

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

ANDREA ELECTRONICS INC.,
Patent Owner.

Patent No. 6,363,345

IPR2017-00626

**REPLY DECLARATION OF BERTRAND HOCHWALD
REGARDING U.S. PATENT NO. 6,363,345**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. RESPONSE TO DR. DOUGLAS’S OPINIONS1

A. Martin’s Sub-Windows Are an Optional Feature1

B. Martin Discloses the Claimed “Future Minimum” Even Where Sub-Windows Are Used.....5

C. Dr. Douglas Misinterprets Martin’s Own Description of How Well His Noise Floor Algorithm Works9

D. Dr. Douglas Mischaracterizes My Deposition Testimony.....11

E. Dr. Douglas Is Incorrect that Hirsch Teaches That 0.2 Seconds Is a Long Time12

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I have been retained by counsel for Apple Inc. as an expert witness in the above-captioned proceeding. I have been asked to provide an opinion regarding the patentability of certain claims in U.S. Patent No. 6,363,345 (“the ’345 Patent”) (Exhibit 1001). I previously submitted declarations in this matter as Exhibits 1003 and 1004.

2. My background and qualifications are set forth in my opening declarations Exhibits 1003 and 1004. A copy of my CV was attached as Exhibit B to those declarations. I disclosed the compensation I am receiving, and prior testimony in my opening declarations. I also set forth my understanding of the relevant legal standards in my opening declarations.

3. I understand that Andrea submitted responses to the petitions and the Institution decisions, and that Andrea submitted two declarations from Dr. Scott Douglas (both labeled Ex. 2002). I have considered Andrea’s Responses and Dr. Douglas’s declarations, and this declaration sets forth my reply to certain of Andrea’s and Dr. Douglas’s arguments.

II. RESPONSE TO DR. DOUGLAS’S OPINIONS

A. Martin’s Sub-Windows Are an Optional Feature

4. Andrea and Dr. Douglas contend that multiple sub-windows ($W > 1$) are a “crucial” part of Martin’s algorithm. [Ex. 2002 (-626 Douglas) at ¶60.] They are wrong because sub-window(s) are not crucial for rapid adjustment of noise

level. Using $W = 1$ in Martin's algorithm is a perfectly reasonable choice for that parameter.

5. Martin says the overall window length L must be large enough to bridge any peak of speech activity, but short enough to follow non-stationary noise variations. He does not make similar comments about the number of sub-windows W . [Ex. 1006 at 1094.] Martin does not specify any upper or lower bounds on W . Where $W = 1$, the length of each sub-window M is equal to the length of the window L . Martin does not suggest that these values would not work. On the contrary, he specifies these values as configurable parameters which one in the art would understand how to set. One in the art would understand that Martin's algorithm functions equally well for any positive integer W . [Ex. 1006, Figure 2.]

6. Martin says a window time length of 0.625 (seconds) is "a good value", and this value corresponds in his example to window sample length of $L = 5000$. He does not provide any qualitative assessment of how many sub-window(s) W would be "good."

7. Martin explains that W is chosen at least in part on the basis of "computational complexity and delay" [Ex. 1006 at 1094.] The basis for "computational complexity" used by Martin at time of publication was in 1993. Six years later in 1999, at the time of the filing of the '345 patent, computers were considerably faster and more capable. Hence a value of W that would be chosen in

1993 could differ in 1999 or today. Martin had the foresight to anticipate this issue, and allow the choice of W to be a design variable, whether smaller or larger.

8. Martin says sub-windows can “improve[e] the noise tracking capability” for “a rapid noise power increase.” [Ex. 1006 at 1094.] Martin does not state that this feature is required to track noise. Just that it improves noise tracking in some circumstances.

9. According to Martin’s algorithm, the noise floor $P_n(i)$ adjusts to rapid noise power decreases, because the noise floor is immediately updated if the current smoothed power is less than the floor. This is true for any W .

10. Other aspects of Martin’s algorithm are not affected by the choice of W . For example, the noise floor $P_n(i)$ is never allowed to be above $\bar{P}_x(i)$. [Ex. 1006 at Figure 2.], and $\bar{P}_x(i)$ has no dependency on W .

11. Dr. Douglas asserts that Martin does not update the noise floor $P_n(i)$ periodically. [Ex. 2002 (-626 Douglas) at ¶72.] That statement is not correct. Where $W = 1$, Martin’s noise floor $P_n(i)$ is always set to P_{Mmin} at the end of the window. In Martin’s Figure 2, both branches of the monotonically increasing test simplify to the same result when $W = 1$. In the “no” branch, Martin selects the minimum of the last W values stored in *min_vec* (italicized for ease of reading). Martin shows this through the mathematical statement $\min(\textit{min_vec}(r*M), \textit{min_vec}((r-1)*M), \dots, \textit{min_vec}(r-W+1)*M)$. The last value in this list is $\textit{min_vec}(r-$

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.