

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

ROKU, INC.  
Petitioner

v.

UNIVERSAL ELECTRONICS INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR No. IPR2019-01615  
U.S. Patent 9,716,853

---

**DECLARATION OF DR. SAMUEL H. RUSS**

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>I.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>QUALIFICATIONS.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>MATERIALS CONSIDERED .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>RELEVANT LEGAL STANDARDS .....</b>	<b>6</b>
	A. Level of ordinary skill .....	7
	B. Claim construction .....	8
	1. “for use in controlling each of at least a first functional operation and a second functional operation of the intended target appliance” .....	9
	2. Other terms.....	11
	C. Obviousness.....	12
<b>V.</b>	<b>BACKGROUND OF THE TECHNOLOGY.....</b>	<b>12</b>
	A. In-Home Entertainment System Topography Was Well-Known .....	15
	B. Infrared Remote Controls and Commands Were Well-Known .....	18
	C. Selecting Remote-Control Commands: Scanning, Receiving, and Dialog Boxes Were Well-Known .....	20
	D. Remote-Control Conversion .....	27
	1. IR Blasters.....	27
	2. Firewire and CEA-931 .....	30
	3. HDMI CEC .....	32
	4. Other Protocols .....	42
	E. Devices with Multiple Communication Methods Were Well- Known .....	43
	F. Lists, Tables, and Data Structures Were Well-Known .....	44
<b>VI.</b>	<b>THE CHALLENGED PATENT .....</b>	<b>51</b>
	A. The Described Invention .....	51
	B. The Asserted Claims: .....	55
	1. Independent Claim 1 .....	55
	2. Dependent Claim 3.....	57

*Declaration for Inter Partes Review of  
U.S. Patent No. 9,716,853*

3.	Dependent Claim 5.....	57
4.	Dependent Claim 7.....	57
<b>VII.</b>	<b>THE ASSERTED PRIOR ART .....</b>	<b>58</b>
A.	Overview of Chardon (EX1005).....	58
B.	Overview of the HDMI Specification (EX1010).....	64
C.	Overview of Stecyk (EX1006).....	69
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE .....</b>	<b>72</b>
A.	Ground 1: Claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 are Rendered Obvious by Chardon in view of HDMI and Stecyk .....	73
1.	Independent Claim 1 .....	75
a)	“[1.P] A universal control engine, comprising:” .....	75
b)	“[1.1] a processing device; and a memory device having stored thereon instructions executable by the processing device, the instructions, when executed by the processing device, causing the universal control engine...” .....	77
c)	“[1.2] to respond to a detected presence of an intended target appliance within a logical topography of controllable appliances which includes the universal control engine” .....	79
d)	“[1.3] by using an identity associated with the intended target appliance to create a listing” .....	83
e)	“[1.4] comprised of at least a first communication method and a second communication method different than the first communication method for use in controlling each of at least a first functional operation and a second functional operation of the intended target appliance and” .....	92
f)	“[1.5] to respond to a received request from a controlling device intended to cause the intended target appliance to perform a one of the first and second functional operations” .....	95
g)	“[1.6] by causing a one of the first and second communication methods in the listing of communication methods that has been associated with	

*Declaration for Inter Partes Review of  
U.S. Patent No. 9,716,853*

the requested one of the first and second functional operations to be used to transmit to the intended target appliance a command for controlling the requested one of the first and second functional operations of the intended target appliance.” .....97

2. Dependent Claim 3.....99

    a) “[3.P] The universal control engine as recited in claim 1, wherein the instructions cause the universal control engine to” .....99

    b) “[3.1] initiate a detection of the presence of the intended target appliance within the logical topography of controllable appliances.” .....100

3. Dependent Claim 5.....101

    a) “[5.P] The universal control engine as recited in claim 1, wherein the instruction [sic] cause the universal control engine to cause” .....101

    b) “[5.1] a prompt to be displayed in a display associated with the universal control engine in response to a detected presence of the intended target appliance within a logical topography of controllable appliances, the prompt requesting a user to provide data indicative of the identity associated with the intended target appliance.” .....101

4. Dependent Claim 7.....105

    a) “[7.P] The universal control engine as recited in claim 1, wherein the instructions cause the universal control engine to” .....105

    b) “[7.1] initiate an interrogation of the intended target appliance to determine which of a plurality of communication methods are supported by the appliance for use in receiving a command for controlling at least one of the first and second functional operations and using results obtained from the interrogation to create the listing.” .....105

**IX. OTHER EVIDENCE RELEVANT TO OBVIOUSNESS.....107**

*Declaration for Inter Partes Review of  
U.S. Patent No. 9,716,853*

I, Samuel H. Russ, declare as follows:

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1. I have been asked by Roku, Inc. (“Roku”) to provide expert opinions in the above-captioned *Inter Partes* Review proceeding involving U.S. Patent No. 9,716,853 (“the ’853 patent”), which is entitled “System And Method For Optimized Appliance Control.”

2. I am being compensated by Roku on an hourly basis for the time I spend in connection with this proceeding. My compensation is not dependent in any way on the substance of my opinions or in the outcome of this proceeding.

**II. QUALIFICATIONS**

3. My qualifications for forming the opinions set forth in this declaration are summarized here and explained in more detail in my curriculum vitae, which is attached as Exhibit 1004. Exhibit 1004 also includes a list of my publications and the cases in which I have testified at deposition, hearing, or trial during the past four years.

4. I received a Bachelor’s degree in Electrical Engineering from the Georgia Institute of Technology (“Georgia Tech”) in 1986 and a Ph.D. in Electrical Engineering from Georgia Tech in 1991.

5. From 2007 to the present, I have been a member of the faculty of the University of South Alabama as an Assistant and Associate Professor in the

# 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.