

ROKU, INC., Petitioner

v.

UNIVERSAL ELECTRONICS, INC., Patent Owner

Case IPR2019-01612 Patent 7,589,642

DECLARATION OF DR. SAMUEL H. RUSS IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER ROKU INC.'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD" Patent Trial and Appeal Board U.S. Patent & Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTE	RODU	CTION	1	
II.	CLA	IM C	ONSTRUCTION	2	
	A.	"Ke	y code signal"	3	
	B.	"Ke	y code generator device"	4	
	C.	"Generating a key code within a key code generator device using the keystroke indicator signal"			
III.	THE GROUNDS PRESENTED IN MY PREVIOUS DECLARATION DISCLOSE ALL OF THE ELEMENTS OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS				
	A.	Ground 1: Mishra in View of Dubil		11	
		1.	Mishra Discloses the Claimed "Receiving" and "Generating	_	
		2.	Mishra in View of Dubil Renders Obvious the Claimed "Modulating."		
		3.	Mishra in View of Dubil Renders Obvious the Dependent claims.	19	
	B.	Grou	and 2: Rye in View of Dubil	26	
		1.	Rye Discloses the Claimed "Receiving" and "Generating."	26	
		2.	Rye in View of Dubil Renders Obvious the Claimed "Modulating."	29	
		3.	Rye in view of Dubil Renders Obvious the Dependent Clai		
	C.	Grou	and 3: Caris in View of Skerlos	31	
		1.	Caris as Applied to Claim 2 Differs from Caris as Applied Claim 1.		
		2.	Caris in View of Skerlos Renders Obvious the Claimed "Modulating."	33	
		3.	Caris in View of Skerlos Renders Obvious Independent Clarand the Dependent Claims.	aim 1 35	
IV.			TION HAS DEMONSTRATED A MOTIVATION TO	36	



Declaration of Dr. Samuel H. Russ U.S. Patent No. 7,589,642

	A.	Ground 1 - A POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Combine Mishra and Dubil
	B.	Ground 2 - A POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Combine Rye and Dubil
	C.	Ground 3 - A POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Combine Caris and Skerlos
V	CON	CLUSION 43



I, Dr. Samuel H. Russ, declare as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

- 1. I am the same Dr. Samuel H. Russ who submitted a prior declaration (EX1003) in this matter, which I understand was filed on September 18, 2019. I have been retained on behalf of Roku, Inc. for the above-captioned *inter partes* review proceeding.
- 2. I understand that the Patent Owner has submitted a response in this case. I also understand that the Patent Owner's expert witness, Dr. Michael D. Sprenger, has submitted a declaration in support of the Patent Owner's response. I have been asked to provide my technical review, analysis, and insight regarding both the Patent Owner's response and Dr. Sprenger's declaration in support thereof.
- 3. My background and qualifications were provided in paragraphs 3-10 of my previous declaration, and my CV was provided as EX1004. My statements in paragraphs 11 and 28-38 of my prior declaration regarding my review of U.S. Patent No. 7,589,642 ("'642 patent") and related materials remain unchanged, as do my understandings of the relevant legal principles stated in paragraphs 12-27.
- 4. Since my prior declaration, I have reviewed and considered the following additional materials:



Pa	aper	Description
	7	Decision Granting Institution
	16	Patent Owner's Response

Exhibit	Description
1033	Deposition Transcript of Michael D. Sprenger, taken September 15,
1033	2020 (IPR2019-01612).
1034	Deposition Transcript of Michael D. Sprenger, taken September 16,
1034	2020 (IPR2019-01613).
1035	Deposition Transcript of Michael D. Sprenger, taken September 16,
1033	2020 (IPR2019-01614).
	Declaration of Michael D. Sprenger in Support of Patent Owner's
2003	Response to the Petition for Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No.
	7,589,642
2007	Prosecution History of U.S. Patent No. 9,355,553
2011	Declaration of Dr. Samuel H. Russ (IPR2019-01613)

- 5. I have also considered all other materials cited herein. My work on this case is being billed at my normal hourly rate, with reimbursement for actual expenses. My compensation is not contingent upon the outcome of this *inter partes* review proceeding.
- 6. In his declaration, Dr. Sprenger makes several statements regarding the '642 patent, the prior art references, and the relevant technology at issue in this proceeding, which I believe to be inaccurate and misleading. My responses to these statements are detailed below.

II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

7. I first turn to the area of claim construction. In my opening declaration, submitted in support of the Petition for *inter partes* review directed to



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.

