



PLANET DEPOS<sup>©</sup>  
We Make It Happen >> *Anywhere*<sup>™</sup>

Transcript of **RUDIGER L. URBANKE**

**Date:** February 25, 2015

**Case:** THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY v. HUGHES  
COMMUNICATIONS, INC., ET AL

Planet Depos, LLC  
Phone: 888-433-3767  
Fax: 888-503-3767  
Email: [transcripts@planetdepos.com](mailto:transcripts@planetdepos.com)  
Internet: [www.planetdepos.com](http://www.planetdepos.com)

Court Reporting | Videography | Videoconferencing | Interpretation | Transcription

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

-----x

THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE :  
OF TECHNOLOGY, :  
Plaintiff, :

v. : Case No.:

HUGHES COMMUNICATIONS, INC., : 2:13-cv-07245-MRP-JEM  
HUGHES NETWORK SYSTEMS, LLC, :  
DISH NETWORK CORPORATION, :  
DISH NETWORK, LLC, and DISHNET:  
SATELLITE BROADBAND, LLC, :  
Defendants.:

-----x

Videotaped Deposition of RÜDIGER L. URBANKE  
Palo Alto, California  
Wednesday, February 25, 2015  
9:57 a.m.

Job No.: 77059  
Pages: 1 - 332  
Reported by: James Beasley, RPR, CA CSR No. 12807

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

2

1 Videotaped Deposition of RÜDIGER L. URBANKE,  
2 held at the offices of:

3

4

5

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP

6

950 Page Mill Road

7

Palo Alto, California 94304

8

(650) 858-6000

9

10

11

12

13

Pursuant to Notice, before James Beasley,

14

Registered Professional Reporter, California Certified

15

Shorthand Reporter, CSR No. 12807.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

3

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

A P P E A R A N C E S

ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFF:

JAMES M. GLASS, ESQUIRE  
QUINN, EMANUEL, URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP  
51 Madison Avenue  
22nd Floor  
New York, New York 10010  
(212) 849-7000

ROBERT KANG, ESQUIRE  
QUINN, EMANUEL, URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP  
50 California Street  
22nd Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111  
(415) 875-6600

ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS:

JAMES DOWD, ESQUIRE  
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP  
350 South Grand Avenue  
Suite 2100  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
(213) 443-5309

ALSO PRESENT: JOSEPH MOURGOS, Videographer

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

4

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C O N T E N T S

EXAMINATION OF RÜDIGER L. URBANKE	PAGE
By Mr. Dowd	9

E X H I B I T S

(Attached to transcript)

URBANKE DEPOSITION EXHIBIT	PAGE
Exhibit 1    Document entitled: "Curriculum Vitae of Prof. Rüdiger Urbanke"; three pages (double-sided).	12
Exhibit 2    Document entitled: "Expert Report of Dr. Rüdiger Urbanke Regarding Validity of U.S. Patent Nos. 7,116,710; 7,421,032; 7,916,781; and 8,284,833"; 39 pages (double-sided).	30
Exhibit 3    Document entitled: "United States Patent No. 7,916,781 B2"; 12 pages (double-sided).	42
Exhibit 4    Document entitled: Exhibit B - Materials Considered"; two pages (double-sided).	49
Exhibit 5    Article entitled: "Irregular Repeat-Accumulate Codes"; eight pages (double-sided).	50

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

5

URBANKE DEPOSITION EXHIBIT	PAGE
Exhibit 6 Article entitled: "Coding Theorems for 'Turbo-Like' Codes"; 10 pages (double-sided).	54
Exhibit 7 Table, one page.	111
Exhibit 8 Table, one page.	114
Exhibit 9 Article entitled: "Practical Loss-Resilient Codes"; 11 pages (double-sided).	117
Exhibit 10 Table labeled: "Random Permutation," with handwriting; one page.	123
Exhibit 11 Table labeled: "Random Permutation," no handwriting; one page.	124
Exhibit 12 Table labeled: "Random Permutation," with red and blue lines; one page.	131
Exhibit 13 Table labeled: "Random Permutation," no red and blue lines; one page.	136
Exhibit 14 Article entitled: "Graph-based Codes and Iterative Decoding"; 115 pages (double-sided).	148

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

6

URBANKE DEPOSITION EXHIBIT	PAGE
Exhibit 15 Article entitled: "Gallager Codes Recent Results"; 12 pages.	165
Exhibit 16 Source code; 16 pages (double-sided).	185
Exhibit 17 Article entitled: "Analysis of Low Density Codes and Improved Designs Using Irregular Graphs"; 11 pages (double-sided).	215
Exhibit 18 E-mail from ART@scarpia.research.bell-labs.com to dariush@shanon.jpl.nasa.gov, dated 4/05/1999; one page.	244
Exhibit 19 E-mail from ART@scarpia.research.bell-labs.com, sent April 05, 1999; one page.	244
Exhibit 20 Article entitled: "Design of Provably Good Low-Density Parity Check Codes"; 36 pages (double-sided).	249
Exhibit 21 Article entitled: "Irregular Turbocodes"; eight pages (double-sided).	265

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

7

URBANKE DEPOSITION EXHIBIT	PAGE
Exhibit 22 E-mail from Brendan Frey to Dariush Divsalar, dated 12/08/1999; one page.	287
Exhibit 23 Document entitled: "Provisional Application for Patent"; 35 pages.	301
Exhibit 24 Article entitled: "Irregular Turbo-Like Codes"; 11 pages (double-sided).	311
Exhibit 25 Document entitled: "United States Patent No. 6,081,909"; 42 pages (double-sided).	312
Exhibit 26 Document entitled: "United States Patent No. 4,623,999"; seven pages (double-sided).	313
Exhibit 27 Article entitled: "Comparison of Construction of Irregular Gallager Codes"; six pages (double-sided).	314
Exhibit 28 Article entitled: "Low Density Parity Check Codes with Semi-Random Parity Check Matrix"; two pages.	315



VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

8

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

---

Palo Alto, California

Wednesday, February 25, 2015

9:57 a.m.

---

P R O C E E D I N G S

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Here begins Video No. I	09:56:28
in the videotaped deposition of Rüdiger Urbanke, in	09:56:30
the matter of The California Institute of Technology	09:56:35
versus Hughes Communications, Incorporated, et al.,	09:56:44
in the United States District Court, for the Central	09:56:44
District of California. The case number is	09:56:48
2:13-cv-07245-MRP-JEM.	09:56:52
Today's date is February 25th, 2015 and	09:57:01
the time on the video monitor is 9:57 a.m.	09:57:07
The videographer today is Joseph Mourgos,	09:57:11
representing Planet Depos. This video deposition is	09:57:15
taking place at 950 Page Mill Road, Palo Alto,	09:57:18
California.	09:57:24
Would counsel please voice identify	09:57:25
yourselves and state whom you represent.	09:57:30
MR. DOWD: Go ahead.	09:57:30
MR. GLASS: Sure. James Glass from Quinn,	09:57:31
Emanuel, Urquhart, & Sullivan, representing	09:57:34
plaintiff Caltech and deponent, Dr. Urbanke. With	09:57:35

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

9

1 me today is Robert Kang, also of Quinn, Emanuel. 09:57:40

2 MR. DOWD: Jim Dowd of WilmerHale for the 09:57:42

3 defendants. 09:57:45

4 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Thank you. The court 09:57:46

5 reporter today is James Beasley, representing Planet 09:57:48

6 Depos. Would the reporter please administer the 09:57:51

7 oath. 09:57:55

8 --- 09:57:56

9 RÜDIGER L. URBANKE,

10 being first duly sworn and/or affirmed by the

11 Certified Shorthand Reporter to tell the truth, the

12 whole truth and nothing but the truth, testified as

13 follows:

14 ---

15 E X A M I N A T I O N

16 --- 09:58:14

17 BY MR. DOWD: 09:58:14

18 Q. Good morning. 09:58:15

19 A. Good morning. 09:58:15

20 Q. Thanks for coming. 09:58:15

21 A. You're welcome. 09:58:17

22 Q. Have you ever been deposed before? 09:58:18

23 A. No. 09:58:19

24 Q. Okay. Let me just go over a few ground 09:58:20

25 rules. 09:58:22

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

10

1           Your counsel may have already discussed           09:58:23  
2           this with you, but because what we say is being           09:58:25  
3           taken by a court reporter, it's important that we           09:58:27  
4           don't speak over one another. So I'll do my best           09:58:30  
5           not to speak when you're speaking and if you could           09:58:33  
6           do your best to do the same, I'd appreciate it;           09:58:35  
7           fair?           09:58:39  
8           A.           Fair.           09:58:39  
9           Q.           Okay. You understand that although we're           09:58:40  
10           in a conference room at the law firm of WilmerHale,           09:58:42  
11           that the transcript and the video that's being taken           09:58:45  
12           will actually be used in a court of law in           09:58:48  
13           Los Angeles?           09:58:51  
14           A.           Yes.           09:58:52  
15           Q.           Okay. Is there any reason why you can't           09:58:53  
16           provide complete and truthful answers today?           09:58:55  
17           A.           No.           09:58:58  
18           Q.           All right. You're not on any medications           09:58:59  
19           or suffering from any conditions?           09:59:01  
20           A.           No.           09:59:03  
21           Q.           We'll take breaks periodically. If you           09:59:06  
22           need a break, just let me know. The only thing that           09:59:09  
23           I would ask, though, is that if I have a question           09:59:13  
24           that is pending to you, if you could answer that           09:59:16  
25           question before we take the break, and then we'll --           09:59:18

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

11

1	then we'll take the break.	09:59:19
2	Okay?	09:59:20
3	A.        Understood.	09:59:21
4	Q.        Okay.  Could you please state your full	09:59:22
5	name for the record.	09:59:24
6	A.        It's Rüdiger L. Urbanke.	09:59:24
7	Q.        Where do you work?	09:59:29
8	A.        At -- I'm a full professor at EPFL in	09:59:30
9	Switzerland.	09:59:34
10	Q.        What do you do there?	09:59:34
11	A.        I'm a full professor in the department of	09:59:35
12	computer science and communications systems.	09:59:38
13	Q.        Do you work in the computer science	09:59:43
14	department?	09:59:45
15	A.        It's a mixed department of communications	09:59:45
16	and computer science.	09:59:48
17	Q.        Okay.  And so does that mean that that	09:59:49
18	department has professors who are both in the	09:59:52
19	computer science field and in the communications	09:59:55
20	field?	09:59:58
21	A.        That's correct.	09:59:59
22	Q.        And you work together?	09:59:59
23	A.        That's correct.	10:00:01
24	MR. DOWD:  Let's mark as Exhibit 1 a copy	10:00:03
25	of your CV.	10:00:05

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

12

1	(Urbanke Exhibit 1 was marked for	10:00:06
2	identification and attached to the	10:00:06
3	transcript.)	10:00:34
4	(Discussion off the record.)	10:00:34
5	BY MR. DOWD:	10:00:35
6	Q. Do you have before you Exhibit 1?	10:00:35
7	A. Yes.	10:00:37
8	Q. Do you recognize it?	10:00:37
9	A. Yes.	10:00:39
10	Q. What is it?	10:00:39
11	A. It's a CV of -- it's my CV.	10:00:40
12	Q. Is it complete?	10:00:44
13	A. Could you please, you know, make it a	10:00:46
14	little bit more specific what you mean by	10:00:51
15	"complete"?	10:00:53
16	Q. Is there anything that's important to your	10:00:54
17	background that's missing from this CV for the	10:00:56
18	purposes of this case?	10:01:00
19	A. It's, I think, a fair representation.	10:01:01
20	There is, of course, many, many other aspects of my	10:01:04
21	professional life that I could have added, but I	10:01:07
22	wanted to keep it, you know, relatively short.	10:01:10
23	Q. Okay. So Exhibit 1, was this prepared for	10:01:12
24	this case?	10:01:14
25	A. Not specifically. It's a standard CV --	10:01:15

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

13

1	Q.	And is this --	10:01:15
2	A.	-- that I have.	10:01:18
3	Q.	Is Exhibit 1 material that you believe	10:01:18
4		best qualifies you to be an expert in this case?	10:01:23
5	A.	I think it would give a fair idea of who I	10:01:26
6		am and, you know, what my qualifications are.	10:01:30
7	Q.	Okay. On Page 3 there's a list of	10:01:33
8		patents; do you see that?	10:01:38
9	A.	Right.	10:01:39
10	Q.	Those are all U.S. patents?	10:01:39
11	A.	I believe so, yes.	10:01:42
12	Q.	Those are all related to error correction	10:01:43
13		codes.	10:01:47
14	A.	They're perhaps in a wider area, not just	10:01:51
15		error correction.	10:01:55
16	Q.	Is any -- withdrawn.	10:01:56
17		Are any of the patents in the field of	10:01:59
18		computer science?	10:02:01
19		MR. GLASS: Objection to the extent it	10:02:01
20		calls for a legal conclusion.	10:02:05
21		THE WITNESS: I -- I'm not sure exactly	10:02:06
22		if -- if I know what you mean.	10:02:07
23		BY MR. DOWD:	10:02:08
24	Q.	Have you heard -- well, withdrawn.	10:02:09
25		You used the term "computer science"	10:02:10

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

14

1	earlier today. When you used that term what did you	10:02:13
2	mean?	10:02:16
3	A. Professors in computer science.	10:02:16
4	Q. Okay. Using that same understanding, do	10:02:18
5	any of the patents that you've listed on Page 3	10:02:20
6	relate to the field of computer science?	10:02:23
7	MR. GLASS: Same objection.	10:02:26
8	THE WITNESS: Most of these patents would	10:02:44
9	probably be well characterized as relating more to	10:02:46
10	physical layer communication.	10:02:51
11	BY MR. DOWD:	10:02:52
12	Q. Physical layer communication? Did I hear	10:02:52
13	that correctly?	10:02:54
14	A. Mostly, not -- not all of them, but, you	10:02:54
15	know, it's -- it's -- that's my main area of	10:02:58
16	expertise.	10:03:02
17	Q. Okay. So your area is in the physical	10:03:02
18	layer as opposed to the MAC layer or other areas; is	10:03:05
19	that correct?	10:03:08
20	A. It's a fair assessment that most of my	10:03:08
21	work has to do with that aspect, but codes are used	10:03:11
22	in a much wider area of applications.	10:03:15
23	Q. I -- I'm just asking about your	10:03:17
24	experience. So your experience is in the PHY layer?	10:03:19
25	A. My experience has to do in general with	10:03:22

