

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

ANDREA ELECTRONICS CORP.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2017-00627  
Patent 6,363,345 B1

---

Before STEPHEN C. SIU, MICHAEL R. ZECHER, and  
JEREMY M. PLENZLER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PLENZLER, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

FINAL WRITTEN DECISION  
*Inter Partes* Review  
35 U.S.C. § 318 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.73

## I. INTRODUCTION

We have jurisdiction to hear this *inter partes* review under 35 U.S.C. § 6 and this Final Written Decision is issued pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 318(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.73. For the reasons that follow, we determine that Apple Inc. (“Petitioner”) has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that claims 1–5, 10–16, 21–23, 25, and 38–46 of U.S. Patent No. 6,363,345 B1 (Ex. 1001, “the ’345 patent”) are unpatentable, but has failed to establish that claims 6–9, 17–20, 24, and 47 of the ’345 patent are unpatentable.

### A. Background

Petitioner filed a Petition to institute an *inter partes* review of claims 1–25 and 38–47 of the ’345 patent. Paper 1 (“Pet.”). Andrea Electronics Corp. (“Patent Owner”) filed a Preliminary Response. Paper 6 (“Prelim. Resp.”).

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 314, we instituted trial on all challenged claims, and on all challenges raised in the Petition. *See* Paper 7 (“Dec. to Inst.”), 12. After institution of trial, Patent Owner filed a Patent Owner Response (Paper 11, “PO Resp.”), to which Petitioner filed a Reply (Paper 18, “Pet. Reply”).

An oral argument was held on April 25, 2018. A transcript of the oral argument is included in the record. Paper 22 (“Tr.”).

### B. Related Matters

Petitioner and Patent Owner identify a number of proceedings, both in district court and before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, involving patents related to the ’345 patent, including a district court proceeding specifically directed to the ’345 patent with Petitioner as a party and Case IPR2017-00626, which is directed to the ’345 patent and involves the same

parties as this proceeding. Pet. viii–x; Paper 4, 1. Our final decision in Case IPR2017-00626 issues concurrently herewith.

*C. Asserted Grounds of Unpatentability and Evidence of Record*

Petitioner contends that the challenged claims are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 as set forth in the table below (Pet. 2–3, 20–67).

Reference(s)	Basis	Claims Challenged
Helf <sup>1</sup>	§ 102	1–7, 9–11, 13, 14, 21, 23, 38–41, and 43
Helf and the Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	§ 103	1–7, 9–11, 13, 14, 21, 23, 38–41, and 43
Helf and Martin <sup>2</sup>	§ 103	6, 8, 9, 12, 25, 42, and 46
Helf and Boll <sup>3</sup>	§ 103	17–20 and 47
Helf and Arslan <sup>4</sup>	§ 103	15 and 16
Helf, Boll, and Arslan	§ 103	24
Helf and Uesugi <sup>5</sup>	§ 103	22
Helf, Martin, and Uesugi	§ 103	44 and 45

Petitioner provides testimony from Bertrand Hochwald, Ph.D.

Ex. 1004. Patent Owner provides testimony from Scott C. Douglas, Ph.D.

Ex. 2002. Petitioner also provides deposition testimony from Dr. Douglas

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Patent No. 5,550,924, iss. Aug. 27, 1996 (Ex. 1010, “Helf”).

<sup>2</sup> Rainer Martin, “*An Efficient Algorithm to Estimate the Instantaneous SNR of Speech Signals*,” Eurospeech 1993 (Ex. 1006, “Martin”).

<sup>3</sup> Steven F. Boll, “*Suppression of Acoustic Noise in Speech Using Spectral Subtraction*,” IEEE 1979 (Ex. 1009, “Boll”).

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Patent No. 5,706,395, iss. Jan. 6, 1998 (Ex. 1011, “Arslan”).

<sup>5</sup> U.S. Patent No. 5,459,683, iss. Oct. 17, 1995 (Ex. 1015, “Uesugi”).

(Ex. 1026) and Patent Owner provides deposition testimony from Dr. Hochwald (Ex. 2005).

#### *D. The '345 Patent*

The '345 patent “relates to noise cancellation and noise reduction and, more specifically, to noise cancellation and reduction using spectral subtraction.” Ex. 1001, 1:19–21. The '345 patent explains that its system receives a noise signal and converts that signal to the frequency domain through a Fast Fourier Transform (FFT). *Id.* at 4:50–5:14. Separate thresholds are set for each frequency bin to determine the location of noise elements for each frequency bin separately. *Id.* at 6:10–13. The '345 patent determines the thresholds by setting two minimum values, which are described as a future minimum and a current minimum. *Id.* at 6:23–41.

At predetermined time intervals (e.g., every 5 seconds), the future minimum value is initialized as the value of the current magnitude of the signal. *Id.* at 6:24–28. Over that time interval, and before the next initialization, the future minimum value of each bin is compared with the current magnitude value of the signal. *Id.* If the current magnitude is smaller than the future minimum, the value of the future minimum is replaced with that current magnitude. *Id.* at 6:28–32.

At the start of each time interval, the current minimum is set as the value of the future minimum that was determined over the previous time interval. *Id.* at 6:34–38. The current minimum then follows the minimum value of the signal for the next time interval by comparing its value with the current magnitude value. *Id.* The current minimum value is used by the spectral subtraction process to remove noise from the signal. *Id.* at 6:38–41.

### *E. Illustrative Claims*

As noted above, Petitioner challenges claims 1–25 and 38–47 of the '345 patent. Claims 1 and 38 are independent, with claims 2–25 and 39–47 depending from either claim 1 or 38. Claim 1 is illustrative, and is reproduced below:

1. An apparatus for canceling noise, comprising:
  - an input for inputting an audio signal which includes a noise signal;
  - a frequency spectrum generator for generating the frequency spectrum of said audio signal thereby generating frequency bins of said audio signal; and
  - a threshold detector for setting a threshold for each frequency bin using a noise estimation process and for detecting for each frequency bin whether the magnitude of the frequency bin is less than the corresponding threshold, thereby detecting the position of noise elements for each frequency bin.

Ex. 1001, 9:35–46.

## II. ANALYSIS

### *A. Claim Construction*

“[W]e need only construe terms ‘that are in controversy, and only to the extent necessary to resolve the controversy.’” *Nidec Motor Corp. v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co.*, 868 F.3d 1013, 1017 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (quoting *Vivid Techs., Inc. v. Am. Sci. & Eng’g, Inc.*, 200 F.3d 795, 803 (Fed. Cir. 1999)). We construe the claims using the broadest reasonable construction in light of the '345 patent Specification. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b). Applying that standard, we interpret the claim terms of the '345 patent according to their ordinary and customary meaning in the context of the patent’s written description. *See In re Translogic Tech., Inc.*,

# 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.