DOCKET

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICROSOFT CORPORATION, Petitioner,

v.

DIRECTSTREAM, LLC, Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2018-01605, -01606, -01607 U.S. Patent No. 7,620,800 B2

REPLY DECLARATION OF DR. HAROLD STONE

Microsoft Corn v Directstream LLC IPR2018-01605 -01606 -01607

A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

IPR2018-01605, -01606, -01607 (U.S. Patent No. 7,620,800)

I have reviewed Patent Owner's Response and Dr. Houman
Homayoun's supporting declaration. I have been asked to reply to certain
statements by Patent Owner and its expert. This is my declaration on those topics.

I. COMPUTATIONAL LOOPS

 Patent Owner and Dr. Homayoun have proposed that the definition of "computational loop" should be "a set of computations that is executed repeatedly per datum, either a fixed number of times or until some condition is true or false."
Patent Owner Response ("Response"), 65; EX2112¶207, 225-226, 229-230, 233, 241. I disagree.

3. In my prior declaration, I did not offer a construction for the phrase "computational loop" because I believed the term should have its plain and ordinary meaning and that meaning was generally well known. I have reviewed the Board's Institution Decision (Paper 21) and agree that the Board's construction of this term as "a set of computations that is executed repeatedly, either a fixed number of times or until some condition is true or false" reflects that plain and ordinary meaning. Institution Decision, 23. Based on my experience, this is how a person of ordinary skill in the art ("a Skilled Artisan") reading the 800 Patent would understand the term in the 2002 time frame. I disagree with Patent Owner's

1

Microsoft Corn v Directstream LLC IPR2018-01605 -01606 -01607

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

and Dr. Homayoun's proposed modification because it does not reflect that understanding.

4. For example, nothing in the words "computational loop" requires repeatedly executing computations "per datum," as the dictionary definition relied on by the Board confirms. While the patent discloses loops, EX1005, FIGS. 4A-4B, 6A-6G, 5:65-6:28, and 6:42-7:37, these loops do not disclose loop calculations that are repeated multiple times "per datum." Rather, what is disclosed is merely the repeated execution of certain computations, *i.e.*, a *computational* loop. A Skilled Artisan would understand that these examples are embodiments of "computational loop" as recited in the claims, and these exemplify the broadest reasonable interpretation of "computational loop."

5. Indeed, the Patent Owner's proposed interpretation of "computational loop" is inconsistent with the disclosure of the 800 Patent. For instance, one example of a "computational loop" included in the disclosure of the 800 Patent can be found in the prior art paper published in 2001 by Caliga and Barker and incorporated-by-reference into the 800 Patent at EX1005, 4:58-62. Patent Owner cites this paper in support of its construction of "computational loop." *See* Response, 67. That loop is reproduced below:

2

Microsoft Corn v Directstream LLC IPR2018-01605 -01606 -01607

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

IPR2018-01605, -01606, -01607 (U.S. Patent No. 7,620,800)



EX2037, 5 (annotated).

6. Note that this figure specifically identifies the structure as a "loop over filter coefficients" and implements the following calculation for index *j*:

Sum = datain(j) * R(j) + datain(j+1) * R(j+1) + Sum, j = 0, 2, 4, ..., ncoef-1

3

Microsoft Corn v Directstream LLC IPR2018-01605 -01606 -01607

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

IPR2018-01605, -01606, -01607 (U.S. Patent No. 7,620,800)

7. Note that to carry out this equation, multiple iterations of the same calculations must occur, albeit with different data values for "datain," "R," and "Sum." The values for "datain" and "R" are different for each iteration, as the indices for each will be different for each iteration. The value of "Sum" will also be different for each iteration, as that value is captured in a register each cycle and fed back over the path that I annotated as "computational loop" to be used in the next cycle for the next iteration of the calculation.

8. The loop above – which is incorporated into the disclosure of the 800 Patent – therefore does not meet the Patent Owner's claim construction for "computational loop" because it is not a set of computations executed repeatedly *per datum* a fixed number of times. Patent Owner's interpretation therefore excludes perhaps the most detailed example of a "computational loop" included in its patent. I believe a Skilled Artisan would accordingly not read the claim phrase "computational loop" as narrowly as Patent Owner does.

9. Patent Owner also asserts that <u>Splash2</u> (EX1007) does not satisfy the claimed "computational loops" under its proposed interpretation. Response, 78-81. I disagree with that conclusion as well. As I discussed in my original declaration, the Unidirectional Systolic Array described in Chapter 8 of <u>Splash2</u> includes multiple processing elements executing computational loops simultaneously to

4

Microsoft Corn v Directstream LLC IPR2018-01605 -01606 -01607

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET



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.