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

15

1	coding.	10:03:25
2	Q. Okay. Now, if we look to the Ph.D. work	10:03:26
3	that you did, am I correct that your Ph.D. thesis	10:03:36
4	related to the field of turbo codes?	10:03:41
5	A. To some degree. This was not the main	10:03:46
6	focus of my Ph.D., but there were some aspect in my	10:03:49
7	Ph.D. that had to do with turbo code.	10:03:52
8	Q. Okay. Now, in addition to turbo codes,	10:03:55
9	you said there were other aspects; what were those?	10:03:57
10	A. The main aspects had to do with what's	10:03:58
11	multiple-access communication. A simple example of	10:04:02
12	what might -- might be meant with this is if you	10:04:05
13	imagine you have your cell phones and many people	10:04:07
14	are trying to communicate to a common cell phone	10:04:10
15	tower, the question is how do you do this	10:04:13
16	efficiently.	10:04:16
17	Q. And am I correct that one of the ways that	10:04:17
18	you investigated was a turbo code?	10:04:19
19	A. Slightly more specifically, I looked at	10:04:25
20	particular ways, information theoretic ways of how	10:04:28
21	to accomplish that. And when you actually implement	10:04:30
22	such a scheme, there's also coding involved and in	10:04:34
23	that aspect, I apply turbo codes.	10:04:34
24	THE REPORTER: I'm sorry.	10:04:34
25	"And in that aspect" --	10:04:34



VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

16

1	Repeat that portion, please.	10:04:41
2	THE WITNESS: Right. So in that aspect	10:04:41
3	when you're actually trying to implement that	10:04:44
4	scheme, that involves coding, and for that portion I	10:04:46
5	used turbo codes.	10:04:50
6	BY MR. DOWD:	10:04:51
7	Q. Did you look at any other form of coding?	10:04:52
8	A. I think this was the main form of coding	10:04:55
9	that I used at that time.	10:04:57
10	Q. I see. Have you ever been an expert	10:04:59
11	witness before?	10:05:08
12	A. No.	10:05:09
13	Q. Have you ever been involved in litigation	10:05:09
14	in the United States before?	10:05:11
15	A. No.	10:05:13
16	Q. Welcome.	10:05:17
17	Okay. What is your relationship with	10:05:22
18	Dr. McEliece?	10:05:25
19	MR. GLASS: Objection. Lacks foundation.	10:05:27
20	Go ahead.	10:05:28
21	THE WITNESS: Dr. McEliece is a very, you	10:05:29
22	know, honored colleague. He is someone that, when I	10:05:34
23	was a student, I read his book, a fantastic book. I	10:05:37
24	met him during conferences. I found him to be an	10:05:42
25	extremely original thinker, someone that would	10:05:46

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

17

1 typically never -- never, you know, follow simply 10:05:50  
2 the pack but would lead, have original ideas, have 10:05:52  
3 extremely good presentation skills, and he's one of 10:05:56  
4 our most valued luminaries in the field of 10:06:01  
5 information theory and coding. Just one example of 10:06:04  
6 why that is true is what's called a Shannon awardee. 10:06:07  
7 That's the highest honor that is given by the 10:06:11  
8 information field society for people working in that 10:06:15  
9 field. 10:06:18  
10 BY MR. DOWD: 10:06:21  
11 Q. So when -- withdrawn. 10:06:21  
12 Would you consider Dr. McEliece a friend? 10:06:22  
13 A. I did not have many -- you know, not -- 10:06:28  
14 you know, my contacts were relatively infrequent. I 10:06:31  
15 had a few e-mail exchanges with him. I would meet 10:06:37  
16 him at, you know, a few conferences, perhaps 10:06:41  
17 workshops. The closest contact I ever had with him 10:06:44  
18 was about two years when I interviewed him for one 10:06:48  
19 of the conferences. This conference takes place 10:06:51  
20 every year in San Diego. It's called ITA, 10:06:54  
21 information theory and applications. 10:06:59  
22 And as part of this conference, there 10:07:00  
23 is -- you know, there's a more entertainment section 10:07:03  
24 in there, and part of this entertainment section 10:07:07  
25 involves interviewing some of our most, you know, 10:07:10

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

18

1	well-known people. And I have done this now with a	10:07:14
2	variety of people and Dr. McEliece was one of them.	10:07:17
3	And so there was a segment, perhaps 30	10:07:20
4	minutes long, where we would talk about his life and	10:07:24
5	his accomplishments, but also other aspects of his	10:07:27
6	life that are not necessarily related to, you know,	10:07:30
7	his technical work, simply to show people who he	10:07:33
8	was.	10:07:36
9	Q. Have you ever published a paper together?	10:07:36
10	A. I believe not.	10:07:41
11	Q. Have you ever conducted a research study	10:07:42
12	together?	10:07:45
13	A. No.	10:07:46
14	Q. Have you ever worked for the same	10:07:46
15	employer?	10:07:48
16	A. Certainly not at the same time. I don't	10:07:51
17	know if he ever worked for Bell Labs. Bell Labs	10:07:54
18	is -- I was at Bell Labs. Bell Labs is -- you know,	10:07:56
19	has a long history. He might have at some point	10:07:58
20	been an employee, perhaps, or visited during the	10:08:02
21	summer, not during the time I was there, but I	10:08:05
22	cannot exclude that perhaps at some point in this	10:08:09
23	past he might have had some connections to	10:08:11
24	Bell Labs.	10:08:13
25	Q. And do you have any social relationship	10:08:13

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

19

1	with Dr. McEliece?	10:08:16
2	A. No, other than the one time where I	10:08:17
3	interviewed him. I visited him for a couple hours	10:08:19
4	up in -- in Caltech in order to get some material	10:08:22
5	for him, simply some pictures, some other things	10:08:26
6	that I -- that we could discuss. And at that point	10:08:29
7	we talked about some points in, you know, his life,	10:08:32
8	some events that happened. That was the closest I	10:08:33
9	ever interacted with him.	10:08:36
10	Q. Now, you mentioned that that was about two	10:08:37
11	years ago?	10:08:39
12	A. I believe it was exactly two years ago,	10:08:40
13	around February. So I must have visited end of	10:08:43
14	January or something like that.	10:08:46
15	Q. And that would be --	10:08:50
16	THE REPORTER: Wait, wait. One at a time	10:08:50
17	and you need to repeat the last portion of your	10:08:50
18	answer.	10:08:52
19	THE WITNESS: I believe that the -- so it	10:08:52
20	was two years ago, and I believe it would have been	10:08:55
21	towards the end of January.	10:08:59
22	BY MR. DOWD:	10:09:01
23	Q. Of 2013?	10:09:01
24	A. Of 2013, yeah.	10:09:05
25	Q. Not to get into too sensitive of a	10:09:07

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

20

1 subject, but I've been informed that his health is 10:09:11  
2 impaired at this point; was he in good health at 10:09:13  
3 that point? 10:09:17

4 A. He had some problems. He did well during 10:09:18  
5 the interview. But he had some -- you know, he had 10:09:23  
6 had some medical issues. I don't know the details 10:09:26  
7 of them. 10:09:28

8 Q. Fair enough. Fair enough. 10:09:29

9 Do you know Dr. Khandekar, who's another 10:09:30  
10 named inventor in this case? 10:09:36

11 A. I might -- I must have met him sometimes 10:09:37  
12 during a conference, but I had the least contact 10:09:42  
13 with him as -- as far as I know. 10:09:46

14 Q. Can you recall any specific instance where 10:09:47  
15 you met? 10:09:50

16 A. So we have a yearly conference called 10:09:50  
17 International Symposium on Information Theory. It's 10:09:53  
18 almost sure that at some point we must've met during 10:09:56  
19 this conferences, because essentially this is a 10:10:01  
20 conference involving about a thousand people, a 10:10:02  
21 thousand participants, and essentially everyone in 10:10:05  
22 our field would go to this conference. So it's a 10:10:07  
23 virtual certainty that we must've met.

24 THE REPORTER: Hold on. You're going to  
25 have to slow down for me; Okay? You're going --

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

21

1 THE WITNESS: Okay. Sorry.

2 THE REPORTER: -- too fast. I have a  
3 little trouble understanding your accent.

4 THE WITNESS: Okay.

5 THE REPORTER: So I need you just to start  
6 the last portion over, slow down.

7 THE WITNESS: So there's a conference 10:10:22  
8 called the international -- International Symposium 10:10:26  
9 of Information Theory. It takes place every year, 10:10:29  
10 typically around June. It involves on the order of 10:10:34  
11 a thousand participants. And since almost everyone 10:10:38  
12 in the field would attend that conference, it's a 10:10:43  
13 virtual certainty that at some point I must have run 10:10:47  
14 into him, exchanged a few words. I don't recall the 10:10:51  
15 specific instance but I think there's a very good 10:10:55  
16 chance that that happened. 10:10:57

17 BY MR. DOWD: 10:10:58

18 Q. Okay. And you mentioned the International 10:10:59  
19 Symposium on Information Theory; are you also 10:11:02  
20 familiar with a conference called Ambleside? 10:11:04

21 A. I -- I've heard the name, although I'm not 10:11:08  
22 sure right now where. But I've heard that name 10:11:12  
23 before, Ambleside, yes. 10:11:15

24 Q. Have you ever attended the Ambleside 10:11:16  
25 conference? 10:11:19

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

22

1 A. I don't think so. If you can tell me 10:11:19  
2 exactly where that is -- I -- I've heard the name 10:11:22  
3 in -- in -- in the context of our conferences, but I 10:11:24  
4 don't believe I've actually been there. 10:11:26  
5 Q. You probably know better than me -- 10:11:28  
6 A. Okay. 10:11:32  
7 Q. -- but my understanding is that it's -- 10:11:32  
8 the -- the -- the location is Ambleside and I 10:11:34  
9 believe it's in -- 10:11:36  
10 A. Yeah. 10:11:36  
11 Q. -- the UK. 10:11:37  
12 A. Yeah, I don't think I've ever been 10:11:38  
13 there -- 10:11:40  
14 Q. Okay. 10:11:40  
15 A. -- in Ambleside, yeah. 10:11:40  
16 Q. How about the Allerton conference; are you 10:11:42  
17 familiar with that conference? 10:11:45  
18 A. Yes, I'm familiar with that conference. 10:11:46  
19 Q. What is the Allerton conference? 10:11:48  
20 A. The Allerton conference is another yearly 10:11:50  
21 conference. It typically takes place around end of 10:11:53  
22 September or beginning of October. It's a 10:11:57  
23 conference that has a focus topics in communications 10:12:01  
24 and control. Although lately the topics have 10:12:04  
25 shifted a little bit. 10:12:12

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

23

1	And so it's a yearly conference that is	10:12:12
2	mostly visited by invitation; most of the people	10:12:15
3	there go by invitation.	10:12:18
4	Q. And what sorts of folks attend?	10:12:20
5	A. Mostly from academia. There are special	10:12:23
6	sessions that are organized, and depending on the	10:12:26
7	topic, certain people are invited. And it's	10:12:29
8	organized by faculty, typically from UIUC, from the	10:12:33
9	University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.	10:12:44
10	Q. Have you attended?	10:12:44
11	A. Yes.	10:12:46
12	Q. When?	10:12:46
13	A. Perhaps the first time might have been in	10:12:47
14	1992, perhaps. I'm not 100 percent sure. I -- I	10:12:50
15	went to Washington University, which is not very far	10:12:54
16	away, and I started in 1990 at Wash U, so perhaps I	10:13:00
17	probably didn't go the first year, perhaps not the	10:13:06
18	second year, but it's a fair guess that around 1992	10:13:09
19	I started going to this conference.	10:13:12
20	Q. Okay. And -- and have been every year	10:13:14
21	ever since or --	10:13:16
22	A. No. I went for a few years in a row, and	10:13:17
23	then I haven't been now in quite a few years. But	10:13:21
24	I've gone there for perhaps a total of 10 years,	10:13:29
25	perhaps.	10:13:32



VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

24

1	Q.	Okay. So the key kind of time frame here	10:13:33
2		is about 1997 to about 2000. Did you attend in	10:13:36
3		those -- those years?	10:13:41
4	A.	I -- I can't be for sure. There's a	10:13:46
5		chance that I attended some of these conferences,	10:13:48
6		but I don't know for sure. I would have to check.	10:13:50
7	Q.	Is there any during that period that you	10:13:52
8		recall that you did attend?	10:13:56
9	A.	Not specifically.	10:13:57
10	Q.	All right. You mentioned the IEEE	10:13:58
11		earlier; is there an IEEE transactions on	10:14:09
12		communications?	10:14:12
13	A.	Yes.	10:14:12
14	Q.	What is that conference about?	10:14:13
15	A.	Oh, that's -- I thought you're referring	10:14:16
16		to a journal.	10:14:19
17	Q.	Ah, pardon me.	10:14:20
18	A.	Okay.	10:14:22
19	Q.	Is there an IEEE-sponsored conference in	10:14:22
20		this field?	10:14:26
21	A.	So the transaction of -- sorry, the	10:14:26
22		IEEE -- International Symposium on Information	10:14:31
23		Theory is sponsored by IEEE.	10:14:34
24	Q.	Pardon me.	10:14:37
25	A.	So is the -- is ITA, and I believe that so	10:14:37

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

25

1 is now the Allerton conference, although I believe 10:14:42  
2 that this is only very recently so that the Allerton 10:14:48  
3 conference is associated to IEEE. I believe that 10:14:51  
4 this might only be the last, perhaps, five, six 10:14:54  
5 years or so. 10:14:58  
6 Q. Uh-huh. And as you move from conference 10:14:59  
7 to conference, International Symposium on 10:15:02  
8 Information Theory, the Allerton conference, the ITA 10:15:07  
9 conference, I think we also mentioned Ambleside, is 10:15:10  
10 it generally the same folks attending these 10:15:14  
11 conferences? 10:15:17  
12 MR. GLASS: Objection. Vague. Lacks 10:15:18  
13 foundation. 10:15:20  
14 THE WITNESS: There's some overlap of 10:15:20  
15 people, but they're also distinct people that would 10:15:24  
16 only go to some of these conferences. 10:15:28  
17 BY MR. DOWD: 10:15:31  
18 Q. Okay. But you would see some of the same 10:15:32  
19 people over and over again at these different 10:15:34  
20 conferences? 10:15:37  
21 MR. GLASS: Same objections. 10:15:37  
22 THE WITNESS: Some of them; some of 10:15:38  
23 these -- some of these people might be at various 10:15:39  
24 conferences. 10:15:42  
25 ///

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

26

1	BY MR. DOWD:	10:15:42
2	Q. Okay. Let's return to the inventors.	10:15:42
3	The third named inventor on the patents	10:15:48
4	that we're dealing with is a Dr. Jin; do you know	10:15:50
5	Dr. Jin?	10:15:54
6	A. I must've also met him at some of these	10:15:55
7	conferences.	10:16:00
8	Q. Do you have a personal relationship with	10:16:01
9	him?	10:16:02
10	A. No.	10:16:03
11	Q. Do you recall any specific instance where	10:16:03
12	you've met him?	10:16:05
13	A. I'm afraid not any particular date and	10:16:06
14	time. But I'm sure I must've met him, I must've	10:16:09
15	talked to him at some point, not extensively --	10:16:14
16	Q. Uh-huh.	10:16:14
17	A. -- and I might have had an occasional	10:16:18
18	e-mail exchange at some point, but various -- you	10:16:20
19	know, perhaps a few. But I don't recall any	10:16:22
20	particular e-mail exchange or any particular time	10:16:24
21	that I met him.	10:16:26
22	Q. Got it. Let's turn to the preparation for	10:16:27
23	the deposition.	10:16:32
24	What did you do to prepare for the	10:16:32
25	deposition today?	10:16:34

