

1 David C. Marcus (SBN 158704)
david.marcus@wilmerhale.com
2 James M. Dowd (SBN 259578)
james.dowd@wilmerhale.com
3 Matthew J. Hawkinson (SBN 248216)
matthew.hawkinson@wilmerhale.com
4 Aaron Thompson (SBN 272391)
aaron.thompson@wilmerhale.com
5 WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
6 HALE AND DORR LLP
350 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2100
7 Los Angeles, CA 90071
8 Telephone: (213) 443-5300
Facsimile: (213) 443-5400
9

10 William F. Lee (pro hac vice)
william.lee@wilmerhale.com
11 WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
12 60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
13 Telephone: (617) 526-6000
Facsimile: (617) 526-5000
14

15 Attorneys for Defendants and Counterclaim-Plaintiffs
Hughes Communications Inc.
16 Hughes Network Systems LLC
DISH Network Corporation,
17 DISH Network LLC, and
dishNET Satellite Broadband LLC
18

19 Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page
20
21
22
23
24

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF
TECHNOLOGY,

Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant,

vs.

HUGHES COMMUNICATIONS INC.,
HUGHES NETWORK SYSTEMS LLC,
DISH NETWORK CORPORATION,
DISH NETWORK LLC, and DISHNET
SATELLITE BROADBAND LLC,

Defendants and Counter-Plaintiffs.

Case No. 2:13-cv-07245-MRP-JEM

**EXPERT REPORT OF DR.
BRENDAN FREY REGARDING
INVALIDITY OF PATENTS-IN-
SUIT**

EXPERT REPORT OF DR. BRENDAN FREY
REGARDING INVALIDITY OF PATENTS-IN-SUIT

I. SUMMARY OF REPORT

1. I have been retained as an expert in this case by counsel for Defendants and Counter-Plaintiffs Hughes Communications Inc., Hughes Network Systems LLC, DISH Network Corporation, DISH Network LLC, and dishNET Satellite Broadband LLC (collectively, “Defendants”). I expect to testify at trial about the matters set forth in this report, if asked about these matters by the Court or by the parties’ attorneys.

2. I understand that the Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant in this proceeding, the California Institute of Technology (“Plaintiff” or “Caltech”) has asserted against Defendants the following four patents:

- U.S. Patent No. 7,116,710 (the “’710 patent”);
- U.S. Patent No. 7,421,032 (the “’032 patent”);
- U.S. Patent No. 7,916,781 (the “’781 patent”); and
- U.S. Patent No. 8,284,833 (the “’833 patent”).

3. I further understand that Plaintiff has asserted the following claims:

- claims 1, 4, 6, 15, 20, and 22 of the ’710 patent;
- claims 1, 18, 19, and 22 of the ’032 patent;
- claims 16 and 19 of the ’781 patent; and
- claims 1, 2, 4, and 8 of the ’833 patent.

4. I have been asked for my expert opinion on whether the claims listed in the preceding paragraph (the “asserted claims”) are valid. In my opinion, all of the asserted claims are invalid for the reasons stated below.

5. I have also been asked for my opinion on whether various documents, including an email from an inventor dated March 7, 2000, demonstrate conception

1 of the claimed invention. In my opinion, these documents do not demonstrate
2 conception for the reasons stated below.

3 6. I have also been asked for my opinion regarding whether three references
4 (two by Luby et al. and one by Richardson et al.) were material to the claimed
5 invention. In my opinion, as explained below, these three references, none of
6 which were before the patent office during prosecution of the asserted patents,
7 were material to the claimed invention.

8 **BACKGROUND**

9 **A. Qualifications and Experience**

10 7. I received a B.Sc. with Honors in Electrical Engineering from the University
11 of Calgary in 1990, a M.Sc. in Electrical and Computer Engineering from the
12 University of Manitoba in 1993, and a Ph.D. in Electrical and Computer
13 Engineering from the University of Toronto in 1997. Since July 2001, I have been
14 at the University of Toronto, where I am a Professor of Electrical and Computer
15 Engineering and Computer Science.

16 8. During my career I have conducted research in the areas of graphical models,
17 error-correcting coding, machine learning, genome biology and computer vision. I
18 have authored more than 200 publications and am named as an inventor on nine
19 patents issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

20 9. I have received a number of honors and awards for the research I have
21 conducted. In 2008, I was named a Fellow of the Institute for Electrical and
22 Electronic Engineers (IEEE), an honor given to a person with an “extraordinary
23 record or accomplishments” in the field of electrical engineering. In 2009, I was
24 named a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science
(AAAS), an honor that recognizes “efforts on behalf of the advancement of science
or its applications which are scientifically or socially distinguished.”

1 10. In 2009, I was awarded a Steacie Fellowship for my work on the theory and
2 implementation of artificial and natural mechanisms for inferring patterns from
3 data. The Steacie Fellowship is awarded by the Natural Sciences and Engineering
4 Research Council of Canada (NSERC) to “outstanding and highly promising
5 scientists and engineers” who are faculty members of Canadian universities. In
6 2011, I received the NSERC’s John C. Polanyi Award, in recognition of my
7 research on inferring genetic codes embedded in DNA that direct activities within
8 cells.

8 11. Throughout my career I have received funding from various governmental
9 agencies to support my research, including the Natural Sciences and Engineering
10 Research Council of Canada, the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, and the
11 Canadian Institute for Advanced Research.

12 12. A copy of my *curriculum vitae* is attached to this report as Exhibit A.

13 **B. Understanding of the Law**

14 13. I am not an attorney. For the purposes of this report, I have been informed
15 about certain aspects of the law that are relevant to my analysis and opinions. My
16 understanding of the law is as follows:

17 i) Invalidity in General

18 14. A patent is presumed valid, and a challenger to the validity of a patent must
19 show invalidity of the patent by clear and convincing evidence. Clear and
20 convincing evidence is evidence that makes a fact highly probable.

21 ii) Anticipation

22 15. A patent claim is invalid if it is “anticipated” by prior art. For the claim to
23 be invalid because it is anticipated, all of its requirements must have existed in a
24 single device or method that predates the claimed invention, or must have been
described in a single publication or patent that predates the claimed invention.

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.