

By: Cono A. Carrano (ccarrano@akingump.com)
David C. Vondle(dvondle@akingump.com)
Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP
1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
Tel. (202) 887-4000
Fax. (202) 887-4288
Email: ccarrano@akingump.com,
dvondle@akingump.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

VIZIO, Inc.
Petitioner

v.

Personalized Media Communications, LLC
Patent Owner

Inter Partes Review No.: Unassigned

**DECLARATION OF STUART LIPOFF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.68
IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 7,752,650**

Declaration of Stuart Lipoff Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68 in Support of
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,752,650

Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS	3
	A. Educational Background	4
	B. Career History and Relevant Industry Participation	4
III.	UNDERSTANDING OF PATENT LAW	8
IV.	BACKGROUND	11
	A. Summary of the '650 Patent	11
	B. Representative Claim 1	12
	C. Background of the Field Relevant to the '650 Patent	13
	D. Summary of the Prosecution History	21
V.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE PERTINENT ART	30
VI.	BROADEST REASONABLE INTERPRETATION	31
	A. “digital television signals”	31
	B. “processor”	32
	C. “digital video signals”	32
VII.	DETAILED INVALIDITY ANALYSIS	33
VIII.	BACKGROUND ON PRIOR ART REFERENCES	34
	A. Background on Mustafa	34
	B. Background on Iijima	35
	C. Background on Campbell	36
	D. Background on Widergren	36
IX.	THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE INVALID OVER MUSTAFA	37
	A. The Challenged Claims are Obvious Based on Mustafa in View of the Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	38
	1. Claim 1 is Obvious Over Mustafa in View of the Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art	38
	2. Claim 2 is Obvious Over Mustafa in View of the Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art	55
	3. Claim 4 is Obvious Over Mustafa in View of the Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art	58
	4. Claim 18 is Obvious Over Mustafa in View of the Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art	60

Declaration of Stuart Lipoff Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68 in Support of
 Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,752,650

5.	Claim 32 is Obvious Over Mustafa in View of the Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art	63
6.	Claim 33 is Obvious Over Mustafa in View of the Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art	64
X.	THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE INVALID OVER MUSTAFA IN VIEW OF IJIMA.....	64
A.	Iijima.....	64
B.	The Combination of Mustafa and Iijima.....	66
C.	Mustafa in view of Iijima Renders Claims 1, 2, 4, 18, 32 and 33 Obvious.....	70
XI.	THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE INVALID OVER CAMPBELL.....	71
A.	Challenged Claims are Obvious Based on Campbell in View of the Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	71
1.	Claim 1 is Obvious Over Campbell in View of the Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art	71
2.	Claim 2 is Obvious Over Campbell in View of the Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art	90
2.	Claim 4 is Obvious Over Campbell in View of the Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art	93
3.	Claim 18 is Obvious Over Campbell in View of the Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art	95
4.	Claim 32 is Obvious Over Campbell in View of the Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art	98
5.	Claim 33.....	99
B.	Widergren.....	99
C.	The Combination of Campbell and Widergren.....	102
D.	Campbell in view of Widergren Renders the Challenged Claims Obvious.....	109
XII.	SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS.....	110
XIII.	CONCLUSION.....	112

Declaration of Stuart Lipoff Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68 in Support of
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,752,650

I, Stuart Lipoff, do hereby declare as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I have been retained as an expert witness on behalf of VIZIO, Inc. (“VIZIO”) for the above-captioned Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (“IPR”) of U.S. Patent No. 7,752,650 (“the ’650 Patent”). I am being compensated for my time in connection with this IPR at my standard consulting rate of \$375 per hour. My compensation is not affected by the outcome of this matter.
2. I have been asked to provide my opinions regarding whether or not Claims 1, 2, 4, 18, 32, and 33 of the ’650 Patent (“the Challenged Claims”) are invalid as obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the alleged invention.
3. The ’650 Patent issued on July 6, 2010, from U.S. Patent Appl. No. 08/460,711 (“the ’711 application”), filed on June 2, 1995. (Ex. 1002 at cover). The ’650 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. 06/317,519, now U.S. Patent No. 4,694,490 (“the ’519 Application”).

Declaration of Stuart Lipoff Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68 in Support of
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,752,650

4. For the purposes of my Declaration, I have been asked to assume that the priority date of the alleged invention recited in the '650 Patent is September 11, 1987.
5. The face of the '650 Patent names John Christopher Harvey and James William Cuddihy as the named inventors, and identifies Personalized Media Communications, LLC as the named assignee. (Ex. 1002 at cover).
6. In preparing this Declaration, I have reviewed the '650 Patent, the file history of the '650 Patent, numerous prior art references, and technical references from the time of the alleged invention.
7. I understand that claims in an IPR are given their broadest reasonable interpretation in view of the patent specification and the understandings of one having ordinary skill in the relevant art.
8. In forming the opinions expressed in this Declaration, I relied upon my education and experience in the relevant field of the art, and have considered the viewpoint of a person having ordinary skill in the relevant art, as of September 11, 1987. My opinions are based, at least in part, on the following references in view of the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art as of September 11, 1987:

Reference	Date of Public Availability
U.S. Patent No. 4,789,895 to Mustafa, et al. ("Mustafa")	Filed April 30, 1987; Issued and Published on December 6, 1988

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.