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

27

1	MR. GLASS: As phrased I'm going to object	10:16:35
2	to that question. It calls for -- potentially	10:16:37
3	calling for attorney-client privileged information	10:16:39
4	and instruct the witness not to answer.	10:16:42
5	THE WITNESS: Could you just please repeat	10:16:44
6	the question?	10:16:45
7	BY MR. DOWD:	10:16:45
8	Q. Sure. What did you do to prepare for your	10:16:46
9	deposition today?	10:16:48
10	MR. GLASS: And the same objection as	10:16:49
11	phrased and instruct the witness not to answer.	10:16:51
12	MR. DOWD: Are you going to follow that	10:16:52
13	instruction?	10:16:54
14	THE WITNESS: Yes.	10:16:54
15	MR. DOWD: That's an improper instruction.	10:16:55
16	MR. GLASS: I think as phrased, that	10:16:57
17	question is overbroad. We both know the boundaries	10:16:58
18	of the question, so...	10:17:02
19	MR. DOWD: I'm not going to waste time	10:17:02
20	debating it with you.	10:17:04
21	MR. GLASS: Sure.	10:17:05
22	MR. DOWD: To the extent you continue to	10:17:06
23	make improper instructions, we'll raise it with the	10:17:08
24	judge.	10:17:11
25	MR. GLASS: That instruction was not	10:17:12

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

28

1 improper, but I agree let's not waste time. 10:17:13

2 MR. DOWD: There's not supposed to be 10:17:13

3 speaking objections here. 10:17:15

4 BY MR. DOWD: 10:17:15

5 Q. Now, Dr. Urbanke, did you prepare for your 10:17:18

6 deposition today? 10:17:20

7 A. I wrote this expert report. 10:17:20

8 Q. Okay. Other than writing the expert 10:17:23

9 report, without getting into any details, did you do 10:17:26

10 anything else? 10:17:29

11 A. Nothing specific. 10:17:29

12 Q. Okay. In advance of coming to the 10:17:31

13 deposition today, did you meet with counsel; "yes" 10:17:33

14 or "no"? 10:17:36

15 A. In advance to meet -- I met with counsel 10:17:36

16 several times also preparing for the report. 10:17:39

17 Q. Okay. So let's talk first about the -- 10:17:42

18 the preparation of the -- preparation for the 10:17:45

19 deposition, okay? 10:17:47

20 When did you first meet to prepare for the 10:17:50

21 deposition? 10:17:53

22 A. There was no specific time to prepare for 10:17:54

23 this thing. This is a continuation of writing my 10:17:58

24 report. I'm simply making sure that, you know, 10:18:00

25 everything is in order, that I know all the facts. 10:18:03

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

29

1 Q. Okay. You have a document in front of 10:18:06  
2 you; is that your report? 10:18:08  
3 A. Yes. 10:18:09  
4 Q. Can you hand over whatever you have there? 10:18:10  
5 A. (Witness complied.) 10:18:12  
6 Q. Actually, why don't you hand over the full 10:18:13  
7 stack. Great. Thanks. 10:18:16  
8 So who selected the documents that you 10:18:52  
9 have in front of you? 10:18:54  
10 A. These are documents that are deemed 10:18:55  
11 important -- I deem important for, you know, the 10:18:58  
12 preparation for today. 10:19:01  
13 Q. Okay. The last document in the stack is a 10:19:03  
14 paper by Dr. MacKay; do you see that? 10:19:06  
15 A. Yes, I see that. 10:19:11  
16 Q. Who is Dr. MacKay? 10:19:12  
17 A. Dr. MacKay is originally a physicist in 10:19:14  
18 the area of statistic physics. I believe he has 10:19:18  
19 some connections to Bob McEliece. Perhaps he was 10:19:21  
20 his student or he was his post doc. I don't know. 10:19:25  
21 Q. Uh-huh. 10:19:25  
22 A. And for some point in time, he got 10:19:28  
23 interested in error code decoding. He wrote -- he 10:19:30  
24 wrote some papers on it. He then got out and is now 10:19:33  
25 in a different area. And he's, you know, located in 10:19:38

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

30

1	Great Britain.	10:19:41
2	Q. Okay. Just because I don't remember the	10:19:43
3	title from -- by heart, what was the title of the	10:19:45
4	paper that you have there?	10:19:47
5	A. This paper is entitled:	10:19:54
6	"Comparison of Constructions of	10:19:56
7	Irregular Gallagher Codes."	10:19:58
8	Q. Why did you select that paper to bring	10:20:00
9	with you today?	10:20:03
10	A. It's, you know, one paper that deals with	10:20:04
11	the general area that we're talking about.	10:20:07
12	Q. Okay. So MacKay worked in the area that	10:20:10
13	relates to this case?	10:20:13
14	A. Yes.	10:20:16
15	MR. DOWD: Let's mark as Exhibit 2 a copy	10:20:16
16	of your report. Feel free to use either the exhibit	10:20:19
17	version or your own version.	10:20:23
18	(Urbanke Exhibit 2 was marked for	10:20:26
19	identification and attached to the	10:20:26
20	transcript.)	10:20:51
21	BY MR. DOWD:	10:20:51
22	Q. Do you recognize Exhibit 2?	10:20:52
23	A. Yes.	10:20:53
24	Q. What is it?	10:20:53
25	A. It's my expert report.	10:20:54

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

31

1	Q.	Now, when were you first engaged for this	10:20:56
2		case?	10:21:00
3	A.	I believe it must have been January,	10:21:01
4		sometime in January.	10:21:07
5	Q.	Of 2015?	10:21:08
6	A.	Yes.	10:21:09
7	Q.	And how were you contacted?	10:21:10
8	A.	I was contacted by an attorney. His name	10:21:14
9		is Mark Tung who asked me to -- if I	10:21:19
10		was --	10:21:24
11		MR. GLASS: I'm going to caution the	10:21:24
12		witness not to divulge any communications between	10:21:26
13		you and counsel.	10:21:28
14		BY MR. DOWD:	10:21:30
15	Q.	Well, let me ask, when in January did	10:21:30
16		Mr. Tong contact you?	10:21:33
17	A.	I don't recall the exact date.	10:21:34
18	Q.	Was it around New Year's or was it around	10:21:36
19		the end of the month?	10:21:39
20	A.	It was earlier.	10:21:41
21	Q.	Okay. Now, did Mr. Tong provide to you	10:21:44
22		any facts that you've relied on in the course of	10:21:52
23		reaching the opinions expressed in Exhibit 2?	10:21:55
24	A.	No.	10:22:00
25	Q.	What were you asked to do?	10:22:00



VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

32

1	A.	So the general question that was posed to	10:22:09
2		me is what is stated in my report. I was asked to	10:22:11
3		give a general opinion about the state-of-the-art	10:22:16
4		and to give some opinions relating to a paper that	10:22:20
5		I'm a co-author with. It's Richardson, et al.	10:22:24
6		And also I added some opinions that have	10:22:28
7		to do with the Luby '79 and the Luby '98 papers.	10:22:32
8	Q.	Is that Luby '97?	10:22:38
9	A.	Sorry, what did I say? Yeah, sorry. '97	10:22:39
10		and '98, yeah.	10:22:42
11	Q.	And if I refer to the Richardson paper	10:22:44
12		that you're a co-author on as Richardson '99, will	10:22:47
13		that make sense?	10:22:52
14	A.	Correct.	10:22:53
15	Q.	Okay. Now, how long did you spend working	10:22:55
16		on the case between the time that you were	10:22:58
17		originally contacted and the time that the report	10:23:01
18		was produced on February 17th?	10:23:03
19	A.	I don't have the exact hours, but I would	10:23:05
20		guess that, perhaps, it took me on the order of	10:23:09
21		maybe 50 hours or something like that. But that's a	10:23:13
22		rough estimate. I don't have the exact, you know,	10:23:16
23		number; I have not tallied up the number.	10:23:18
24	Q.	Okay. Who wrote the report?	10:23:22
25	A.	I didn't type every single word, but this	10:23:23

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

33

1 is my report. I wrote this report. 10:23:26  
2 Q. Okay. Who typed it? 10:23:28  
3 A. Various parts were, you know, typed up. 10:23:30  
4 Q. Okay. Did you receive any portion of this 10:23:35  
5 already written? 10:23:39  
6 A. No. Well, this is my -- this is my -- 10:23:41  
7 it's my opinion, my work, and this is my -- my 10:23:44  
8 things. But I didn't type everything up myself. 10:23:47  
9 Q. Okay. You understand that there are also 10:23:50  
10 reports from a Dr. Shokrollahi and a Dr. Divsalar in 10:23:52  
11 this case? 10:23:59  
12 A. I've heard names mentioned, but I have no 10:23:59  
13 particular knowledge about, you know, who -- who 10:24:02  
14 is -- might be other experts or something like that. 10:24:04  
15 I've heard some names mentioned, but that's it. 10:24:07  
16 Q. If paragraphs of your report are 10:24:10  
17 word-for-word identical to the paragraphs in 10:24:13  
18 Dr. Shokrollahi or Dr. Divsalar's report, can you 10:24:15  
19 explain how that happened? 10:24:18  
20 MR. GLASS: Objection. Vague. Lacks 10:24:19  
21 foundation. 10:24:23  
22 THE WITNESS: If you could point out a 10:24:23  
23 particular paragraph that might have the 10:24:25  
24 characteristic. 10:24:27  
25 ///

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

34

1	BY MR. DOWD:	10:24:28
2	Q. Sure. I will. I'll come back to that.	10:24:29
3	Let me look at Paragraph 5 with you for a	10:24:31
4	second.	10:24:35
5	A. Sure.	10:24:36
6	Q. It's on educational background?	10:24:37
7	Do you see in the second line it starts	10:24:43
8	talking about time frequency transform?	10:24:50
9	A. Yes.	10:24:50
10	Q. Is that just an error?	10:24:53
11	THE REPORTER: Wait. Hold on. Hold on.	
12	"Do you see in the second line" --	
13	Start there and slow down.	
14	Q. It starts talking about time frequency	
15	transform. Is that just an error?	
16	A. Yeah, that's an error.	10:24:55
17	Q. Okay. Are you aware of any other errors	10:24:57
18	in the report?	10:25:00
19	A. I don't think anything grave. I think,	10:25:00
20	you know, University of Vienna should technically be	10:25:04
21	University Vienna, I missed that word. But there's	10:25:07
22	only one university in Vienna, so there's no	10:25:11
23	possible cause of confusion.	10:25:16
24	Q. Okay. After -- I guess between your	10:25:20
25	retention in January and the date of the report,	10:25:24

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

35

1	February 17th, how many times did you meet with	10:25:28
2	counsel?	10:25:31
3	A. "Meet" means exactly what?	10:25:36
4	Q. Meeting in person.	10:25:38
5	A. Between -- what was the time frame, again,	10:25:41
6	I'm sorry?	10:25:44
7	Q. When you were retained for the case and	10:25:45
8	the February 17th date on your report?	10:25:47
9	A. I believe once.	10:25:49
10	Q. Where was that meeting?	10:25:50
11	A. In San Francisco.	10:25:52
12	Q. When did that take place?	10:25:54
13	A. When exactly was that? Today was the	10:26:04
14	25th. Perhaps two weeks ago.	10:26:07
15	Q. Okay.	10:26:14
16	A. Perhaps a little bit more, yeah.	10:26:14
17	Q. How long was the meeting?	10:26:16
18	A. I would say, perhaps, two or three hours	10:26:19
19	or something on this order.	10:26:29
20	Q. And what was the purpose?	10:26:31
21	A. In general to get some legal counsel. I'm	10:26:35
22	not a lawyer.	10:26:38
23	Q. Okay. Did it relate to any of the	10:26:44
24	opinions that are stated in your report?	10:26:52
25	A. No.	10:26:54

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

36

1	Q.	Okay. At any time between when you were	10:26:54
2		retained and when you signed your report on	10:26:56
3		February 17th, were you provided with any facts that	10:26:59
4		you were asked to assume for the purpose of this	10:27:02
5		case?	10:27:05
6	A.	No.	10:27:05
7	Q.	If we'd turn to the last page, Page 36,	10:27:05
8		that is your signature?	10:27:09
9	A.	Yes.	10:27:10
10	Q.	Okay. Now, I take it you've been retained	10:27:14
11		by Caltech for the case; is that correct?	10:27:19
12	A.	I'm not sure I understand exactly. Can	10:27:22
13		you tell me what that means, "retained by	10:27:26
14		Caltech," --	10:27:27
15	Q.	Who --	10:27:27
16	A.	-- as opposed -- as opposed to who else	10:27:28
17		would -- I'm not sure exactly what, you know -- what	10:27:30
18		exactly means "retained" here.	10:27:35
19	Q.	Well, I don't know the facts of how you	10:27:37
20		came to be retained, so if you could just tell me	10:27:40
21		who retained you, that's what I'm after.	10:27:43
22	A.	I -- as I mentioned, I was contacted to be	10:27:46
23		an expert witness in this case.	10:27:48
24	Q.	Okay. Did you sign any form of engagement	10:27:50
25		letter?	10:27:54

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

37

1	A.	No.	10:27:54
2	Q.	Did you sign any form of agreement?	10:27:54
3	A.	No.	10:27:57
4	Q.	Are you receiving any form of compensation	10:27:57
5		for your opinions?	10:28:00
6	A.	Yes, as stated in my expert report, I	10:28:01
7		receive a compensation that is based on an hourly	10:28:05
8		charge.	10:28:08
9	Q.	Okay. So how much are you being paid for	10:28:09
10		the opinions in your report?	10:28:12
11	A.	I'm being paid \$500 per hour.	10:28:13
12	Q.	Now, you understand the case involves four	10:28:18
13		patents?	10:28:22
14	A.	Yes.	10:28:22
15	Q.	And if I refer to them as the '710, the	10:28:26
16		'032, the '781, and the '833 patents, does that make	10:28:31
17		sense to you?	10:28:36
18	A.	Yes.	10:28:37
19	Q.	Okay. Before being retained by -- for	10:28:39
20		this case -- well, just because it's going to bug	10:28:41
21		me, so you don't know whether you were retained by	10:28:45
22		Caltech or by the law firm that represents Caltech;	10:28:48
23		is that the issue?	10:28:51
24	A.	Yes.	10:28:52
25	Q.	All right. Before you were retained, had	10:28:53

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

38

1	you ever seen the '710 patent?	10:28:56
2	A. I don't believe so.	10:28:58
3	Q. Had you ever seen the '032 patent?	10:29:00
4	A. I don't believe so.	10:29:03
5	Q. How about the '781?	10:29:04
6	A. I don't believe so.	10:29:06
7	Q. How about the '833?	10:29:06
8	A. I don't believe so.	10:29:09
9	Q. Have you ever read any of these patents	10:29:10
10	before you were retained?	10:29:12
11	A. I don't believe so.	10:29:13
12	Q. Okay. When is the first time that you	10:29:14
13	heard of these patents?	10:29:20
14	A. When I reviewed the case history, that's	10:29:22
15	when, you know, I heard about these particular	10:29:24
16	patents.	10:29:27
17	Q. Okay. And that was sometime in January?	10:29:27
18	A. January throughout -- yes, January and	10:29:29
19	then February -- extending to February until the	10:29:32
20	report was written, yes.	10:29:35
21	Q. Okay. Of this year?	10:29:36
22	A. Yes.	10:29:38
23	Q. Okay. Have you analyzed the claims of the	10:29:38
24	'710 patent?	10:29:50
25	A. No.	10:29:51

