

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE INC.  
Petitioner

v.

CPC PATENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

IPR2022-00602  
Patent No. 9,665,705

---

**SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF DR. ANDREW SEARS**

IPR2022-00602

Supplemental Declaration of Dr. Andrew Sears  
U.S. Patent No. 9,665,705

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**I. INTRODUCTION .....3**

**II. OPINIONS.....3**

A. CPC’s “PUSH-BUTTON” ARGUMENT ..... 3

B. *MATHIASSEN* AND THE CLAIMED “SERIES OF ENTRIES OF THE BIOMETRIC SIGNAL” ..... 8

C. *MATHIASSEN* IS “COMPUTER ART” ..... 11

D. CLAIMS 1(D1)-1(D3)..... 13

**III. CONCLUSION .....14**

IPR2022-00602

Supplemental Declaration of Dr. Andrew Sears  
U.S. Patent No. 9,665,705

I, Dr. Andrew Sears, hereby declare the following:

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1. I have been asked to respond to certain issues raised by Patent Owner in Patent Owner's Response dated December 22, 2022 ("POR"). All of my opinions expressed in my original declaration (Ex. 1003) remain the same. I have reviewed the relevant portions of the POR and the relevant portions of Dr. Easttom's declaration and deposition transcript in connection with preparing this supplemental declaration.

**II. OPINIONS**

**A. CPC's "Push-Button" Argument**

2. As I discussed in my original declaration (Ex. 1003), a POSITA would have been motivated and found it obvious to modify *Mathiassen's* portable control to output *McKeeth's* duress and alert attributes, in addition to issuing an open door command that unlocks the car door locks for the car owner/administrator. (Ex. 1003, ¶¶ 149-171). Providing access while issuing a silent alert to authorities when a user indicated they were under duress would have improved theft prevention "or non-authorized use of the car" because authorities would have been notified when the break-in or robbery was occurring. (Ex. 1003, ¶ 150 (*citing* Ex. 1004, [0145])). Additionally, as *Mathiassen* expressly teaches security of car systems being a "key issue," a POSITA would have been motivated to increase such security to make car

IPR2022-00602

Supplemental Declaration of Dr. Andrew Sears  
U.S. Patent No. 9,665,705

owners feel safer by providing duress access that included alerting authorities when an authorized user was under duress or alert access that included sounding an alarm when an unauthorized user was trying to access the vehicle. (Ex. 1003, ¶ 150 (*citing* Ex. 1004, [0145]); Ex. 1003, ¶¶ 151-161).

3. *Mathiassen* understood that “security” was a “key issue” in car systems in order to “prevent theft or non-authorized use of the car,” as the automotive industry was known to emphasize “secure access by blocking non-authorized users access to the car.” (Ex. 1004, [0145]). Thus, due to the desirability of secure access for only authorized individuals, *Mathiassen* applies the fingerprint recognition access system to a car’s central locking system to distinguish authorized users from un-authorized users. *Id.* Based on *Mathiassen’s* express disclosure of using fingerprint recognition to provide the “secure access” that was known to be desired in car locking systems, a POSITA would not have looked to a less-secure push button as providing any type of access, such as duress, as a push button would not have prevented non-authorized users from gaining access to the vehicle.

4. Dr. Easttom opines that a POSITA would have implemented a push button in *Mathiassen* to indicate duress because push buttons are “easy to install” and a “simple mechanical feature[.]” (Ex. 2013, *Declaration of Dr. William C. Easttom III*, ¶ 61). In my opinion, Dr. Easttom’s opinion does not recognize or address *Mathiassen’s* express purpose of applying the fingerprint recognition access

IPR2022-00602

Supplemental Declaration of Dr. Andrew Sears  
U.S. Patent No. 9,665,705

system to cars to **prevent un-authorized use**. Within the field of access security, duress was known as a condition where an *authorized* user was being forced to access a device (e.g., a vehicle). (Ex. 1003, ¶¶ 64-67, ¶ 91 (*McKeeth* teaching a user indicating they are “experiencing duress or force to access the computer system”), ¶¶ 145-146 (comparing the ’705 Patent’s disclosed “duress” situation occurring when an authorized user is in a “coercive situation” with *McKeeth*’s duress condition), ¶ 151). Thus, a POSITA would have understood providing access when a user is under duress includes identifying the user is an authorized user. If a push button, alone, was used to indicate duress, the car locking system would not be able to identify an authorized user from an un-authorized user pressing the button. Therefore, for a push button to provide duress access in *Mathiassen*’s central locking system and for *Mathiassen* to accomplish the purpose of preventing un-authorized use, a POSITA would have understood *Mathiassen*’s fingerprint sensor would have verified the user was authorized.

5. Indicating duress by “discreetly” signaling duress was well-known to be desirable. (Ex. 1003, ¶ 153 (*citing Zhinger*)). A POSITA would have understood a user presenting their fingerprint and having to separately press a push button would not be as discreet as indicating duress in the same presented fingerprint. Dr. Easttom’s opinions of a “simpler” duress indication would have required two operations instead of a single fingerprint. In my opinion, it would not have been

IPR2022-00602

# 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.