content Protection .....	26
4.	Decryption and Descrambling .....	30
B.	Summary of the '635 Patent.....	32
C.	Summary of the Prosecution History .....	35
D.	Priority Date of the '635 Patent.....	36
1.	Claim 13 Is Not Supported By The Written Description Of The '490 Patent.....	37
2.	Claims 18, 20, 32, and 33 Are Not Supported By The Written Description Of The '490 Patent.....	38
3.	Claims 21, 28, 29, and 30 Are Not Supported By The Written Description Of The '490 Patent.....	42
4.	Claims 3, 4, And 7 Are Not Entitled To The November 3, 1981 Priority Date of the '490 Patent .....	43
V.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art.....	45
VI.	Broadest Reasonable Interpretation.....	46
1.	“Executable instructions”.....	46

2.	“Encrypted digital information transmission . . . unaccompanied by any non-digital information transmission” .....	46
3.	“Communicating said control signal to said remote transmitter station” .....	46
4.	“Decrypting” .....	47
5.	“Processor” .....	47
VII.	Background on Prior Art References .....	48
A.	Background on Chandra .....	48
B.	Background on Seth-Smith .....	49
C.	Background on Campbell .....	49
D.	Background on Nachbar .....	50
VIII.	Claims 13, 18, 20, 32, and 33 Are Invalid Over Chandra .....	50
1.	Claim 18 Is Anticipated By Chandra .....	51
2.	Claim 20 Is Anticipated By Chandra .....	56
3.	Claim 32 Is Anticipated By Chandra .....	58
4.	Claim 33 Is Obvious Over Chandra In View of Nachbar .....	61
5.	Claim 13 Is Anticipated By Chandra .....	66
IX.	Claims 4, 7, 21, 28-30 Are Invalid Over Seth-Smith .....	68
1.	Claim 2 Is Anticipated By Seth-Smith .....	68
2.	Claim 4 Is Anticipated By Seth-Smith .....	76
3.	Claim 7 Is Anticipated By Seth-Smith .....	77
4.	Claim 21 Is Anticipated By Seth-Smith .....	78
5.	Claim 28 Is Anticipated By Seth-Smith .....	80

6.	Claim 29 Is Anticipated By Seth-Smith .....	81
7.	Claim 30 Is Anticipated By Seth-Smith .....	82
X.	Claim 3 Is Invalid Over Campbell.....	82
1.	Claim 3 Is Obvious Over Campbell.....	83
XI.	Secondary Considerations of Non-Obviousness .....	89
XII.	Conclusion .....	92

I, Anthony J. Wechselberger, do hereby declare as follows:

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1. I have been retained as an expert witness on behalf of Apple, Inc. (“Apple”) for the above-captioned Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (“IPR”) of U.S. Patent No. 8,559,635 (“the ’635 patent”). I am being compensated for my time in connection with this IPR at my standard consulting rate of \$350 per hour. My compensation is not affected by the outcome of this matter.
2. I have been asked to provide my opinions regarding whether Claims 3, 4, 7, 13, 18, 20, 21, 28-30, 32, and 33 of the ’635 patent (“the Challenged Claims”) are invalid as anticipated or would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the alleged invention.
3. The ’635 patent issued on October 15, 2013, from U.S. Patent Appl. No. 08/449,413 (“the ’413 application”), filed on May 24, 1995. (Ex. 1003 at cover.) The ’635 patent alleges to be a continuation of a series of applications dating back to U.S. Patent Appl. No. 07/096,096 filed on September 11, 1987, now U.S. Patent No. 4,965,825 (“the ’096 Application”). The ’096 Application alleges to be a continuation-in-part of a series of applications dating back to U.S. Patent Appl. No. 06/317,510 filed November 3, 1981, now U.S. Patent No. 4,694,490 (“the ’510 Application”).

# 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.