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

39

1	Q.	How about the '032?	10:29:52
2	A.	No.	10:29:53
3	Q.	'781?	10:29:53
4	A.	No.	10:29:55
5	Q.	'833?	10:29:55
6	A.	No.	10:29:59
7	Q.	I -- I noticed when I was reading the	10:29:59
8		report, there's no opinion that compares any	10:30:02
9		specific prior art reference to any claim	10:30:06
10		limitation; is that correct?	10:30:11
11	A.	That's correct.	10:30:12
12	Q.	Okay. So you -- you've not attempted to	10:30:12
13		determine whether any reference or combination of	10:30:14
14		references discloses the limitations of one of the	10:30:17
15		asserted claims?	10:30:24
16	A.	I have been asked to comment on the report	10:30:25
17		of Dr. Frey, and so my response was my expertise was	10:30:27
18		in response to what was written by Dr. Frey, but not	10:30:33
19		specifically to the claims of the patent.	10:30:36
20	Q.	Okay. And -- and -- and just so there's	10:30:38
21		no mystery about it, part of the processes, so that	10:30:39
22		I can understand what are the right areas to ask you	10:30:43
23		and what are the wrong areas to ask you --	10:30:46
24	A.	Right.	10:30:48
25	Q.	-- and I just want to confirm that you	10:30:48



VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

40

1 have not formed any opinion about whether the 10:30:51  
2 Divsalar reference, for example, the Luby '97, 10:30:54  
3 Luby '98, Richardson '99, Frey '99, you've not 10:30:59  
4 formed any opinion about whether those specific 10:31:04  
5 references disclose the specific limitations of any 10:31:06  
6 claim that's asserted in this case? 10:31:09  
7 A. No. 10:31:11  
8 Q. Okay. When is the first time you heard 10:31:13  
9 the term "IRA code"? 10:31:15  
10 MR. GLASS: Lacks foundation. 10:31:18  
11 MR. DOWD: I hope not. 10:31:24  
12 THE WITNESS: Sorry? 10:31:26  
13 MR. DOWD: I said: "I hope not." 10:31:27  
14 THE WITNESS: I didn't understand. 10:31:31  
15 MR. GLASS: You can go ahead and answer 10:31:31  
16 the question. 10:31:33  
17 THE WITNESS: Okay. 10:31:34  
18 BY MR. DOWD: 10:31:34  
19 Q. Let me ask the question again. I was just 10:31:34  
20 being funny. Your counsel said that it lacks 10:31:37  
21 foundation which would suggest that you never heard  
22 the term "IRA code," which would be a funny thing if  
23 you're giving testimony about IRA codes.  
24 THE REPORTER: Sir --  
25 MR. DOWD: You don't have to take it down.

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

41

1 THE REPORTER: Yeah, this is being  
2 videotaped and I've got to take a clear record, so I  
3 just need you to slow down; okay?

4 MR. DOWD. Yeah, fair enough.

5 THE REPORTER: Thank you.

6 MR. DOWD: I'll just reask the question.

7 THE REPORTER: I appreciate that.

8 MR. DOWD: I'll just reask the question. 10:31:51

9 THE REPORTER: Go ahead. 10:31:52

10 BY MR. DOWD: 10:31:52

11 Q. So the question was, when is the first 10:31:54

12 time you heard the term "IRA codes"? 10:31:56

13 A. I can't assert with certainty when exactly 10:31:59

14 I heard it, but it must have been -- or, you know, 10:32:03

15 there was a conference at the International 10:32:07

16 Symposium on Information Theory, for example, in 10:32:10

17 probably June or July 2000, certainly there I 10:32:13

18 must've heard about it. Whether or not I heard 10:32:17

19 about it slightly prior to it, I don't know. 10:32:20

20 Q. Okay. So the first concrete time that you 10:32:23

21 can recall is a conference in June/July 2000? 10:32:25

22 A. I don't actually recall the event, but 10:32:28

23 since I was there at the conference and I do 10:32:31

24 remember that, you know, there was some excitement 10:32:33

25 about those codes, it must have been at that point 10:32:35

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

42

1	in time that, you know, that happened. That's the	10:32:39
2	most logical explanation.	10:32:41
3	Q. All right. IRA codes, the I, the R, the A	10:32:44
4	it's an acronym, right?	10:32:48
5	A. Exactly.	10:32:49
6	Q. What does I stand for?	10:32:50
7	A. Irregular.	10:32:59
8	Q. What does R stand for?	10:33:00
9	A. Repeat.	10:33:01
10	THE REPORTER: Wait. Slow down. You guys	10:33:01
11	are going to have to just slow down. Start with.	10:33:01
12	"What does I stand for" --	10:33:01
13	THE WITNESS: Irregular.	10:32:59
14	BY MR. DOWD:	10:33:00
15	Q. What does R stand for?	10:33:00
16	A. Repeat.	10:33:01
17	Q. And what does A stand for?	10:33:02
18	A. Accumulate.	10:33:04
19	MR. DOWD: Why don't we mark as Exhibit 3	10:33:12
20	a copy of the '781 patent just for reference.	10:33:17
21	(Urbanke Exhibit 3 was marked for	10:33:21
22	identification and attached to the	10:33:21
23	transcript.)	10:33:44
24	BY MR. DOWD:	10:33:44
25	Q. Do you have Exhibit 3?	10:33:45

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

43

1	A.	Yes, I do.	10:33:46
2	Q.	Have you seen it before?	10:33:47
3	A.	Yes.	10:33:49
4	Q.	What is it?	10:33:49
5		MR. GLASS: Objection. Vague.	10:33:51
6		THE WITNESS: Let me just check here,	10:34:16
7		sorry. So this is the third one in a continuation	10:34:18
8		of patents, the third out of the four patents that	10:34:45
9		were filed by these three inventors.	10:34:48
10		BY MR. DOWD:	10:34:53
11	Q.	Okay. So is this a copy of the '781	10:34:53
12		patent?	10:34:58
13	A.	Sorry, are you asking me if that's a copy?	10:34:58
14	Q.	Yes. Exhibit 3 is a copy of the '781	10:35:02
15		patent?	10:35:06
16	A.	Yes, I believe so.	10:35:06
17	Q.	Okay. Now, if you turn to the last page,	10:35:07
18		which has on the bottom the page number ending in	10:35:10
19		3 -- 6351, you see there are claims that are recited	10:35:14
20		there?	10:35:21
21	A.	Yes.	10:35:21
22	Q.	Have you read these claims before?	10:35:21
23	A.	I very quickly skimmed through them simply	10:35:24
24		for the purpose of determining that they relate to	10:35:27
25		IRA codes, but I didn't examine these claims in any	10:35:30

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

44

1	detail.	10:35:33
2	Q. Okay. Do you understand what a claim	10:35:33
3	limitation is?	10:35:36
4	A. I have a very vague understanding of what	10:35:37
5	it is.	10:35:40
6	Q. What is your understanding?	10:35:40
7	A. Sorry, what the -- what the limitations in	10:35:45
8	general -- the claims in general are? That's what	10:35:48
9	the question is?	10:35:48
10	THE REPORTER: I'm sorry.	10:35:48
11	THE WITNESS: Okay.	10:35:48
12	THE REPORTER: I didn't catch that.	10:35:48
13	You're going to have to repeat yourself, please.	10:35:54
14	THE WITNESS: Okay. Sorry, perhaps I	10:35:54
15	didn't understand the previous question exactly.	10:35:55
16	Okay.	10:35:57
17	BY MR. DOWD:	10:35:57
18	Q. What is your understanding of what a claim	10:35:57
19	limitation is, generally?	10:36:00
20	A. I understand what -- the very basic idea	10:36:03
21	of what claims are, what the limitations in	10:36:07
22	particular are. If that refers to something	10:36:10
23	different than the claims, I'm not sure I	10:36:12
24	understand.	10:36:13
25	Q. Okay. Let me -- let me see if I can	10:36:13

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

45

1	approach it a different way.	10:36:15
2	If you focus on the right column, there's	10:36:17
3	a Claim 19?	10:36:20
4	A.    Yes.	10:36:22
5	Q.    Do you understand that it's the words that	10:36:24
6	are recited in Claim 19 that define the right of the	10:36:27
7	patent?	10:36:31
8	A.    Yes.	10:36:33
9	MR. GLASS: Objection. Vague. Calls for	10:36:34
10	a legal conclusion.	10:36:35
11	BY MR. DOWD:	10:36:35
12	Q.    Okay. So when I'm referring to the	10:36:36
13	"limitations of the claim," I'm referring to the	10:36:38
14	words that are used.	10:36:40
15	A.    The elements.	10:36:41
16	Q.    Right. And do you understand that unless	10:36:42
17	something's recited by the claim, it's not required	10:36:45
18	by the claim?	10:36:48
19	A.    Okay. I wasn't aware of that particular	10:36:53
20	limitation.	10:36:57
21	Q.    Okay. So in -- in performing the analysis	10:36:58
22	reflected in your report, you were not aware that	10:37:01
23	it's the limitations of the claim that define the	10:37:07
24	rights?	10:37:10
25	MR. GLASS: Objection. Mischaracterizes	10:37:10

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

46

1 testimony. 10:37:12

2 THE WITNESS: I did not do a patent -- I 10:37:12

3 did not -- I did not do a claim investigation or a 10:37:15

4 claim thing. The only reason I looked at these 10:37:19

5 claims was to determine that in general they refer 10:37:22

6 to IRA codes. That's the extent to which I looked 10:37:25

7 at the claims. 10:37:29

8 BY MR. DOWD: 10:37:30

9 Q. Okay. But you do know that if the claim 10:37:31

10 doesn't require -- withdrawn. 10:37:37

11 If the claim doesn't recite a requirement, 10:37:39

12 then the claim doesn't require that requirement, 10:37:43

13 right? 10:37:47

14 A. Might very well be so. I'm not a lawyer; 10:37:47

15 I don't know. 10:37:50

16 Q. You can't answer that one way or the 10:37:51

17 other? 10:37:53

18 A. If you say so, I trust you that that's 10:37:53

19 true but -- 10:37:56

20 Q. Okay. 10:37:56

21 A. -- I'm not a lawyer. 10:37:56

22 Q. Let's just focus on Claim 19, for example. 10:37:58

23 There's no reference in Claim 19 to the 10:38:05

24 Shannon limit, right? 10:38:09

25 MR. GLASS: Objection. Calls for a legal 10:38:17

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

47

1 conclusion. 10:38:18  
2 THE WITNESS: There's not the word 10:38:18  
3 "Shannon" in there directly, but that doesn't 10:38:19  
4 necessarily mean it doesn't reference it in some 10:38:22  
5 indirect way. I have not investigated that with 10:38:24  
6 respect to this aspect, so I don't know. 10:38:28  
7 BY MR. DOWD: 10:38:30  
8 Q. Okay. So you have no opinion about 10:38:30  
9 whether Claim 19 requires performance within some 10:38:32  
10 percentage of the Shannon limit, correct? 10:38:35  
11 A. I have not done this analysis. I don't 10:38:38  
12 know. 10:38:41  
13 Q. All right. And that's true for all claims 10:38:41  
14 that are asserted in this case? 10:38:43  
15 A. Yes, I have not looked at the claims with 10:38:44  
16 respect to a particular question. 10:38:47  
17 Q. You see Claim 19 also does not recite any 10:38:49  
18 encoding or decoding that -- that it has to be in 10:38:53  
19 linear time as opposed to something else, right? 10:38:58  
20 MR. GLASS: Objection. Calls for a legal 10:39:01  
21 conclusion. 10:39:02  
22 THE WITNESS: Might be. As -- as I said, 10:39:02  
23 I've -- I've not been asked to do that analysis, and 10:39:05  
24 so I have not done it. I don't know. 10:39:08  
25 ///



VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

48

1	BY MR. DOWD:	10:39:10
2	Q. Okay. So you have no opinion about --	10:39:10
3	withdrawn.	10:39:10
4	So you have formed no opinion that	10:39:15
5	Claim 19 or any other claim asserted in this case	10:39:18
6	requires encoding or decoding in linear time?	10:39:22
7	A. No, I have not done this analysis.	10:39:25
8	Q. All right. Now, Claim 19 also doesn't	10:39:28
9	recite anything about complexity, a minimum	10:39:35
10	complexity, does it?	10:39:41
11	MR. GLASS: Calls for a legal conclusion.	10:39:42
12	THE WITNESS: Same -- same answer as	10:39:43
13	before. It might very well be, but I have not	10:39:44
14	looked at that.	10:39:47
15	BY MR. DOWD:	10:39:48
16	Q. Okay. So you have no opinion about	10:39:48
17	whether any claim at issue in this case has a	10:39:50
18	minimum complexity requirement?	10:39:53
19	A. No.	10:39:54
20	Q. Okay. Let's turn back to your report for	10:40:08
21	a second, and if we could go to Paragraph 82,	10:40:11
22	please. Just let me know when you have that.	10:40:15
23	A. Yes, I have I found the paragraph.	10:40:35
24	Q. And that paragraph begins:	10:40:37
25	"As the paper by Dr. McEliece and his	10:40:39

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

49

1 teammates demonstrates, inventing" -- 10:40:47  
2 THE REPORTER: Wait. I'm sorry, slow  
3 down.  
4 "As the"?  
5 BY MR. DOWD:  
6 Q. -- "paper by Dr. McEliece and his  
7 teammates demonstrates, inventing IRA 10:40:50  
8 codes consisted of more than," -- 10:40:50  
9 And then it continues; do you see that? 10:40:52  
10 A. Right. 10:40:54  
11 Q. What paper are you talking about? 10:40:55  
12 A. I referred to the paper that irregular IRA 10:40:58  
13 codes -- one version of this -- a short version of 10:41:05  
14 this paper was -- was published or was represented 10:41:10  
15 at the -- the International Symposium of Information 10:41:14  
16 Theory. 10:41:22  
17 MR. DOWD: Let's mark as Exhibit 4, I 10:41:22  
18 believe, a copy of the Exhibit B from your report, 10:41:30  
19 the list of materials considered. 10:41:33  
20 (Urbanke Exhibit 4 was marked for 10:41:35  
21 identification and attached to the 10:41:35  
22 transcript.) 10:41:59  
23 BY MR. DOWD: 10:41:59  
24 Q. Do you have Exhibit 4? 10:41:59  
25 A. Yes, I have Exhibit 4. 10:42:00

