UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.
Petitioner

v.

ANDREA ELECTRONICS CORPORATION
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2017-00626
U.S. Patent 6,363,345

DECLARATION OF SCOTT C, DOUGLAS, PH.D. IN SUPPORT OF PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

Patent Owner
Andrea Electronics Corp.
EXHIBIT 2002
IPR2017-00626

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1
- A. Engagement 1
- B. Compensation and Prior Testimony 1
- C. Qualifications and Professional Experience 2
- D. Summary of My Study 5

II. Relevant Legal Standards 6
- A. Claim Construction 7
- B. Anticipation 7
- C. Obviousness 8

III. Claim Construction and one of ordinary skill in the art 10
- A. Claim Construction 10
- B. One Of Ordinary Skill In The Art 11

IV. Background of the Technology 12
- A. Audio Signals 13
- B. Analyzing Audio Signals 17
- C. Adaptive Filtering 21

V. Overview Of The '345 Patent 22

VI. CLAIMS 4-11, 13-25, 38-42, AND 43-47 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER HIRSCH IN VIEW OF ANY SECONDARY REFERENCE 24
- A. Grounds Based on The Combination of Hirsch and Martin 25
  - 1. Summary of the Asserted References 25
    - a) Hirsch 25
    - b) Martin 27
    - c) Martin's Techniques Allegedly Reduce Delay 31
    - d) The Role of Subwindows in Martin's Algorithm 33
    - e) Martin's SNR Computation 34
  - 2. Claims 4-11 are Not Obvious Over Hirsch In View of Martin 35
    - a) The combination of Hirsch and Martin does not teach or disclose a "current minimum" and a "future minimum" 35

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

(1) P_{Mmin} is Not a "Future Minimum" in the Rapidly Varying Noise Power Case (*i.e.*, for monotonically increasing signals) 36
(2) There is No "Future Minimum" in the Slowly Varying Noise Power Case (*i.e.*, for non-monotonically increasing signals) 37
b) $P_n(i)$ is Not Set to P_{Mmin} Periodically 38
c) The Combination of Hirsch and Martin Fails to disclose the "Current Magnitude" of Claim 10 41
3. Method Claims 43
4. A skilled artisan would not have been motivated to combine Hirsch and Martin 44
5. Apple's Validity Positions are Based on Dr. Hochwald's Incomplete Analysis and His Incorrect Understanding of the Martin System 53
a) Apple's Attempt to Eliminate Subwindows Is Contrary to Martin's Express Disclosure 53
b) Dr. Hochwald Failed to Analyze the Monotonic Decision Block 55
c) Dr. Hochwald Has an Erroneous Understanding of the Sample Counter and the Update of the Min_Vec Array 58
B. Grounds Based on The Combination of Hirsch And The Other Relied-Upon Secondary References 62
1. Summary of the Asserted References 62
a) Boll 62
b) Arslan 63
c) Uesugi 63
2. A skilled artisan would not have been motivated to combine Hirsch and Boll or Arslan as alleged 64
3. Ground Based on the Combination of Hirsch, Martin, and Boll 69
4. Ground Based on the combination of Hirsch, Boll, and Arslan 71
5. Grounds Based on the Combinations of Hirsch and Uesugi, and Hirsch, Martin and Uesugi 71
VII. Conclusion 73

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

I, Scott C. Douglas, Ph.D., do hereby declare:

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Engagement

1. I have been retained by counsel for Andrea Electronics Corporation as an expert witness to render opinions on certain issues concerning *Inter Partes* Review No. IPR2017-00626 of U.S. Patent No. 6,363,345 to Joseph Marash *et al*. (Ex. 1001, "the '345 Patent").

B. Compensation and Prior Testimony

2. I am being compensated at a standard rate of $575 per hour for my study and preparation of this declaration. I am also being reimbursed for reasonable and customary expenses associated with my work and testimony in this study. This compensation is not dependent on my opinions or testimony or the outcome of this matter.

3. I have previously testified as an expert in the following matters, which also involved the '345 Patent: U.S. International Trade Commission Investigation Nos. 337-TA-949 and 337-TA-1026 on behalf of Andrea Electronics Corp. During the previous four years, I have additionally testified as an expert in the following matters: *Ericsson Inc. v. Apple Inc.*, E.D.Tx., 2:15-cv-288-JRG-RSP; and *Masimo v. Covidien*, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Interference No. 105875.

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

C. Qualifications and Professional Experience

4. I am currently a professor in the Department of Electrical Engineering at the Bobby B. Lyle School of Engineering at Southern Methodist University. I have been a professor in the Department of Electrical Engineering at Southern Methodist University since August 1998. I have taught, and continue to teach, courses to undergraduate and graduate level students in the areas of signal processing, including adaptive filtering and adaptive arrays. My research at Southern Methodist University is focused in the areas of acoustic signal processing, active noise control, adaptive filtering, array processing, multichannel blind deconvolution and source separation.

5. Prior to my position at Southern Methodist University, I was an assistant professor in the Department of Electrical Engineering at the University of Utah. I taught courses to undergraduate and graduate level students in the areas of signal processing, including digital signal processing, adaptive filtering, and active noise control. In addition to teaching, I also performed research in the areas of adaptive filtering, active noise control, multichannel blind deconvolution and source separation, and hardware implementations of adaptive signal processing systems.

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.