

## Contents

|           |  |    |
|-----------|--|----|
| I.        | Materials considered                                 | 3  |
| II.       | Expert background                                    | 5  |
| III.      | Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art                   | 6  |
| IV.       | Term constructions                                   | 6  |
| V.        | Technical background                                 | 7  |
| V.A.      | “Direct conversion”                                  | 7  |
| V.B.      | “Reduced intersymbol interference coding”            | 9  |
| V.B.1.    | Discussion of “intersymbol interference”             | 9  |
| V.B.2.    | Discussion of “coding”                               | 13 |
| V.C.      | “Interleaver and de-interleaver”                     | 13 |
| V.D.      | “Differential phase shift keying” (DPSK)             | 15 |
| VI.       | The ‘258 patent                                      | 17 |
| VI.A.     | “Direct conversion module” and “homodyne receiver”   | 18 |
| VI.A.1.   | Obviousness of direct conversion module              | 19 |
| VI.B.     | “Reduced intersymbol interference coding” and “DPSK” | 20 |
| VI.B.1.   | ISI coding, differential encoding, and DPSK          | 20 |
| VI.B.1.1. | Obviousness of DPSK                                  | 21 |
| VI.B.2.   | ISI coding and the Giannakis paper                   | 22 |
| VI.C.     | “Headset” vs. “headphone”                            | 23 |
| VI.D.     | “Unique user code” vs. “access code”                 | 24 |
| VI.E.     | “CDMA” and “spread spectrum”                         | 24 |
| VI.F.     | “Independent CDMA operation”                         | 25 |

|                              |   |    |
|------------------------------|---|----|
| VI.G.                        | Transmit-receive symmetry   | 25 |
| VI.H.                        | “Digital-to-analog converter (DAC)” and audio output/reproduction | 26 |
| VI.I.                        | “Virtually free from interference”                                | 27 |
| VI.J.                        | Interleaver/de-interleaver and the Giannakis paper                | 28 |
| VII.                         | Rationale or Motivation to Combine                                | 29 |
| VII.A.                       | Intersymbol interference  | 30 |
| VII.B.                       | Interleaving  | 31 |
| VIII.                        | Conclusion  | 33 |
| Attachment 1: Claim Charts   |   | 34 |
| Claim 3 of the ‘258 patent   |   | 35 |
| Claim 4 of the ‘258 patent   |   | 45 |
| Claim 8 of the ‘258 patent   |   | 50 |
| Claim 10 of the ‘258 patent  |   | 53 |
| Claim 11 of the ‘258 patent  |   | 57 |
| Attachment 2: John Moring CV |   | 61 |

1. I, John Moring, hereby declare:
2. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein, and if called as a witness in a legal proceeding in the United States, or elsewhere, could and would testify competently thereto. All statements made herein on my personal knowledge are true, and those statements made on information and belief are believed to be true.
3. I have been asked to address and offer opinions on the technology claimed in U.S. Patent No. 7,865,258 B2, specifically in claims 3, 4, 8, 10, and 11 (“challenged claims”), and the prior-art technology disclosed in U.S. Patent No. 6,563,892 and the 1998 paper by Haartsen, and a 2000 paper by G. B. Giannakis, et al. (See section I for a list of references).
4. I am being compensated at my customary hourly rate for the time spent on developing, forming, and expressing the facts and opinions in this declaration. I have no personal interest in the ultimate outcome of any related proceedings.

#### **I. Materials considered**

5. In the course of developing this declaration, I examined the following materials.
  - U.S. Patent No. 7,865,258 B2 (“the ‘258 patent”);
  - Excerpts from the ‘258 patent file history, including file histories of its parent applications such as Appl. No.: 10/648,012 (“the 2003 application”), Application No. 13/356,949 (“the 2012 application”);
  - Order No. 12 Construing Terms of the Asserted Patents, Inv. No. 337-TA-943, July 24, 2015 (“ITC claim constructions”);
  - Decision on Appeal from the United States International Trade Commission in Investigation No. 337-TA-943, June 12, 2017 (“Federal Circuit Opinion”)
  - U.S. Patent No. 6,563,892 to Haartsen et al. (“the ‘892 patent” or “the Haartsen patent”);

- Haartsen, J., “Bluetooth—The Universal Radio Interface for Ad Hoc, Wireless Connectivity”, Ericsson Review, Telecommunications Technology Journal No. 3, 1998, pp. 110–117 (“the 1998 Haartsen paper”);

The two preceding items together comprise “the Haartsen reference.”

- Haartsen, J., “The Bluetooth Radio System”, IEEE Personal Communications, February 2000 (“the 2000 Haartsen paper”);
- Giannakis, G. B., et al., “Load-Adaptive MUI/ISI-Resilient Generalized Multi-Carrier CDMA with Linear and DF Receivers,” European Transactions on Telecommunications, Volume 11, Issue 6, pages 527–537; November–December 2000 (“the Giannakis paper”);
- Zhou, S., et al., “Frequency-Hopped Generalized Multicarrier CDMA for Multipath and Interference Suppression,” MILCOM 2000 Proceedings, October 2000 (“the Zhou paper”);
- U.S. Patent No. 5,530,929 to Lindqvist et al.

6. The 1998 Haartsen paper is explicitly mentioned and incorporated by reference in its entirety in the Haartsen patent (collectively, “the Haartsen reference”):

“Readers interested in various details regarding the Bluetooth technology are referred to the article entitled “BLUETOOTH—The universal radio interface for ad hoc, wireless connectivity” authored by Jaap Haartsen and found in the Ericsson Review, Telecommunications Technology Journal No. 3, 1998, the disclosure of which is incorporated here by reference.” (’892 patent at 2:23-29).

7. The Giannakis paper discloses a design for performance improvement in CDMA transmitters and receivers, specifically applicable to “Bluetooth-like” networking, including both reduced intersymbol interference coding and bit error rate (BER) improvement through interleaving/de-interleaving.

8. These references, and the ways they describe the technology disclosed in the challenged claims of the ‘258 patent, are discussed in subsequent sections of this paper.

## II. Expert background

9. I earned my Bachelor of Science degree in Electrical Engineering in 1981 from the University of Cincinnati, with specialization in computers and communications. I earned my Master of Science degree in Electrical Engineering in 1983 from the University of Southern California (as a Hughes Fellow), with specialization in communications and signal processing. I have worked in the field continuously since 1981.

10. In the early 1980s, I developed and simulated algorithms for advanced portable military wireless networks at Hughes Aircraft. In the late 1980s, I developed and fielded Internet hardware and applications for military use while at TRW. In the early 1990s, I developed standards and products for dynamic management of satellite communication systems at Titan Linkabit. In the mid-1990s, I contributed to the first cellular Internet products, and related projects at Pacific Communication Sciences, Inc.

11. Since 1997 I have consulted in the field full time. Projects are too numerous to list, but include working with wireless location technologies from the late 1990s, including designing and overseeing some of the first field trials of handset location technologies (including GPS) for cellular carriers, and contributing to the standards that described operation of that equipment. I have worked a number of projects involving Bluetooth technology, notably consulting to the Bluetooth Special Interest Group continuously from 2000 through 2007. In this role I supported the qualification and testing efforts and reviewed the specifications released in this period.

12. My current projects include authoring standards for, and otherwise supporting development of, wireless communications for future intelligent highway deployments.

13. I have taught communications courses for the University of Wisconsin-Madison and the University of California-San Diego. I have presented at major technical conferences and contributed to texts in the field. I have four US patents granted in my name, with others pending in the US and internationally. Please see Attachment 2 for a complete CV.

# 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.