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

50

1	Q.	And this is the list of materials that you	10:42:02
2		considered in forming the opinions in your report in	10:42:05
3		the case; is that correct?	10:42:08
4	A.	Yes.	10:42:09
5	Q.	Can you identify which paper you're	10:42:09
6		talking about in Paragraph 82?	10:42:13
7	A.	It must be the second International	10:42:23
8		Symposium on Turbo Codes and Related Topics.	10:42:25
9	Q.	Is that the one that begins:	10:42:31
10		"Jin et al., irregular	10:42:34
11		repeat-accumulate codes"?	10:42:35
12	A.	Yes.	10:42:38
13	Q.	Six from the bottom?	10:42:38
14	A.	Yes.	10:42:41
15		MR. DOWD: Let's mark as a copy of	10:42:44
16		Exhibit 5 the Jin et al., IRA codes paper.	10:42:46
17		(Urbanke Exhibit 5 was marked for	10:42:52
18		identification and attached to the	10:42:52
19		transcript.)	10:43:18
20		BY MR. DOWD:	10:43:18
21	Q.	Do you have Exhibit 5?	10:43:19
22	A.	Let me just check that that's the same.	10:43:28
23		Yes, I do.	10:43:35
24	Q.	Okay. And is Exhibit 5 a copy of the Jin	10:43:35
25		et al., IRA codes paper that you're referring to in	10:43:40

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

51

1	Paragraph 82?	10:43:43
2	A. Yes.	10:43:44
3	Q. Okay. Now, when you were performing your	10:43:45
4	analysis, did you use the Jin et al., IRA codes	10:43:49
5	paper?	10:43:53
6	A. I looked at that paper, yes.	10:43:54
7	Q. And in performing your analysis, you	10:43:58
8	compared the prior art references that we discussed	10:44:01
9	earlier, the Luby '97 and '98, the Richardson '99,	10:44:06
10	and the other references to IRA codes; do you recall	10:44:09
11	that?	10:44:13
12	A. Yes.	10:44:13
13	Q. When you performed this analysis, were the	10:44:17
14	IRA codes that you had in mind the codes in the	10:44:21
15	paper that we marked as Exhibit 5?	10:44:23
16	A. IRA codes have various representation;	10:44:29
17	this is one particular representation of these	10:44:31
18	codes.	10:44:33
19	Q. Okay. And so my question is, when you	10:44:33
20	performed the comparison of the prior art to IRA	10:44:36
21	codes, were the IRA codes that you had in mind the	10:44:39
22	ones from Exhibit 5?	10:44:42
23	A. I had in mind in general application of	10:44:45
24	IRA codes. There are various ways of representing	10:44:49
25	them. And so my understanding for IRA codes applies	10:44:52

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

52

1	to the general way of thinking of IRA codes.	10:44:55
2	Q. Okay. And so that would include the IRA	10:44:59
3	codes in Exhibit 5; is that right?	10:45:02
4	A. That is one particular way of representing	10:45:04
5	IRA codes.	10:45:06
6	Q. All right.	10:45:07
7	Okay. Let's turn to Paragraph 57 in your	10:45:56
8	report. And you begin a discussion there of a	10:45:59
9	repeat-accumulate codes; do you have that in mind?	10:46:10
10	A. You said Paragraph 58 or 57, sir?	10:46:12
11	Q. If I misspoke, I apologize; I meant 51.	10:46:15
12	A. You're talking about the one product of	10:46:26
13	the research, trying to analyze?	10:46:28
14	Q. Yes. So there's a discussion from	10:46:31
15	Paragraph 51 through about 58 of RA codes, right?	10:46:35
16	A. Yes.	10:46:42
17	Q. What are RA codes?	10:46:43
18	A. Repeat-accumulate codes.	10:46:45
19	Q. So repeat-accumulate codes are serial	10:46:48
20	concatenated codes, correct?	10:46:53
21	A. Repeat-accumulate codes are a particular	10:46:56
22	version of turbo codes, which were invented by the	10:47:01
23	set of -- or which were published by a set of	10:47:05
24	authors in an attempt to try to understand why turbo	10:47:10
25	codes which were introduced in '93 behaved so well.	10:47:15

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

53

1           It was at that point, you have to           10:47:17  
2           imagine -- a, you know, quite a confused time in           10:47:19  
3           which people didn't really understand why these           10:47:24  
4           codes were doing so well. And whereas most people           10:47:27  
5           at that point in time would have gone off and tried           10:47:32  
6           to make codes more complicated and trying to get           10:47:35  
7           even better numbers, you know, RA codes went the           10:47:40  
8           opposite way and tried to simplify it in an attempt           10:47:44  
9           to come up with something that was so simple that           10:47:49  
10          potentially they could be analyzed.           10:47:52

11           They were never thought to be codes that           10:47:53  
12          could potentially could actually be used in           10:47:57  
13          practice. It was considered a toy or as a teaching           10:48:00  
14          tool.           10:48:04

15          Q.           So when you said RA codes "are a           10:48:04  
16          particular version of turbo codes," what did you           10:48:07  
17          mean?           10:48:12

18          A.           You take an RA code, you take a turbo code           10:48:12  
19          and you essentially eliminate everything and bring           10:48:14  
20          it down to the simplest possible version which is           10:48:17  
21          not revealed.           10:48:20

22          Q.           Which is not trivial?           10:48:24

23          A.           You -- you -- you're trying to eliminate           10:48:25  
24          all kinds of complexity so that what you end up with           10:48:27  
25          is still something that, you know, is not, you know,           10:48:31

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

54

1 the empty set or not something empty. So it's the 10:48:36  
2 simplest possible version which shows -- excuse 10:48:38  
3 me -- which shows some characteristics of turbo 10:48:40  
4 codes, but it was not intended to accurately reflect 10:48:42  
5 what turbo codes do, nor was it ever intended to 10:48:46  
6 match in any way the performance of turbo codes. 10:48:50  
7 Q. I understand. 10:48:53  
8 A. Okay. 10:48:54  
9 Q. I'm just getting at what your 10:48:54  
10 understanding of an RA code is. 10:48:56  
11 And is it fair to say that an RA code is 10:48:58  
12 an attempt to take a turbo code and simplify it down 10:49:01  
13 to basic elements for the purpose of analysis? 10:49:06  
14 A. Yes. 10:49:08  
15 Q. Okay. 10:49:08  
16 MR. DOWD: Let's mark as Exhibit 6, I 10:49:16  
17 believe -- 10:49:21  
18 THE REPORTER: Yes. 10:49:21  
19 MR. DOWD: -- a copy of the paper, "Coding 10:49:22  
20 Theorems for 'Turbo-Like' Codes," by Divsalar et 10:49:25  
21 al., bears Bates numbers HUGHES1916 through 1925. 10:49:32  
22 (Urbanke Exhibit 6 was marked for 10:49:37  
23 identification and attached to the 10:49:37  
24 transcript.) 10:50:02  
25 ///

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

55

1	BY MR. DOWD:	10:50:02
2	Q. Do you have Exhibit 6?	10:50:02
3	A. Yes.	10:50:04
4	Q. Do you recognize it?	10:50:04
5	A. Yes.	10:50:07
6	Q. What is it?	10:50:10
7	A. It's the paper entitled:	10:50:11
8	"Coding Theorems for Turbo-Like	10:50:13
9	Codes."	10:50:17
10	Q. And if I refer to this as the "Divsalar	10:50:17
11	paper," will that make sense to you?	10:50:21
12	A. Yes.	10:50:23
13	Q. When's the first time you saw the Divsalar	10:50:23
14	paper?	10:50:28
15	A. It must have been about the time when it	10:50:28
16	was published, so I guess '98, around that time, I	10:50:31
17	believe. I have to check exactly when the	10:50:38
18	publication date was.	10:50:40
19	Q. And how did you come to read it in '98?	10:50:42
20	A. Let me see if I see the conference --	10:50:54
21	either through the conference or I must've received	10:50:58
22	it by one of the office. Let me check.	10:51:02
23	So I must say I don't know exactly how I	10:52:02
24	first received it, but I assume that I, perhaps, saw	10:52:04
25	a talk that they gave relating to this, perhaps	10:52:08



VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

56

1 the -- either the International Symposium of 10:52:13  
2 Information Theory or perhaps at the Allerton 10:52:17  
3 conference, could have been either. 10:52:20  
4 Q. Okay. Is there a reason why this paper 10:52:22  
5 sticks out in your mind? 10:52:24  
6 A. Yes. 10:52:26  
7 Q. Why is that? 10:52:26  
8 A. Because IRA codes were an important 10:52:27  
9 development of turbo codes exactly for the reason 10:52:32  
10 that they simplified things and they showed a 10:52:34  
11 particular analysis which is called the input/output 10:52:38  
12 weight distribution analysis or -- and/or, you know, 10:52:42  
13 he's referred I think in a particular sentence as 10:52:45  
14 interleaver gain analysis, has various other names 10:52:49  
15 in the literature. 10:52:52  
16 And so this was, I believe, the first time 10:52:54  
17 interleaver gain exponent conjecture -- sorry, 10:52:58  
18 interleaver gain exponent conjecture and I believe 10:53:02  
19 it's the first time that people managed to carry 10:53:03  
20 through this analysis for something that looked like 10:53:09  
21 a turbo code. And so that's why it was an important 10:53:12  
22 paper in the development of coding theorem. 10:53:15  
23 Q. Okay. Just as a digression, you mentioned 10:53:23  
24 that you may have received a copy of this from one 10:53:31  
25 of the authors; do you recall that? 10:53:35

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

57

1 A. I -- as I said, I don't recall whether or 10:53:36  
2 not I downloaded it perhaps on a conference web page 10:53:39  
3 or perhaps I received the paper directly, perhaps by 10:53:43  
4 going to the conference, perhaps people might have 10:53:46  
5 distributed the copy. 10:53:50  
6 So there are various ways of -- of how 10:53:51  
7 this might have happened, but I don't recall how I 10:53:52  
8 might have first come to see it. 10:53:55  
9 Q. We're going to come to this when we get to 10:53:57  
10 the -- to your Richardson '99 paper, but was it 10:54:00  
11 common at this time, '98, '99, 2000, for people 10:54:03  
12 working in the field to e-mail copies of their 10:54:08  
13 papers to each other? 10:54:11  
14 MR. GLASS: Objection. Vague. 10:54:12  
15 Go ahead. 10:54:13  
16 THE WITNESS: Not very common, I think. 10:54:14  
17 BY MR. DOWD: 10:54:16  
18 Q. Okay. But it did happen? 10:54:17  
19 A. It happened on occasions. 10:54:18  
20 Q. All right. You mentioned the interleaver 10:54:21  
21 gain exponent conjecture; do you recall that? 10:54:28  
22 A. Yes. 10:54:32  
23 Q. And that's referring to the fact that in 10:54:32  
24 an RA code the repeat and the accumulate are 10:54:35  
25 separated by an interleaver? 10:54:38

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

58

1	A.	Yes.	10:54:40
2	Q.	And the idea was, what, that the	10:54:41
3		interleaver approved performance over either of	10:54:44
4		those two codes alone?	10:54:47
5	A.	The idea was that the -- the accumulate	10:54:50
6		itself is a trivial code that doesn't give any	10:54:56
7		coding gain whatsoever, but that for a particular	10:55:00
8		combination of these elements, nevertheless some not	10:55:04
9		very good, but a reasonable, you know, code could be	10:55:09
10		constructed. As I said, it was not a good code;	10:55:13
11		there were much better codes out there. These were	10:55:16
12		not considered to be any particularly ground	10:55:19
13		breaking codes. But they had some characteristics	10:55:24
14		of turbo codes, and since at that point the analysis	10:55:26
15		that one wanted to carry out for turbo codes was not	10:55:30
16		possible to do, it was carried out first here, just	10:55:33
17		showing that, in principal, some type of analysis	10:55:37
18		could be carried through for some codes that had	10:55:41
19		some of the characteristics of turbo codes.	10:55:46
20	THE REPORTER:	Wait.	10:55:46
21		"Could be carried through"?	10:55:47
22	THE WITNESS:	Carried through for some	10:55:47
23		codes that had some of the characteristics of turbo	10:55:50
24		codes.	10:55:53
25		///	

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

59

1	BY MR. DOWD:	10:55:54
2	Q. You mentioned a couple times the idea of a	10:55:54
3	good code; is your idea of a good code related to	10:55:58
4	its performance against the Shannon limit?	10:56:05
5	A. So there are many parameters in which a	10:56:07
6	code can be good. Let me just mention a few. It's	10:56:10
7	not a one dimensional issue.	10:56:13
8	Q. Uh-huh.	10:56:16
9	A. One important one is, indeed, the -- what	10:56:17
10	sometimes is called the gap to capacity, how close a	10:56:20
11	code can operate reliably close to the Shannon	10:56:24
12	limit. But there are many, many other parameters	10:56:28
13	that are important for a code.	10:56:32
14	The encoding complexity, that's the number	10:56:33
15	of operations that are needed to perform the	10:56:37
16	encoding operation; the decoding complexity, so the	10:56:39
17	number of operations that are required to perform	10:56:44
18	the decoding, these are both related also to the	10:56:47
19	energy consumption that the code has.	10:56:52
20	Further characteristics might be the error	10:56:55
21	floor that relates to whether or not a code, even	10:56:59
22	though it might be possible to decode essentially	10:57:04
23	all the bits, there might still be, with some	10:57:08
24	nonnegotiable probability, a few of the bits that	10:57:12
25	are left and cannot be decoded.	10:57:16

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

60

1                   And, you know, these are, perhaps, some of                   10:57:19  
2                   the main characteristics. Further ones that are                   10:57:22  
3                   important in practice is how such a code could be                   10:57:26  
4                   mapped into hardware. So depending on hardware or                   10:57:28  
5                   software, depending on what platform, what                   10:57:33  
6                   application.                   10:57:36  
7                   And all of this together gives a fairly                   10:57:36  
8                   complex vector that needs to be optimized, criteria                   10:57:41  
9                   to be optimized. And depending on the application,                   10:57:47  
10                  one would then judge which code would be best for                   10:57:50  
11                  that particular application.                   10:57:53  
12                  Q.                   Okay. And let me pause on that for a                   10:57:54  
13                  minute. Am I correct that you could perform                   10:57:58  
14                  miserably on all of those characteristics and still                   10:58:01  
15                  be an IRA code?                   10:58:04  
16                  MR. GLASS:    Objection. Vague.                   10:58:07  
17                  THE WITNESS:  There are probably some                   10:58:09  
18                  tweaks you can do. That probably would depend on                   10:58:16  
19                  very fine definition of what you imply with an --                   10:58:20  
20                  with an RA code. So you could probably on purpose,                   10:58:23  
21                  trying to, you know, choose something that is very                   10:58:29  
22                  bad.                   10:58:33  
23                  BY MR. DOWD:                   10:58:33  
24                  Q.                   And I'm using the definition of RA code                   10:58:33  
25                  you gave me earlier.                   10:58:35

