

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

<i>In re</i> patent of Lunsford, <i>et al.</i>	§	Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review
	§	
U.S. Patent No. 7,092,671	§	Attorney Docket No.: 52959.48
	§	
Issued: August 15, 2006	§	Customer No.: 27683
	§	
	§	Real Party in Interest: Apple Inc.
	§	
Title: Method and System for	§	
Wirelessly Autodialing a Telephone	§	
Number from a Record Stored on a	§	
Personal Information Device	§	

Declaration of Nenad Medvidović, PhD
Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	QUALIFICATIONS AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE	3
III.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	8
IV.	RELEVANT LEGAL STANDARDS	10
	A. Anticipation.....	11
	B. Obviousness	11
V.	BACKGROUND TECHNOLOGY.....	12
	A. Computers	12
	B. Autodialing Systems	13
	C. Contact Management and Address Book Programs	15
	D. Wireless protocols.....	17
VI.	THE '671 PATENT.....	18
	A. Overview of the '671 Patent	18
	1. Alleged Problem.....	18
	2. Summary of Alleged Invention of the '671 Patent	19
	B. Prosecution History of the '671 Patent.....	23
VII.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	25
	A. “wireless port”	25
VIII.	IDENTIFICATION OF HOW THE CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE....	26
	A. Challenge #1: Claims 1-6 and 9-14 are invalid under 35 U.S.C § 103 over Yun in view of Kikinis	26
	1. Summary of Yun	26
	2. Summary of Kikinis	30
	3. Reasons to Combine Yun and Kikinis	33
	4. Detailed Analysis	36
	B. Challenge #2: Claims 7 and 15 are invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Yun in view of Kikinis and further in view of Inoue	62
	1. Summary of Inoue.....	62
	2. Reasons to Combine Yun/Kikinis and Inoue.....	63
	3. Detailed Analysis	65
	C. Challenge #3: Claims 1-7 and 9-15 are invalid under 35 U.S.C § 103 over Harris in view of Kikinis	68

1. Summary of Harris	68
2. Summary of Kikinis	69
3. Reasons to Combine Harris and Kikinis	69
4. Detailed Analysis	72
IX. CONCLUSION.....	98

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I am making this declaration at the request of Apple Inc. in the matter of the *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,092,671 (“the ’671 Patent”) to Lunsford, *et al.*

2. I am being compensated for my work in this matter at the rate of \$650/hour. I am also being reimbursed for reasonable and customary expenses associated with my work and testimony in this proceeding. My compensation is not contingent on the outcome of this matter or the specifics of my testimony.

3. I have been asked to provide my opinions regarding whether claims 1-7 and 9-15 of the ’671 Patent are invalid, either because they are anticipated or would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art (“POSITA”) at the time of the alleged invention, in light of the prior art. It is my opinion that all of the limitations of claims 1-7 and 9-15 would have been obvious to a POSITA.

4. In the preparation of this declaration, I have studied:

- a) The ’671 Patent, Exhibit 1001 (APPL-1001);
- b) The prosecution history of the ’671 Patent, Exhibit 1002 (APPL-1002);
- c) U.S. Patent No. 6,084,949 to Yun (“Yun”), Exhibit 1005 (APPL-1005);

- d) U.S. Patent No. 5,790,644 to Kikinis (“Kikinis”), Exhibit 1006 (APPL-1006);
- e) U.S. Patent No. 7,080,154 to Inoue *et al.* (“Inoue”), Exhibit 1007 (APPL-1007);
- f) U.S. Patent No. 4,868,848 to Magnusson *et al.* (“Magnusson”), Exhibit 1008 (APPL-1008);
- g) U.S. Patent No. 5,455,858 to Lin (“Lin”), Exhibit 1009 (APPL-1009);
- h) U.S. Patent No. 5,561,705 to Allard *et al.* (“Allard”), Exhibit 1010 (APPL-1010);
- i) U.S. Patent No. 6,600,902 to Bell (“Bell”), Exhibit 1011 (APPL-1011);
- j) U.S. Patent No. 6,738,643 to Harris (“Harris”), Exhibit 1012 (APPL-1012);
- k) U.S. Patent No. 5,457,742 to Vallillee *et al.* (“Vallillee”), Exhibit 1013 (APPL-1013);
- l) U.S. Patent No. 7,257,426 to Witkowski *et al.* (“Witkowski”), Exhibit 1014 (APPL-1014).

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.