

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Apple Inc.
Petitioner

v.

California Institute of Technology
Patent Owner

Case Nos. IPR2017-00210, IPR2017-00211, IPR2017-00219, IPR2017-00297,
IPR2017-00423, IPR2017-00700, IPR2017-00701, IPR2017-00728

**DECLARATION OF RICHARD GOLDENBERG IN SUPPORT OF
UNOPPOSED MOTIONS TO SUBMIT REPLACEMENT EXHIBITS
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(c)**

**Apple vs. Caltech
IPR2017-00700
Apple 1025**

1. I, Richard Goldenberg, am employed at WilmerHale and am lead counsel of record for Petitioner Apple Inc. in the above captioned *inter partes* review proceedings. I am an attorney duly admitted to practice before the United States Patent and Trademark Office. I supervised and assisted in preparation of the captioned *inter partes* review proceedings.

2. This declaration is filed in support of Petitioner's Unopposed Motions to Correct Clerical Errors in the captioned *inter partes* review proceedings. I understand that these motions will be filed to correct exhibits filed with the captioned *inter partes* review proceedings, which are directed to U.S. Patent No. 7,116,710 (the "'710 Patent"), U.S. Patent No. 7,916,781 (the "'781 Patent"), and U.S. Patent No. 7,421,032 (the "'032 Patent") (collectively, the "'710, '781, and '032 IPRs").

3. Petitioner inadvertently filed incorrect versions of the following exhibits in the captioned *inter partes* review proceedings:

- Frey, B. J. and MacKay, D. J. C., "Irregular Turbocodes," *Proc. 37th Allerton Conf. on Comm., Control and Computing*, Monticello, Illinois, 1999 (the "Frey exhibit").
- D. Divsalar, H. Jin, and R. J. McEliece, "Coding theorems for 'turbo-like' codes," *Proc. 36th Allerton Conf. on Comm., Control and Computing*, Allerton, Illinois, 1998 (the "Divsalar exhibit").

- Declaration of Paul H. Siegel (the “Siegel Declaration exhibit”).

4. The exhibit numbers for each of the Frey, Divsalar, and Siegel

Declaration exhibits in the ’710, ’781, and ’032 IPRs are listed in the table below.

Petitioner did not file the Siegel Declaration exhibit in the ’781 Patent IPRs.

| Exhibit Name | IPR Number | Patent Number | Exhibit Number |
|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Frey | IPR2017-00210 | 7,116,710 | 1002 |
| Frey | IPR2017-00211 | 7,116,710 | 1102 |
| Frey | IPR2017-00219 | 7,116,710 | 1202 |
| Frey | IPR2017-00297 | 7,916,781 | 1010 |
| Frey | IPR2017-00423 | 7,916,781 | 1110 |
| Frey | IPR2017-00700 | 7,421,032 | 1010 |
| Frey | IPR2017-00701 | 7,421,032 | 1110 |
| Frey | IPR2017-00728 | 7,421,032 | 1210 |
| Siegel | IPR2017-00210 | 7,116,710 | 1020 |
| Siegel | IPR2017-00211 | 7,116,710 | 1120 |
| Siegel | IPR2017-00219 | 7,116,710 | 1220 |
| Siegel | IPR2017-00700 | 7,421,032 | 1023 |
| Siegel | IPR2017-00701 | 7,421,032 | 1123 |
| Siegel | IPR2017-00728 | 7,421,032 | 1223 |
| Divsalar | IPR2017-00210 | 7,116,710 | 1003 |

| | | | |
|----------|---------------|-----------|------|
| Divsalar | IPR2017-00211 | 7,116,710 | 1103 |
| Divsalar | IPR2017-00219 | 7,116,710 | 1203 |
| Divsalar | IPR2017-00297 | 7,916,781 | 1017 |
| Divsalar | IPR2017-00423 | 7,916,781 | 1117 |
| Divsalar | IPR2017-00700 | 7,421,032 | 1017 |
| Divsalar | IPR2017-00701 | 7,421,032 | 1117 |
| Divsalar | IPR2017-00728 | 7,421,032 | 1217 |

5. During the process of filing petitions in the '710, '781, and '032 IPRs, an associate at my firm, Jonathan E. Barbee, assisted me in the collection and uploading of the exhibits to each petition. In those IPR filings, Mr. Barbee directed legal staff to upload incorrect versions of the Frey exhibit and the Divsalar exhibit and omitted the "Exhibit 1" attached to the Siegel Declaration exhibit.

6. For the Frey exhibit, being aware of the prior result in IPR2015-00067, I intended for a copy of the Frey reference to be filed that included a March 20, 2000 date stamp from the Cornell University Library. During prior litigation with a different defendant, my firm obtained and produced to the Patent Owner over a year ago such a copy of the Frey reference, which bears the Bates Stamp HUGES00883604-83627 and bears a date stamp of March 20, 2000 from the Cornell University Library. My firm had several additional copies of the Frey reference in the firm's document management database, including the

inadvertently-filed exhibits. Mr. Barbee selected the wrong document because the inadvertently-filed versions of the exhibit had been circulated for a different purpose. However, the text of the corrected Frey exhibit is identical to the text of the inadvertently-filed exhibits and will not affect the manner in which Frey teaches the claims as explained in the petitions filed in the '710, '781, and '032 IPRs.

7. For the '710 Patent IPRs (IPR2017-00210, -00211, and -00219) and the '781 Patent IPRs (IPR2017-00297 and -00423), the corrected exhibits contain the following material, which the inadvertently-filed Frey exhibit lacks: a table of contents, a date stamp, and page numbering corresponding to the Table of Contents of the publication in which the Frey reference was published. The Table of Contents from that publication was filed as a separate exhibit with the petitions for the '710 Patent IPRs as Ex. 1015, Ex. 1115, and Ex. 1215 to demonstrate when the Frey reference was available to the public—the Table of Contents in these exhibits bears a date stamp of March 20, 2000 from the Cornell University Library (*i.e.*, the same date stamp present in the corrected Frey exhibit) and indicates that the first page of Frey is page 241. The pagination of the inadvertently-filed Frey exhibit does not match the pagination identified in the Table of Contents in Ex. 1015, Ex. 1115, and Ex. 1215 because the inadvertently-filed Frey exhibit begins at page 1. In the corrected Frey exhibit, the first page of the exhibit is page 241, which

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.