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

61

1                   My only question is, some IRA codes could                   10:58:37  
2                   be optimized to perform very well under these                   10:58:43  
3                   criteria; some could be not optimized and perform                   10:58:48  
4                   poorly on some or all of these criteria; both would                   10:58:50  
5                   be IRA codes?                   10:58:55  
6                   MR. GLASS: Objection. Vague. Outside                   10:58:55  
7                   the scope.                   10:58:56  
8                   Go ahead.                   10:58:56  
9                   THE WITNESS: Not all. IRA codes are very                   10:58:57  
10                   special in many -- in many parameters. So I agree                   10:59:00  
11                   that, for example, in terms of the Shannon limit you                   10:59:03  
12                   could have differences depending on how exactly one                   10:59:05  
13                   chose it. But no matter how you do it, it will                   10:59:08  
14                   always be linear time encodable and there will  
15                   always --  
16                   THE REPORTER: Hold on. Hold on. Slow  
17                   down.  
18                   "But no matter how" --  
19                   Start there.                   10:59:13  
20                   THE WITNESS: How you do it, there will                   10:59:13  
21                   always be linear time encodable; there will be                   10:59:16  
22                   linear time decodable, and they're very natural to                   10:59:21  
23                   be mapped into, you know, hardware applications.                   10:59:25  
24                   BY MR. DOWD:                   10:59:28  
25                   Q.                   Okay. And so those characteristics,                   10:59:28

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

62

1	linear time encodable, linear time decodable, easy	10:59:31
2	to map into hardware, that's also all true of RA	10:59:36
3	codes, right?	10:59:41
4	MR. GLASS: Same objections.	10:59:42
5	THE WITNESS: RA codes have some of these	10:59:43
6	characteristics, I agree, yes.	10:59:45
7	BY MR. DOWD:	10:59:47
8	Q. Those three that I just mentioned, right?	10:59:47
9	MR. GLASS: Same objections.	10:59:50
10	THE WITNESS: RA codes are linear time	10:59:54
11	encodable, that's correct.	10:59:56
12	BY MR. DOWD:	10:59:58
13	Q. And they're, from a hardware standpoint,	10:59:58
14	relatively easy to implement, correct?	11:00:00
15	A. That's correct.	11:00:04
16	Q. Okay. And I think we agreed a moment ago	11:00:04
17	that, with respect to the performance against the	11:00:07
18	Shannon limit or what you referred to as the gap to	11:00:11
19	capacity, you could have an IRA code that performs	11:00:15
20	very well or you could have an IRA code that	11:00:19
21	performs poorly, both of which would be IRA codes,	11:00:22
22	right?	11:00:28
23	MR. GLASS: Outside the scope. Outside	11:00:28
24	the scope.	11:00:31
25	THE WITNESS: Yes.	11:00:31

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

63

1	BY MR. DOWD:	11:00:31
2	Q. Okay. And that's also true of RA codes,	11:00:31
3	right?	11:00:35
4	MR. GLASS: Same objections.	11:00:35
5	THE WITNESS: RA codes almost uniformly	11:00:36
6	are not very good codes. I don't think you can have	11:00:38
7	RA codes that are very good codes in pretty much any	11:00:42
8	application.	11:00:45
9	BY MR. DOWD:	11:00:45
10	Q. Let me ask it a slightly different way,	11:00:46
11	because I meant to ask a different question, so	11:00:48
12	sorry.	11:00:51
13	You can have RA codes that perform closer	11:00:51
14	to the Shannon limit and RA codes that perform	11:00:54
15	farther away from the Shannon limit, right?	11:00:57
16	A. RA codes would be uniformly relatively far	11:01:02
17	away from the Shannon limit.	11:01:05
18	Q. I don't disagree with you that they would	11:01:07
19	all be probably worse than IRA codes, or maybe	11:01:10
20	there's an overlap, I don't know. But my point is	11:01:14
21	only that you can have better performing and worse	11:01:17
22	performing codes when you -- when you're looking at	11:01:20
23	as your criteria a gap to capacity, right?	11:01:24
24	MR. GLASS: Vague. Outside the scope.	11:01:26
25	THE WITNESS: I don't exactly agree	11:01:36



VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

64

1	with -- with you, because RA codes, the way they are	11:01:37
2	is essentially one RA code for a particular rate	11:01:39
3	that you want. So -- so you cannot really compare	11:01:44
4	various RA codes for the same application. So	11:01:47
5	essentially there is one RA code that you have in	11:01:50
6	essence if you think about large ones.	11:01:53
7	So it's not really that you could compare	11:01:56
8	one with another one.	11:01:58
9	BY MR. DOWD:	11:02:01
10	Q. I don't want to spend too much time on	11:02:03
11	this because I think I'm together with you, but you	11:02:05
12	can design different RA codes for different rates,	11:02:08
13	right?	11:02:11
14	A. Right.	11:02:11
15	Q. Those may perform closer to the Shannon	11:02:12
16	limit or farther away from the Shannon limit for	11:02:17
17	that particular channel?	11:02:19
18	MR. GLASS: Same objections.	11:02:22
19	THE WITNESS: The Shannon limit is a	11:02:23
20	function of the rate, so you cannot really directly	11:02:24
21	compare these.	11:02:27
22	BY MR. DOWD:	11:02:28
23	Q. I understand that. What I'm saying is	11:02:28
24	that if you look from channel to channel, sometimes	11:02:31
25	the RA code will be closer and sometimes it will be	11:02:37

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

65

1	farther away.	11:02:39
2	THE REPORTER: "From channel"?	11:02:39
3	Hold on.	11:02:39
4	"From channel to channel"?	11:02:39
5	BY MR. DOWD:	11:02:39
6	Q. Sometimes the RA code will be closer;	11:02:37
7	sometimes it will be farther away?	11:02:39
8	MR. GLASS: Same objections.	11:02:40
9	THE WITNESS: You would have to give me a	11:02:41
10	definition of what "closeness" means since we are	11:02:43
11	not talking about the same case. You're comparing	11:02:45
12	essentially apples to oranges, so unless you give me	11:02:48
13	a definition of what the -- you know, what the --	11:02:52
14	what the difference the Shannon limit would be for	11:02:54
15	various different rates and how you would compare	11:02:55
16	different cases I cannot answer that question.	11:02:59
17	BY MR. DOWD:	11:03:01
18	Q. All right. We can -- we can come back to	11:03:02
19	that.	11:03:04
20	MR. DOWD: Why don't we take our first	11:03:10
21	break.	11:03:12
22	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record.	11:03:13
23	The time is 11:03 a.m.	11:03:14
24	(Recess taken at 11:03 a.m.)	11:03:16
25	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the	11:11:24

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

66

1	record. The time is 11:11 a.m.	11:11:25
2	BY MR. DOWD:	11:11:28
3	Q. Now, before the break we discussed	11:11:29
4	Dr. MacKay at one point; do you recall that?	11:11:33
5	A. Yes.	11:11:36
6	Q. Do you know Dr. MacKay?	11:11:36
7	A. Yes.	11:11:38
8	Q. Have you met him personally?	11:11:39
9	A. Yes.	11:11:41
10	Q. How do you know him?	11:11:41
11	A. I met him at conferences. He also visited	11:11:42
12	me, I think, on one or two occasions at EPFL as a	11:11:45
13	speaker as we have many other people that are	11:11:49
14	visiting. And I might have been once at -- I'm not	11:11:52
15	sure if it was Cambridge or at least some university	11:11:55
16	in the UK where he had organized the workshop and I	11:11:59
17	was invited as one of the speakers there too.	11:12:03
18	Q. Okay. Back in this time frame, '98	11:12:06
19	through about 2000, were you aware of Dr. MacKay's	11:12:10
20	work?	11:12:14
21	A. This was a very, very confused time frame,	11:12:15
22	so just maybe a little bit to set the stage.	11:12:17
23	Essentially there was the invention of turbo codes	11:12:23
24	in '93, and starting, perhaps, in '95, there were	11:12:25
25	three or four different groups that, from very	11:12:29

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

67

1	different directions, started to working on coding.	11:12:32
2	Some of them were traditional people in	11:12:35
3	coding, typically in the E community, typically	11:12:39
4	trying to improve turbo codes.	11:12:41
5	But at the -- at the same time, there were	11:12:43
6	two other groups that got into the game; one was	11:12:45
7	David MacKay, and I think Dr. Frey at some point	11:12:50
8	connected up with him and there were several papers	11:12:56
9	together.	11:13:01
10	They essentially rediscovered what is	11:13:01
11	called the Gallagher codes or LDPC codes and -- at	11:13:03
12	some point and, you know, realized that they had	11:13:09
13	rediscovered concepts from the '60s.	11:13:11
14	At the same time they had a background in	11:13:14
15	physics. Brendan Frey probably is more computer	11:13:18
16	science.	11:13:23
17	On the other hand, there was a group	11:13:25
18	involving Luby and his co-authors. They have a	11:13:28
19	background of theoretical computer science and	11:13:32
20	mathematics and they were interested in a completely	11:13:35
21	different aspect, not the physical layer	11:13:39
22	applications or transmission but they were	11:13:41
23	interested in content distribution.	11:13:45
24	And they, themselves, have started	11:13:47
25	independently, particularly Spielman and --	11:13:50

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

68

1 THE REPORTER: Wait. Wait. I need you to 11:13:55  
2 repeat that again. I didn't understand it. 11:13:56

3 THE WITNESS: Right. So they, themselves, 11:13:56  
4 in particular amongst a group of authors that are on 11:13:58  
5 the Luby et al., papers, in particular Spielman and 11:14:01  
6 Luby themselves, have started independently in 11:14:08  
7 various groups, at some point they connected, and 11:14:11  
8 they were interested in content distribution. 11:14:14

9 And they also rediscovered a version of 11:14:18  
10 Gallagher codes and a version of this decoding 11:14:20  
11 algorithm. And at some point realized that they had 11:14:24  
12 basically rediscovered that concept themselves. 11:14:29

13 Now, all these groups were in very 11:14:31  
14 different communities, some of them in theoretical 11:14:35  
15 computer science. They would publish at conferences 11:14:38  
16 like STOCK or FOX which are theoretical computer 11:14:40  
17 science conferences. 11:14:44

18 MacKay had a physics background, that 11:14:44  
19 meant, again, he would, even though he had a 11:14:50  
20 similar goal of coming up with error correcting 11:14:55  
21 codes, would have a very different -- 11:14:55

22 THE REPORTER: Wait. 11:14:55

23 "Even though he had a similar goal"? 11:14:57

24 THE WITNESS: Goal of finding good error 11:14:57  
25 correcting codes, he would use a very, very 11:15:02

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

69

1	different language.	11:15:04
2	And then there were people in EE that used	11:15:05
3	traditional language that is used for coding. And	11:15:08
4	it took quite a while for these groups to somehow	11:15:11
5	merge to find a common language and to understand	11:15:14
6	that they were talking about similar concepts or the	11:15:18
7	same concepts but expressed in this very different	11:15:21
8	languages.	11:15:24
9	BY MR. DOWD:	11:15:26
10	Q. Have you finished your answer?	11:15:26
11	A. Yes.	11:15:28
12	Q. So my question was, were you familiar with	11:15:31
13	Dr. MacKay's work in 1998 through 2000?	11:15:34
14	A. Certainly by the year 2000, I would have	11:15:37
15	known him.	11:15:40
16	Q. How about '99?	11:15:41
17	A. I would have to -- you know, I cannot be	11:15:49
18	absolutely positive, but it's -- it's possible,	11:15:52
19	yeah.	11:15:54
20	Q. What's your best understanding?	11:15:54
21	A. Now, in the '99 preprint version of our	11:16:14
22	paper, he's not cited as one of the references. So	11:16:18
23	perhaps he was at that point not high on my radar	11:16:22
24	screen. Whether I heard his name before it or not,	11:16:25
25	I cannot swear. Right now I don't know. But he's	11:16:29

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

70

1 not as one -- listed as one of the references in 11:16:32  
2 the -- in the '99 paper, which was '99, April 6. 11:16:34  
3 So at that point he was not mentioned in 11:16:37  
4 the list of references. 11:16:39  
5 Q. When did he first give a visiting lecture 11:16:40  
6 at your university? 11:16:44  
7 A. Oh, perhaps 2004, 2005. I don't know. 11:16:45  
8 Perhaps later. 11:16:49  
9 Q. Now, you talked about a group in the 11:16:51  
10 physics or computer science area; you talked about a 11:16:55  
11 group in the coding theory area? 11:16:59  
12 A. Right. 11:16:59  
13 Q. Do you recall that? 11:17:02  
14 A. Right. 11:17:03  
15 Q. The group in the computer science physics 11:17:05  
16 area is looking at LDPC codes, right? 11:17:09  
17 A. Yes, they rediscovered something which 11:17:14  
18 later turned out to be LDPC codes. 11:17:16  
19 Q. And that's Luby MacKay? 11:17:19  
20 A. No, MacKay was not part of this group. 11:17:22  
21 Q. Okay. 11:17:22  
22 A. It's Luby -- it's Luby, Mitzenmacher, 11:17:26  
23 Shokrollahi and Spielman, so these are the main 11:17:28  
24 actors in that round. 11:17:32  
25 Q. And then we've been talking before about 11:17:33

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

71

1	Divsalar and the RA codes?	11:17:35
2	A. Right.	11:17:36
3	Q. You say that's a different group working	11:17:36
4	on different types of research?	11:17:39
5	A. Yes.	11:17:41
6	Q. Is your opinion in the case based on a	11:17:42
7	belief that a person in the RA codes group would not	11:17:47
8	have been aware of the Luby '97, Luby '98,	11:17:51
9	Richardson '99 papers?	11:17:57
10	A. It's my opinion that they were not widely	11:17:58
11	read. There certainly must have been some people	11:18:03
12	that were aware. I first became aware when Aamod	11:18:06
13	joined Bell Labs --	11:18:06
14	THE REPORTER: "I first became aware" --	11:18:06
15	THE WITNESS: I first became aware of that	11:18:13
16	line of work when Aamod joined Bell Labs. I believe	11:18:13
17	it was '99, although I don't know the exact date	11:18:18
18	when he joined.	11:18:22
19	At that point he told us -- since he was	11:18:22
20	part of the other group as well, he told us about	11:18:25
21	that work and I became aware of that work.	11:18:28
22	BY MR. DOWD:	11:18:28
23	Q. Let me ask you, then, the direct question.	11:18:31
24	Is it your opinion that a person of	11:18:34
25	ordinary skill in the art in 1999 would not have	11:18:38



VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

72

1           been aware of the Luby '97 and Luby '98 references?           11:18:43

2           A.           It's very unlikely that they would have           11:18:46

3           been aware.           11:18:50

4           Q.           And is your opinion in the case based on           11:18:50

5           them not being aware of those references?           11:18:52

6           A.           Sorry, what was the first question? I           11:18:55

7           thought these were different questions. I -- can           11:18:57

8           you repeat the first question again, please.           11:18:59

9           Q.           The -- are the opinions that you've           11:18:59

10          expressed in your report in this case based on your           11:19:02

11          belief that a person of ordinary skill would not           11:19:04

12          have been aware of the Luby '98 or '98 --

13          A.           No --

14                    THE REPORTER: Wait. Wait. Hold on.

15                    MR. DOWD: Yes, sir.

16                    THE REPORTER: You need to slow down for

17          me, please.

18                    And you need to allow him to ask the

19          complete --

20                    THE WITNESS: Sorry.

21                    THE REPORTER: -- question before you

22          answer.

