

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ZTE (USA) Inc.,
HTC Corporation, and
HTC America, Inc.,

Petitioner

v.

Evolved Wireless LLC,

Patent Owner

DECLARATION OF PAUL S. MIN, PH.D

Case No. IPR2016-00758

ZTE/HTC
Exhibit 1014-0001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction & Summary of Opinions.....	1
II.	Background/Qualifications	2
III.	Documents and Materials Considered.....	6
IV.	Legal Principles	7
V.	Challenged Claims of 481 Patent	13
VI.	Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	15
VII.	Technical Background	16
VIII.	State of the Art.....	19
IX.	Prior Art References	20
	A. Panasonic 792.....	20
	B. Panasonic 114.....	22
	C. Chu	23
X.	Claim Construction.....	24
XI.	Invalidity Analysis of 481 Patent	24
	A. Claims 1-2 and 8-9 are anticipated by and/or obvious in view of Panasonic 792.....	24
	1. Independent Claim 1	24
	2. Dependent Claim 2	29
	3. Independent Claim 8	29
	4. Dependent Claim 9	32
	B. Claims 3, 4, 10, and 11 are invalid based on Panasonic 792 and Panasonic 114.....	32

1.	Dependent Claim 3	32
2.	Dependent Claim 4	33
3.	Dependent Claim 10	35
4.	Dependent Claim 11	35
5.	Reasons to Combine the Panasonic References	36
C.	Claims 6 and 13 are invalid based on Panasonic 792, Panasonic 114, and Chu.....	38
1.	Dependent Claim 6	38
2.	Dependent Claim 13	40
3.	Reasons to Combine the Panasonic References and Chu.....	40
XII.	Public Availability of Prior Art References	41
A.	Panasonic 792 (Exhibit 1002) was available to members of the general public as of at least March 21, 2006, without any restrictions.	41
B.	Panasonic 114 (Exhibit 1003) was available to members of the general public as of at least May 2, 2006, without any restrictions....	51
C.	Chu (Exhibit 1004) was available to members of the general public as of at least July 1972, without any restrictions.	58

I. Introduction & Summary of Opinions

1. My name is Paul Min. I submit this declaration on behalf of ZTE (USA) Inc., HTC Corporation, and HTC America, Inc. (“Petitioner”), which I understand are challenging the validity of claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, and 13 (“the challenged claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 8,218,481 (“the 481 patent”) in a petition for *inter partes* review.

2. I have been asked to provide an opinion on the validity of the challenged claims. In my opinion, for the reasons in the following sections, the challenged claims are invalid on the following grounds:

- (1) claims 1, 2, 8, and 9 of the 481 patent are anticipated by and/or obvious in view of Panasonic 792 (Exhibit 1002);
- (2) claims 3, 4, 10, and 11 of the 481 patent are obvious in view of Panasonic 792 (Exhibit 1002) and Panasonic 114 (Exhibit 1003); and
- (3) claims 6 and 13 are obvious in view of Panasonic 792 (Exhibit 1002), Panasonic 114 (Exhibit 1003), and Chu (Exhibit 1004).

3. I have also been asked to provide an opinion on whether Exhibits 1002, 1003, and 1004 to the petition were available to interested members of the public before June 9, 2006, which is the claimed priority date of the 481 patent. In my opinion, for the reasons in the following sections:

- (1) Exhibit 1002 (Panasonic 792) was available to members of the general

public, including interested members of the public, without restriction as of at least March 21, 2006;

(2) Exhibit 1003 (Panasonic 114) was available to members of the general public, including interested members of the public, without restriction as of at least May 2, 2006; and

(3) Exhibit 1004 (Chu) was available to members of the general public, including interested members of the public, without restriction as of at least July 1972.

II. Background/Qualifications

4. Appendix A to this declaration is my curriculum vitae, which sets forth my qualifications.

5. I received a B.S. degree in Electrical Engineering in 1982, an M.S. degree in Electrical Engineering in 1984, and a Ph.D. degree in Electrical Engineering in 1987 from the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor. I received several academic honors, including my B.S. degree with honors, a best graduate student award and a best teaching assistant award during my M.S. study, and a best paper award from a major international conference for reporting results from my Ph.D. thesis.

6. After receiving my Ph.D., I worked at Bellcore in New Jersey from August 1987 until August 1990. At Bellcore, I was responsible for evolving the

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.