

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE, INC.,  
Petitioner

v.

SAINT LAWRENCE COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,  
Patent Owner

Case IPR2017-01244  
U.S. Patent 6,807,524

---

SAINT LAWRENCE COMMUNICATIONS, LLC'S PATENT OWNER  
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND ..... 6

    A. Prior Art Speech Processing ..... 6

    B. The '524 Patent: Bruno Bessette, Redwan Salami, and Roch Lefebvre Invent  
    A New Perceptual Weighting Device Adapted To Wideband Signals To  
    Achieve A High Quality Reconstructed Signal ..... 9

III. SUMMARY OF THE PETITIONER’S PROPOSED GROUNDS FOR REVIEW ..... 12

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION. .... 13

    a. Wideband speech signal (independent claims 1, 8, 15, 29, and 36). .... 14

V. THE SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART. .... 16

    a. Salami (Ex. 1008). .... 17

    b. Kroon (Exhibit 1005). .... 20

    c. Makamura (Exhibit 1021). .... 23

    d. Lim (Exhibit 1014). .... 26

VII. The Petitioner Failed To Demonstrate That It Is Reasonably Likely To Prevail  
On Any Of Its Proposed Obviousness Rejections ..... 29

    A. The Petitioner Failed To Set Forth A Proper Obviousness Analysis..... 30

    B. The Prior Art Does Not Teach All Of The Limitations Of The Challenged  
    Independent Claims. .... 32

        1. The Combination Of Salami and Kroon Would Not Have Taught “a signal  
preemphasis filter responsive to the wideband speech signal for enhancing  
a high frequency content of the wideband speech signal to thereby produce  
a preemphasised signal,” Or “a perceptual weighting filter, responsive to  
said preemphasised signal and said synthesis filter coefficients, for  
filtering said preemphasised signal in relation to said synthesis filter  
coefficients to thereby produce said perceptually weighted signal,” As  
Recited By Independent Claim 1 And As Similarly Recited In Each Of  
The Other Challenged Independent Claims (8, 15, 29, and 36). .... 32

        2. The Combination Of Salami and Kroon Would Not Have Taught A  
“perceptual weighting filter having a transfer function with fixed

denominator whereby weighting of said wideband speech signal in a formant region is substantially decoupled from a spectral tilt of said wideband speech signal,” As Recited By Independent Claim 1 And As Similarly Recited In Each Of The Other Challenged Independent Claims (8, 15, 29, and 36). .....37

3. The Combination Of Salami and Kroon Would Not Have Taught A “pitch codebook search device responsive to said perceptually weighted signal for producing pitch codebook parameters and an innovative search target vector,” As Recited By Independent Claim 15. ....43

4. The Combination Of Salami and Kroon Would Not Have Taught “an innovative codebook search device, responsive to said synthesis filter coefficients and to said innovative search target vector, for producing innovative codebook parameters,” As Recited By Independent Claim 15. ....45

5. The Combination Of Salami and Kroon Would Not Have Taught “a signal forming device for producing an encoded wideband speech signal comprising said pitch codebook parameters, said innovative codebook parameters, and said synthesis filter coefficients” As Recited By Independent Claim 15. ....45

6. The Combination Of Salami and Kroon Would Not Have Taught Additional Limitations Of Independent Claims 29 and 36. ....46

C. A POSITA Would Not Have Combined The Teachings Of Salami and Kroon To Achieve The Invention Recited In Any Of Independent Claims 1, 8, 15, 29, and 36 And Reasonably Expect Success. ....47

D. The Dependent Claims Would Not Have Been Obvious.....51

1. The Secondary References Do Not Teach The Limitations That Are Missing From The Primary Reference.....51

2. A POSITA Would Not Have Combined The Teachings Of Salami, Kroon and Makamura To Achieve The Invention Recited In Any Of The Challenged Dependent Claims 2, 3, 9, 10, 16, 17, 30, 31, 37, And 38 And Reasonably Expect Success. ....52

3. The Combination of Salami, Kroon, and Makamura Would Not Have Taught “A perceptual weighting device ... wherein said signal pre-emphasis filter has a transfer function of the form:  $P(z) = 1 - \mu z^{-1}$  wherein  $\mu$  is a pre-emphasis factor having a value located between 0 and 1,” As Recited In Claim 2 And As Similarly Recited In Claim 9.....55

4. A POSITA Would Not Have Combined The Teachings Of Salami, Kroon, Lim And The Alleged APA To Achieve The Invention Recited In Any Of

The Challenged Dependent Claims 4-6, 11-14, 18-21, 32-35, 39, 40 And  
42 And Reasonably Expect Success. ....55

VIII. Conclusion .....57

**PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST**

<b><u>Exhibit Number</u></b>	<b><u>Description</u></b>
2001	P. Mermelstein, "G.722, A new CCITT Coding Standard for Digital Transmission of Wideband Audio Signals," IEEE Comm. Mag., Vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 8-15, Jan. 1988.
2002	Fuemmeler et. al, "Techniques for the Regeneration of Wideband Speech from Narrowband Speech," EURASIP Journal on Applied Signal Processing 2001:0, 1-9 (Sep. 2001).
2003	C.H. Ritz et. al., "Lossless Wideband Speech Coding," 10th Australian Int'l. Conference on Speech Science & Technology, p. 249 (Dec. 2004).
2004	Expert Declaration of Dr. Gottesman
2005	"Discrete-Time Signal Processing," by Alan V. Oppenheim, Ronald W. Schafer
2006	<a href="https://www.mathworks.com/help/matlab/math/random-numbers-with-specific-mean-and-variance.html">https://www.mathworks.com/help/matlab/math/random-numbers-with-specific-mean-and-variance.html</a>
2007	Transcript of Deposition of Dr. Johnson
2008	O. Gottesman and A. Gersho, "Enhanced Waveform Interpolative Coding at Low Bit Rate," in IEEE Transactions on Speech and Audio Processing, vol. 9, November 2001, pp. 786-798
2009	O. Gottesman and A. Gersho, "Enhancing Waveform Interpolative Coding with Weighted REW Parametric Quantization," in IEEE Workshop on Speech Coding Proceedings, pp. 50-52, September 2000, Wisconsin, USA
2010	O. Gottesman and A. Gersho, "High Quality Enhanced Waveform Interpolative Coding at 2.8 kbps," in Proc. IEEE ICASSP'2000, vol. III, pp. 1363-1366, June 5-9, 2000, Istanbul, Turkey.

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.