23                    THE WITNESS: Sorry.

24                    THE REPORTER: Okay? Can I get a clean

25          question without interruption, please.           11:19:22

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

73

1	BY MR. DOWD:	11:19:22
2	Q. Are the opinions that are expressed in	11:19:25
3	your report based on your belief that a person of	11:19:28
4	ordinary skill in information theory would not have	11:19:31
5	been aware of the Luby '97 or Luby '98 references?	11:19:35
6	A. No, not entirely. There's simply one	11:19:38
7	other aspect that I mentioned, but...	11:19:41
8	Q. Okay. So when you say they're "not	11:19:43
9	entirely," are they based in part on your belief	11:19:46
10	that a person of ordinary skill in information	11:19:48
11	theory would not have been aware of Luby '97 and	11:19:50
12	Luby '98?	11:19:54
13	A. No, let me rephrase it.	11:19:55
14	My opinion that it would have been not	11:19:57
15	obvious to combine this is not based on the fact	11:19:59
16	that they would not have been available. But I also	11:20:02
17	expressed the opinion that these papers at that	11:20:05
18	point in time would have been very unlikely to be	11:20:07
19	known by people in various areas.	11:20:10
20	Q. "Unlikely to be known," is that what you	11:20:12
21	said?	11:20:15
22	A. That someone of ordinary skills would have	11:20:15
23	been aware of these papers.	11:20:19
24	Q. It is "unlikely"?	11:20:19
25	A. It's very unlikely, yes.	11:20:21

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

74

1	Q.	Okay. And your opinions in your report	11:20:23
2		are in part based on that belief, correct?	11:20:25
3	A.	No, it's just one other aspect that I	11:20:27
4		mentioned.	11:20:31
5	Q.	Well, when you say it's one aspect that	11:20:31
6		you mentioned, am I correct that you mention it	11:20:34
7		because it affects your opinions in this case?	11:20:36
8	A.	It doesn't -- it doesn't affect the	11:20:38
9		opinion whether a person of ordinary skills could	11:20:41
10		have combined it. I just thought that I also	11:20:44
11		mentioned that these were completely different	11:20:47
12		communities. And so it's another reason that a	11:20:49
13		person might not have even been aware of the papers.	11:20:52
14	Q.	Okay. So you have no actual basis to	11:20:55
15		believe that there was not a person in 1999 who, in	11:20:58
16		fact, knew about Richardson '99, Luby '98, Luby '97,	11:21:04
17		and the Divsalar paper?	11:21:11
18	A.	I cannot be certain that there were no --	11:21:14
19		no people that knew all these papers combined.	11:21:17
20		That's correct.	11:21:21
21	Q.	Okay. Let's go back to the Divsalar	11:21:22
22		paper, Exhibit 6. And I'd like to focus on the --	11:21:28
23		the Figure 3, which you had reproduced in your	11:21:33
24		report, which appears on Page 5, original Page 5 of	11:21:37
25		the Divsalar paper.	11:21:46

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

75

1	Do you have that?	11:21:47
2	A. Yes.	11:21:48
3	Q. And I'd like to walk through how this	11:21:48
4	works from left to right, okay?	11:21:51
5	A. Right.	11:21:55
6	Q. So what's shown here in Figure 3 and	11:21:56
7	discussed on Page 5 is a method of encoding a	11:21:59
8	signal, right?	11:22:05
9	A. That's correct.	11:22:06
10	Q. And reading from left to right, the first	11:22:06
11	thing that happens is that the encoder receives a	11:22:09
12	block of data N in the signal to be encoded, right?	11:22:14
13	MR. GLASS: Objection. Calling for a	11:22:18
14	legal conclusion.	11:22:21
15	THE WITNESS: On a technical basis,	11:22:21
16	there's a stream of bits that come in there. And	11:22:23
17	these bits are repeated by factor Q.	11:22:27
18	BY MR. DOWD:	11:22:30
19	Q. Well, if you look above the figure, do you	11:22:31
20	see the third sentence of the paragraph where it	11:22:35
21	says:	11:22:37
22	"An information block of length N"?	11:22:37
23	A. The third -- can you just please, again,	11:22:42
24	say where it is.	11:22:45
25	Q. Yes. Above the figure, the third sentence	11:22:46

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

76

1 of the paragraph, says: 11:22:50  
2 "An information block of length N." 11:22:52  
3 Do you see that? 11:22:53  
4 A. Yes. 11:22:54  
5 Q. And then in the figure we see, there's N 11:22:55  
6 coming in from the left, right? 11:22:58  
7 A. Yes. 11:23:00  
8 Q. So that is a block of information bits, 11:23:00  
9 right? 11:23:03  
10 MR. GLASS: Same objection. Outside the 11:23:03  
11 scope. Calling for a legal conclusion. 11:23:05  
12 THE WITNESS: To me it could be a block; 11:23:08  
13 it could be a sequence. It's information that 11:23:11  
14 starts at some point in time. 11:23:14  
15 BY MR. DOWD: 11:23:15  
16 Q. Okay. And at least we know the Divsalar 11:23:15  
17 paper says it's a "block of length N," right? 11:23:19  
18 A. There is a sentence that contains the word 11:23:25  
19 "block," yes. 11:23:27  
20 Q. Now, the next thing that happens is the 11:23:37  
21 encoder in Figure 3 performs an encoding operation 11:23:58  
22 using the N information bits as the input, right? 11:24:08  
23 A. How do you mean "the next" -- the whole 11:24:15  
24 diagram represents the encoding. 11:24:17  
25 Q. Okay. Well, let's see if we can just 11:24:18

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

77

1	agree that the encoder of Figure 3 performs an	11:24:21
2	encoding operation using the N information bits as	11:24:25
3	its input, right?	11:24:30
4	MR. GLASS: Same objections.	11:24:31
5	THE WITNESS: So there is a sequence of	11:24:33
6	bits that are shifted into this register or into	11:24:37
7	this particular systems. You know, the whole	11:24:42
8	diagram is a systems point of view in which you have	11:24:44
9	various boxes and information shifted from the left	11:24:47
10	to the right, and as it is shifted through, every	11:24:50
11	box performs certain operations on that particular	11:24:53
12	sequence.	11:24:57
13	BY MR. DOWD:	11:24:57
14	Q. Okay. And in a repeat-accumulate code,	11:24:58
15	the repeat-accumulate code, like what's shown in	11:25:06
16	Figure 3, will perform an encoding operation, right?	11:25:10
17	MR. GLASS: Same objections. Calling for	11:25:14
18	a legal conclusion. Outside the scope of the expert	11:25:16
19	report.	11:25:20
20	THE WITNESS: So the systems point of view	11:25:26
21	is a point of view in which information is	11:25:28
22	transformed, and that overall description is a	11:25:35
23	description of an encoder, yes.	11:25:37
24	BY MR. DOWD:	11:25:39
25	Q. Okay. Let's just focus briefly on what	11:25:39

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

78

1	each one of these blocks is, okay; do you have that	11:25:42
2	in mind?	11:25:46
3	A. Sure.	11:25:47
4	Q. The first block is a rate 1 over Q	11:25:47
5	repetition encoder, right?	11:25:51
6	A. Correct.	11:25:52
7	Q. The next block labeled: "P," that's an	11:25:52
8	interleaver, right?	11:25:56
9	A. Correct.	11:25:57
10	Q. And then the final block labeled:	11:25:58
11	"Rate-1, one over one plus D," that's an	11:26:02
12	accumulation block, right?	11:26:05
13	A. Correct.	11:26:07
14	Q. Okay. So the encoding operation will	11:26:08
15	include repeating the N bits Q times in the repeater	11:26:15
16	block, right?	11:26:20
17	A. The repetition will repeat incoming bits,	11:26:21
18	every incoming bit Q times; that's correct.	11:26:25
19	Q. Okay. And that means every bit in the	11:26:29
20	block of N bits will be repeated Q times, right?	11:26:32
21	A. Each of the incoming bits will be repeated	11:26:36
22	Q times --	11:26:36
23	(Overlapping speakers.)	11:26:36
24	THE REPORTER: Wait. I -- go ahead.	11:26:39
25	MR. GLASS: Same objections. Outside the	11:26:39

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

79

1	scope. I didn't mean to interrupt.	11:26:42
2	THE REPORTER: It's okay.	11:26:42
3	And then can I get your answer again,	11:26:42
4	please.	11:26:43
5	THE WITNESS: Incoming bits, every	11:26:43
6	incoming bit will be repeated Q times.	11:26:48
7	BY MR. DOWD:	11:26:51
8	Q. And that's every bit of the information	11:26:51
9	block N, right?	11:26:54
10	MR. GLASS: Same objections.	11:26:55
11	THE WITNESS: Now, you know, this paper is	11:26:58
12	not particularly the one that I was asked to opinion	11:27:02
13	on. And, you know, it's not clear to me that I	11:27:05
14	would like to do another realtime analysis of this	11:27:11
15	particular paper. I was not asked to do so for my	11:27:15
16	expert report.	11:27:19
17	BY MR. DOWD:	11:27:21
18	Q. Well, sir, this figure appears in	11:27:22
19	Paragraph 54 of your expert report, correct?	11:27:25
20	A. That's true. And it's -- in general it's	11:27:26
21	a -- you know, a particular repeat --	11:27:30
22	repeat/accumulate code, takes information, repeats	11:27:34
23	it Q times, permutes it, and then puts it through an	11:27:36
24	accumulator.	11:27:42
25	Q. All right. So let's walk through how that	11:27:43



VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

80

1	works.	11:27:47
2	The output of the repeater is shown as $qN$	11:27:47
3	bits, right?	11:27:51
4	A.          Correct.	11:27:52
5	MR. GLASS: Same objections.	11:27:53
6	BY MR. DOWD:	11:27:54
7	Q.          And that means that there are $Q$ copies of	11:27:54
8	each of the $N$ bits, right?	11:27:57
9	MR. GLASS: Same objections. Outside the	11:27:59
10	scope.	11:28:01
11	THE WITNESS: As I said, a repeat	11:28:14
12	accumulator code takes bits, repeats them, permutes	11:28:16
13	them, and then accumulates them. That's what I've	11:28:21
14	also written in my expert report. These are the	11:28:25
15	components. And that's the degree to which I have,	11:28:30
16	you know, examined the exact ramifications of that	11:28:35
17	particular scheme.	11:28:38
18	BY MR. DOWD:	11:28:39
19	Q.          Well, what -- what I'd like to do is --	11:28:40
20	and I understand you've said that, but let's walk	11:28:42
21	through the pieces of that so that we can understand	11:28:46
22	and be on the same page.	11:28:48
23	So "yes," "no," "I don't know."	11:28:51
24	The rate-1 over $Q$ repetition block will	11:28:54
25	produce at its output $qN$ repeated bits?	11:28:59

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

81

1	MR. GLASS: Same objections. Outside the	11:29:05
2	scope.	11:29:06
3	THE WITNESS: The repetition will take	11:29:06
4	every incoming bit and will repeat it Q times.	11:29:11
5	BY MR. DOWD:	11:29:14
6	Q. Okay. And is there something about the	11:29:14
7	math that would yield a different result than qN	11:29:17
8	repeated bits?	11:29:20
9	MR. GLASS: Vague. Outside the scope.	11:29:20
10	Go ahead.	11:29:22
11	THE WITNESS: What a repeater does, that's	11:29:23
12	exactly what it does. It takes every single bit,	11:29:27
13	repeats it Q times.	11:29:30
14	BY MR. DOWD:	11:29:34
15	Q. Okay.	11:29:34
16	A. That's what a repeater does.	11:29:32
17	Q. All right. And then those qN repeated	11:29:34
18	bits are input to the interleaver P, right?	11:29:37
19	A. The stream of information that's coming in	11:29:40
20	with the permuted bits is then being interleaved;	11:29:42
21	that's correct.	11:29:48
22	Q. Okay. And what happens in the interleaver	11:29:49
23	P is that you change the order of the bits, right?	11:29:53
24	MR. GLASS: Same objections.	11:29:57
25	THE WITNESS: That's correct.	11:29:58

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

82

1	BY MR. DOWD:	11:29:59
2	Q. Then the $qN$ repeated bits are output from	11:30:00
3	the interleaver and input to the accumulator block,	11:30:08
4	right?	11:30:13
5	A. You take the stream off bits that come out	11:30:13
6	of the interleaver and you put it through an	11:30:17
7	accumulator, yes.	11:30:21
8	Q. And that's shown in the figure as the $qN$	11:30:21
9	bits going into the rate-1 accumulator, right?	11:30:24
10	A. I see a symbol $qN$ appearing and an error	11:30:27
11	that goes into the rate-1 one plus one over $D$ block.	11:30:30
12	THE REPORTER: Wait.	11:30:30
13	"Going to the rate" --	11:30:30
14	Start there, please.	11:30:34
15	THE WITNESS: I'm -- I'm seeing a symbol	11:30:34
16	called $qN$ which goes into a rate-1 one plus one over	11:30:38
17	$D$ block.	11:30:44
18	BY MR. DOWD:	11:30:48
19	Q. And if we go back to the same sentence	11:30:48
20	that I was pointing at before, it says:	11:30:50
21	"An information block of length $N$ is	11:30:52
22	repeated $Q$ times, scrambled by an	11:30:55
23	interleaver of size $qN$ , and then encoded	11:30:59
24	by a rate-1 accumulator."	11:31:02
25	Right?	11:31:05

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

83

1 A. I see the sentence. 11:31:05  
2 Q. And that is what is shown in Figure 3, 11:31:08  
3 right? 11:31:19  
4 A. That's one possible interpretation, yes. 11:31:19  
5 Q. Now, what happens in the accumulation step 11:31:25  
6 is shown in the paper in the formula here, Figure -- 11:31:32  
7 I'm sorry, Formula 5.1, right? 11:31:36  
8 MR. GLASS: Objection. Outside the scope. 11:31:41  
9 THE WITNESS: It was not my task to 11:31:49  
10 examine in detail the paper in here. So this might 11:31:51  
11 very well be correct, but I have not done an 11:31:55  
12 in-depth analysis of this particular paper. 11:31:58  
13 BY MR. DOWD: 11:32:00  
14 Q. I'll tell you what, take a moment and read 11:32:00  
15 the fourth sentence of the paragraph right above the 11:32:03  
16 figure, the one that says: 11:32:07  
17 "The accumulator can be viewed." 11:32:08  
18 Do you see that there? 11:32:11  
19 A. Yes, I see that. 11:32:12  
20 Q. Read that down to the end of Formula 11:32:14  
21 5.1 and let me know when you're read it. 11:32:20  
22 A. I've read it. 11:32:52  
23 Q. Okay. And let me start with, prior to 11:32:54  
24 today, had you read the description of Figure 3 in 11:32:58  
25 Divsalar? 11:33:03

