

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE, INC.,  
Petitioners,

v.

UNILOC LUXEMBOURG S.A.,  
Patent Owner.

---

PATENT 8,872,646

---

**DECLARATION OF WILLIAM C EASTTOM II**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS .....	2
III.	LEGAL STANARDS USED IN MY ANALYSIS.....	2
	A. Obviousness.....	2
	B. Priority Date .....	4
	C. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	4
	D. Broadest Reasonable Interpretation.....	5
IV.	OVERVIEW OFTHE ‘646 PATENT .....	6
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	6
	A. “glitch” .....	7
	B. “A change in dominant axis” .....	7
	C. “dominant axis logic to determine an idle sample value for a dominant axis of the mobile device based on the motion data” .....	7
	D. “dominant axis logic ... to compare a difference between a current sample value along the dominant axis determined based on the motion of the device and the idle sample value of the dominant axis against a threshold value” .....	8
	E. “computation logic to determine whether the motion caused a change in the dominant axis” .....	8
	F. “power logic to wake up the device when the motion of the device indicates a change in the dominant axis of the device” .....	10
	G. “power logic to move the device from the inactive state to an active state upon detection of a change in the dominant axis which is the axis experiencing the largest effect of gravity” .....	10

H. “long average logic to calculate an average of accelerations over a sample period” .....	10
VI. PETITIONER’S CITED REFERENCES.....	12
VII. VALIDITY ANALYSIS.....	13
A. Last Active State.....	13
1. Pasolini .....	14
2. Goldman .....	15
3. McMahan.....	16
4. Mizell .....	16
5. Park 16	
B. Specific Combinations .....	17
1. Park with Mizell, McMahan, Goldman, and/or Pasolini.....	17
2. Goldman with Park, Mizell, McMahan, and/or Pasolini.....	19
VIII. CONCLUSION .....	20
EASTTOM CV.....	22
A. Education.....	22
1. University Degrees .....	22
2. Industry Certifications .....	23
3. Hardware and Networking Related Certifications .....	23
4. Operating System Related Certifications.....	23
5. Programming and Web Development Related Certifications .....	24
6. Database Related Certifications .....	24
7. Security and Forensics Related Certifications .....	24
8. Software Certifications .....	25
9. Licenses.....	25
B. Publications .....	25
1. Books26	
2. Papers, presentations, & articles.....	28
3. Patents .....	30
C. Standards and Certification Creation.....	31

D. Professional Awards and Memberships .....	32
E. Speaking Engagements .....	33
F. Litigation Support Experience .....	37
1. Testifying Experience .....	44
G. Professional Experience .....	47
H. Continuing Professional Education .....	51
I. References to my work .....	53
1. Media References .....	53
2. References to publications .....	54
3. Universities using my books .....	62
J. Training .....	64
K. Technical Skills .....	65

I, Chuck Easttom, hereby declare as follows:

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

1. My name is William Charles Easttom II (Chuck Easttom) and I have been retained by Uniloc Luxembourg S.A. (“Uniloc” or the “Patent Owner”) to provide my expert opinions regarding U.S. Patent No. 8,872,646 (the ‘646 Patent). In particular, I have been asked to opine on whether a person of ordinary skill in the art (POSITA) at the time the inventions described in the ‘646 Patent were conceived would have found all claims, Claims 1, 3, 5-11, 13-18, and 20 (“Challenged Claims”) as unpatentable in light of the cited references and arguments in the IPR.

2. Based on my review of the Petition and its exhibits, and my understanding of the relevant requirements of patent law, and my decades of experience in the field of computer science including cell phones and cell phone technology, it is my opinion that the Challenged Claims would not have been obvious in light of the proposed combinations.

3. I am being compensated for my time at my standard consulting rate of \$300 per hour. I am also being reimbursed for expenses that I incur during the course of this work. Apart from that, I have no financial interest in Uniloc. My compensation is not contingent upon the results of my study or the substance of my opinions.

Apple v. Uniloc, IPR2018-289  
Uniloc’s Exhibit 2001, page 1

# 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.