

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Patent Owner.

IPR2017-00210
Patent No. 7,116,710

DECLARATION OF DR. MICHAEL MITZENMACHER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	ENGAGEMENT.....	1
II.	QUALIFICATIONS	1
III.	COMPENSATION AND PRIOR TESTIMONY	6
IV.	LEGAL PRINCIPLES	7
V.	INTRODUCTION TO CHANNEL CODING AND TERMINOLOGY	10
VI.	OVERVIEW OF THE ART AND CITED REFERENCES	15
	A. Turbo Codes	18
	1. Berrou’s turbo codes	18
	B. Gallager/LDPC codes	20
	1. Gallager Codes are rediscovered	20
	C. Cited References	23
	1. Frey	23
	2. Luby <i>et al.</i>	26
	3. Divsalar	27
VII.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	28
VIII.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	29
	A. “rate”	29
IX.	REBUTTAL TO GROUND 1: CLAIMS ARE NOT ANTICIPATED BY FREY	30
	A. The Petition and Dr. Davis both fail to identify “obtaining a block of data in the signal to be encoded” as recited in Claim 1	30

B.	Frey does not disclose partitioning into sub-blocks as recited in Claim 1	31
C.	Frey does not disclose a second encoder that has a “rate close to one” or a “rate substantially close to one”	35
X.	REBUTTAL TO GROUND 2: CLAIMS ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER DIVSALAR IN VIEW OF FREY	45
A.	Divsalar does not cure Frey’s lack of anticipation of the “partitioning” step.....	46
B.	A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art would not be motivated to combine Divsalar with Frey	46
1.	Frey’s irregular codes performed poorly	46
2.	Frey and Divsalar are not “similar codes”	54
3.	The Petition’s proposed modification to Divsalar is not supported by the teachings of Frey.....	55
4.	A person of ordinary skill would not have expected the proposed modification to Divsalar to be successful.....	60
XI.	REBUTTAL TO GROUND 3: CLAIMS ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER DIVSALAR, FREY AND LUBY97.....	67
XII.	SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS.....	68
A.	Nexus between the objective evidence and the claims.....	69
B.	Long-felt need and failure of others	75
C.	Industry Praise	78
D.	Unexpected Results.....	80
E.	Commercial Success	81
XIII.	CONCLUDING STATEMENTS.....	84

I, Michael Mitzenmacher, declare as follows:

I. ENGAGEMENT

1. I have been retained by counsel for the California Institute of Technology as an expert witness in the above-captioned proceeding. I have been asked to provide my opinion about the state of the art of the technology described in U.S. Patent No. 7,116,710 (the “710 patent”) and on the patentability of the claims of this patent. The following is my written testimony on these topics.

II. QUALIFICATIONS

2. I am currently employed as a Professor of Computer Science at Harvard University. Specifically, I am the Thomas J. Watson, Sr. Professor of Computer Science in the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences. I joined the faculty of Harvard as an Assistant Professor in January 1999. I was promoted to Associate Professor in 2002 and to Professor in 2005. In 2010, I began a three-year term as Area Dean, which is essentially equivalent to what other schools call Department Chair, of Computer Science, and held that position through June 2013. My work address is 33 Oxford Street, Cambridge, MA 02138. My primary research interests include design and analysis of algorithms, networks and data transmission, and information theory.

3. I received my undergraduate degree in Mathematics and Computer Science from Harvard College in 1991. I received a Certificate of Advanced Study

in Mathematics from Cambridge University in 1992. I received a Ph.D. in Computer Science from the University of California at Berkeley in 1996. From August 1996 to January 1999, I was employed as a Research Scientist at Digital Systems Research Center, where my work included projects on algorithms for the Internet and error-correcting codes.

4. I am listed as an inventor or co-inventor on 19 issued patents, and am the co-author of a textbook entitled “Probability and Computing” published by Cambridge University Press. I am a Fellow of the Association for Computing Machinery, and currently serve as the Chair of the ACM Special Interest Group on Algorithms and Computation Theory (SIGACT).

5. The fields of endeavor at issue in this case are error-correction coding methods, including repeat-accumulate codes, Turbo codes, and low-density parity-check codes. I have published over 200 research papers in computer science and engineering conferences and journals, many of which have explored algorithms and data structures for error-correction codes, including both mathematical analysis and applications.

6. I have authored or co-authored a number of papers specifically in the area of low-density parity-check codes, including papers that have been presented as potential prior art in these proceedings. For example, the paper "Improved

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.