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

84

1	A.	I've read that paper certainly sometime,	11:33:03
2		yes.	11:33:07
3	Q.	Okay. For the purposes of preparing your	11:33:07
4		report, did you perform an analysis of the Divsalar	11:33:09
5		disclosure and how the components of Figure 3 work?	11:33:13
6	A.	I did not look at the particular claims	11:33:16
7		and try to match them up or in any way analyze them	11:33:20
8		with respect to this particular paper.	11:33:24
9	Q.	And I'm -- I'm not asking about that. I'm	11:33:26
10		asking, did you perform any analysis of how the	11:33:28
11		individual components disclosed here in Figure 3 are	11:33:31
12		described to work by the Divsalar paper?	11:33:35
13	A.	You're talking about how the component is	11:33:40
14		disclosed in the patent relating to what's written	11:33:44
15		here in this particular paper?	11:33:46
16	Q.	No. So let me ask my question, again.	11:33:48
17	A.	Okay.	11:33:51
18	Q.	My question is, we've got the repeater;	11:33:51
19		we've got the permuter; we've got the accumulator	11:33:55
20		shown in Figure 3 of Divsalar.	11:34:00
21	A.	Sure.	11:34:02
22	Q.	And my question is, in preparing your	11:34:03
23		opinions in this case, did you perform any analysis	11:34:05
24		of how Divsalar explains those components operating?	11:34:08
25	A.	Could you explain a little bit more what	11:34:16

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

85

1 you mean with "analysis". 11:34:19

2 Q. Did you do anything to understand 11:34:20

3 Divsalar's disclosure of how Figure 3 operates? 11:34:23

4 A. "Disclosure" here means the paper? 11:34:26

5 Q. Means the paper Divsalar that you have 11:34:29

6 marked in front of you as Exhibit 6 that -- 11:34:32

7 (Overlapping speakers.) 11:34:32

8 THE WITNESS: If that's the paper, if 11:34:35

9 that's what you mean, yes, I've read the paper. 11:34:36

10 BY MR. DOWD: 11:34:36

11 Q. Okay. So let's focus on the accumulator 11:34:39

12 and focus on how it works, okay? 11:34:40

13 Do you have that in mind? 11:34:43

14 A. I see the accumulator, yes. 11:34:46

15 Q. The accumulator in Figure 3 operates 11:34:51

16 according to the formula 5.1, right? 11:34:54

17 MR. GLASS: Objection. Outside the scope. 11:34:58

18 THE WITNESS: As I said, I did not prepare 11:35:00

19 an in-depth analysis how that might relate to 11:35:01

20 various components disclosed in the patent. I feel 11:35:04

21 uncomfortable having to do this on the spot. 11:35:06

22 BY MR. DOWD: 11:35:09

23 Q. I'm not asking you about the patent; I'm 11:35:09

24 asking you about what Divsalar discloses. 11:35:11

25 A. Okay. I -- this is a publication. I've 11:35:14

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

86

1	read the publication. I understand what the	11:35:15
2	publication says.	11:35:17
3	Q. All right. So am I correct that the	11:35:19
4	accumulator of Figure 3 in Divsalar operates	11:35:21
5	according to the Formula 5.1 in Divsalar immediately	11:35:25
6	above the figure?	11:35:29
7	MR. GLASS: Same objections. Outside the	11:35:30
8	scope.	11:35:32
9	THE WITNESS: It is written here that this	11:35:32
10	formula exactly -- it is written here that this	11:35:35
11	formula represents some accumulation.	11:35:38
12	BY MR. DOWD:	11:35:38
13	Q. All right. So let's walk through how the	11:35:42
14	accumulation of the formula in Figure 5.1 operates.	11:35:44
15	Now, you see in the text it says:	11:35:52
16	"The accumulator can be viewed as a	11:35:54
17	truncated rate-1 recursive convolutional	11:35:56
18	encoder with transfer function one over	11:36:00
19	one plus D, but we prefer to think of it	11:36:03
20	as a block code whose input block, X sub	11:36:06
21	one through X sub N, and output block, Y	11:36:10
22	sub one through Y sub N, are related by	11:36:14
23	the formula..."	11:36:16
24	And then it gives the formula, right?	11:36:18
25	A. Correct.	11:36:20

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

87

1 Q. So the input to the accumulation is the 11:36:20  
2 block X sub one through X sub N, right? 11:36:23  
3 MR. GLASS: Objection. Outside the scope. 11:36:27  
4 THE WITNESS: He has here an input of X to 11:36:28  
5 X1. I'll remark that whether or not you are 11:36:32  
6 thinking of it as a block -- 11:36:32  
7 THE REPORTER: Wait. Wait. Hold on. 11:36:32  
8 Start that part over. I didn't catch it. 11:36:38  
9 THE WITNESS: Whether or not you're 11:36:38  
10 thinking of this as a block or you consider this a 11:36:40  
11 block or an infinite stream, it would be exactly the 11:36:44  
12 same formula. 11:36:48  
13 BY MR. DOWD: 11:36:49  
14 Q. Okay. But what Divsalar actually says is 11:36:49  
15 that it's an input block X sub one through X sub N, 11:36:52  
16 right? 11:36:56  
17 MR. GLASS: Same objections. 11:36:56  
18 THE WITNESS: If you say so, yes. 11:36:57  
19 BY MR. DOWD: 11:36:59  
20 Q. I mean, am I reading that incorrectly? 11:36:59  
21 A. As I said, I did not do an in-depth 11:37:02  
22 analysis and I prefer not to do so now on this spot. 11:37:04  
23 Q. I -- really, you know, my question doesn't 11:37:09  
24 get at what you'd prefer to do or what you wouldn't. 11:37:11  
25 My question is, is it correct that the 11:37:14



VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

88

1 input to the accumulator, as taught in Divsalar, is 11:37:17  
2 an input block  $X$  sub one through  $X$  sub  $N$ ? 11:37:20  
3 MR. GLASS: Same objections. 11:37:24  
4 THE WITNESS: The sequence of bits -- 11:37:24  
5 THE REPORTER: Wait. Wait. You didn't 11:37:24  
6 allow him to give his objection. It's very 11:37:24  
7 important. 11:37:24  
8 Can you give your answer over, please. 11:37:32  
9 THE WITNESS: As I said, such a code works 11:37:32  
10 by taking a sequence of bits, putting it into the 11:37:34  
11 sequence -- into the sequence of blocks that you 11:37:38  
12 have and you get a sequence of bits out. That's my 11:37:40  
13 understanding of RA codes and that's my definition 11:37:43  
14 that I would like to use. 11:37:48  
15 BY MR. DOWD: 11:37:50  
16 Q. Okay. So when Divsalar says that the 11:37:50  
17 input to the accumulator is, quote: "Input block  $X$  11:37:53  
18 sub one through  $X$  sub  $N$ ," can you tell me "yes," 11:37:56  
19 "no," "I don't know," that's the input to the 11:38:00  
20 accumulator? 11:38:02  
21 A. I see a sentence in which it says there's 11:38:04  
22 a block whose input is  $X_1$  up to  $X_N$ . That's what I 11:38:07  
23 see. 11:38:12  
24 Q. Okay. And then it continues that the 11:38:12  
25 output block is  $Y$  sub one through  $Y$  sub  $N$ , right? 11:38:14

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

89

1	A.	I'm -- all I'm doing is here reading that	11:38:17
2		there's an output block Y1 to YN. I'm not forming	11:38:19
3		any opinion on that.	11:38:23
4	Q.	Okay. And let's talk about the	11:38:24
5		relationship between those blocks described by the	11:38:27
6		Formula 5.1.	11:38:30
7		Do you see that there?	11:38:31
8	A.	I see the Formula 5.1; that's correct.	11:38:32
9	Q.	Now, X1 through XN, those are the qN	11:38:37
10		repeated bits, right?	11:38:43
11		MR. GLASS: Outside the scope.	11:38:46
12		THE WITNESS: According to his definition	11:38:47
13		here, there is some bits called X1 and they are	11:38:51
14		accumulated, yes.	11:38:56
15		BY MR. DOWD:	11:38:58
16	Q.	Okay. And the accumulator performs XOR	11:38:58
17		sums on subsets of those bits, right?	11:39:03
18		MR. GLASS: Same objections. Outside the	11:39:05
19		scope.	11:39:07
20		THE WITNESS: The accumulator does what an	11:39:07
21		accumulator does; it exactly sums up the sequence of	11:39:09
22		bits.	11:39:12
23		BY MR. DOWD:	11:39:12
24	Q.	Using an XOR summing, right?	11:39:13
25		MR. GLASS: Same objection.	11:39:15

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

90

1	THE WITNESS: It -- it's a summation; it's	11:39:15
2	a mathematical operation; it's a sum.	11:39:18
3	BY MR. DOWD:	11:39:18
4	Q. And when you perform a mathematical	11:39:22
5	summing operation on bits, you're using either mod 2	11:39:24
6	or exclusive OR mathematics, right?	11:39:28
7	MR. GLASS: Same objection.	11:39:31
8	THE WITNESS: Now we're talking about --	
9	MR. GLASS: Outside the scope.	
10	THE REPORTER: Wait. Wait. You've got to	
11	allow a pause for him to get in an objection,	
12	please; otherwise, I hear two people speaking at the	
13	same time and I can't take it down.	
14	THE WITNESS: I apologize.	
15	MR. GLASS: I was just going to say	
16	outside the scope.	
17	THE REPORTER: Thank you. I appreciate	
18	it.	
19	MR. GLASS: Go ahead.	11:39:45
20	THE WITNESS: To me, it's a plus that's	11:39:45
21	well-defined in mathematics. There might be many	11:39:47
22	ways of representing it -- it's a plus, okay?	11:39:51
23	BY MR. DOWD:	11:39:53
24	Q. Okay. And is there something about --	11:39:53
25	withdrawn.	11:39:53

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

91

1                   That plus sign represents an exclusive OR                   11:39:56  
2                   operation, correct?                   11:40:00  
3                   A.               Perhaps you can think of this. It is                   11:40:01  
4                   simply a sum of elements in the field of  $GF(2)$ .                   11:40:04  
5                   Q.               In the field  $GF(2)$ ?                   11:40:08  
6                   A.               Yes, that's what it's called.                   11:40:11  
7                   Q.               Well, if I have two bits and I'm adding                   11:40:14  
8                   those two bits together and I show you the two bits                   11:40:18  
9                   with a plus side between them, you would know that                   11:40:22  
10                   you could perform an XOR operation to do the                   11:40:25  
11                   summation, right?                   11:40:29  
12                   A.               There might be --                   11:40:30  
13                   MR. GLASS: Same objection.                   11:40:30  
14                   THE WITNESS: There might be --                   11:40:30  
15                   MR. GLASS: Outside the scope.                   11:40:31  
16                   Go ahead.                   11:40:32  
17                   THE WITNESS: Sorry. There might be many                   11:40:32  
18                   ways of doing it. This is not what my expert report                   11:40:34  
19                   is about. My expert report is about the general                   11:40:37  
20                   definition. To me this is a plus -- it's a plus in                   11:40:40  
21                    $GF(2)$ ; that's what it is mathematically. There                   11:40:44  
22                   might be many other ways of representing it. That's                   11:40:47  
23                   not my -- that's not what my expert report is about.                   11:40:50  
24                   BY MR. DOWD:                   11:40:52  
25                   Q.               Okay. My question is, if I tell you to                   11:40:52

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

92

1 add a 1 and a 0, two bits, and I show that with a 11:40:56  
2 plus sign, you would understand that one way to do 11:41:02  
3 that is through an exclusive OR operation; "yes" or 11:41:07  
4 "no"? 11:41:10  
5 A. There might be a way of doing this. 11:41:10  
6 Q. I'm not asking you if there might be other 11:41:12  
7 ways; I'm asking, do you know that one way to do it 11:41:14  
8 is an exclusive OR operation, right? 11:41:17  
9 A. This might very well be true, yes. 11:41:19  
10 Q. Okay. So when Dr. Divsalar testified in 11:41:23  
11 this case that this performs an XOR operation, you 11:41:29  
12 have no basis to disagree with him, do you? 11:41:33  
13 A. If he says so, I believe him. 11:41:36  
14 Q. Okay. So let's look at how each of the Y1 11:41:41  
15 through YN subsets is calculated, okay? 11:41:46  
16 Y1 is comprised of the subset X1, right? 11:41:54  
17 MR. GLASS: Outside the scope. 11:41:57  
18 THE WITNESS: Y1 simply takes the first 11:41:59  
19 element and computes the sum. 11:42:02  
20 BY MR. DOWD: 11:42:03  
21 Q. Okay. Y2 is comprised of the subset X1 11:42:04  
22 plus X2, right? 11:42:08  
23 MR. GLASS: Same objection. 11:42:11  
24 THE WITNESS: What this box does, it's an 11:42:13  
25 accumulated and it computes mathematically whatever 11:42:16

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

93

1 an accumulator does. That's what it is. That's 11:42:19  
2 what I can say. 11:42:20  
3 BY MR. DOWD: 11:42:25  
4 Q. Okay. Let me maybe come at this a 11:42:26  
5 different way. 11:42:29  
6 Take -- turn back to the '781 patent, 11:42:29  
7 Exhibit 3, and turn to Column 3. And I'd like you 11:42:50  
8 to read to yourself Lines 5 down to Line 24. Let me 11:42:59  
9 know when you're done. 11:43:11  
10 A. Are we talking about page -- Column 3? 11:43:12  
11 Q. Column 3 from Line 5 where it begins: 11:43:16  
12 "The accumulator" -- "accumulator may be a truncated 11:43:19  
13 rate-1 recursive convolutional coder," all the way 11:43:23  
14 down past the formula to Line 24. 11:43:28  
15 A. I'm done. 11:44:27  
16 Q. Okay. So this describes an accumulator, 11:44:29  
17 right? 11:44:33  
18 MR. GLASS: Objection. Outside the scope. 11:44:33  
19 THE WITNESS: I have not -- you know, I 11:44:34  
20 have not read this patent and tried to make an 11:44:36  
21 analysis of it. I feel uncomfortable now making 11:44:38  
22 on-the-spot judgment. 11:44:41  
23 BY MR. DOWD: 11:44:41  
24 Q. So when it says: "The encoder is an 11:44:43  
25 accumulator," you don't know whether it's an 11:44:45

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RUDIGER L. URBANKE  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

94

1	accumulator?	11:44:48
2	MR. GLASS: Same objections. Calls for a	11:44:48
3	legal conclusion.	11:44:50
4	THE WITNESS: Whatever is written here, I	11:44:50
5	don't doubt it, but I have not, you know, looked in	11:44:56
6	details about this thing. There is one thing to	11:44:59
7	think about what technically a word means. There's	11:45:02
8	another one legal means. I have no -- no idea, you	11:45:05
9	know, what exactly that would be defined and what	11:45:07
10	exactly that would mean in a legal way and there's	11:45:11
11	no way for me now on the spot to -- to answer this	11:45:14
12	question.	11:45:17
13	BY MR. DOWD:	11:45:19
14	Q. So in performing the analysis that you	11:45:19
15	have performed for this case, you have -- nothing	11:45:22
16	that you did allowed you to form an opinion about	11:45:28
17	whether the intercoder 206 in the '781 patent is an	11:45:31
18	accumulator?	11:45:36
19	A. I was not asked --	11:45:36
20	MR. GLASS: Same -- same objections. Go	11:45:36
21	ahead.	11:45:39
22	THE WITNESS: I was not asked to perform	11:45:39
23	an opinion on that.	11:45:41
24	BY MR. DOWD:	11:45:43
25	Q. Okay. So let me just ask you this. Do	11:45:43