

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

APPLE INC., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., and SAMSUNG  
ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

SMART MOBILE TECHNOLOGIES LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2022-00981  
U.S. Patent No. 8,472,936

---

**DECLARATION OF MICHAEL D. KOTZIN, PH.D.  
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.68 IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR  
*INTER PARTES* REVIEW**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	Introduction.....	4
II.	Qualifications and Professional Experience.....	5
III.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	9
IV.	Relevant Legal Standards .....	10
V.	Overview of the '936 Patent.....	12
VI.	Claim Construction.....	14
VII.	Identification of how the Claims are Unpatentable.....	15
A.	Ground 1: Claims 1, 8-11, 13, 15, 17, and 19 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Rautiola in view of Regnier and Sainton.....	15
1.	Summary of Rautiola.....	15
2.	Summary of Regnier.....	19
3.	Summary of Sainton .....	21
4.	Reasons to Combine Rautiola, Regnier, and Sainton.....	23
5.	Claim 1.....	42
6.	Claim 8.....	77
7.	Claim 9.....	79
8.	Claim 10.....	80
9.	Claim 11.....	82
10.	Claim 13.....	83
11.	Claim 15.....	85
12.	Claim 17.....	87
13.	Claim 19.....	89
B.	Ground 2: Claims 1, 8-9, 11, 13, 17, and 19 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Grube in view of Gillig.....	92

1.	Summary of Grube .....	92
2.	Summary of Gillig .....	94
3.	Reasons to Combine Grube and Gillig .....	96
4.	Claim 1 .....	99
5.	Claim 8 .....	114
6.	Claim 9 .....	114
7.	Claim 11 .....	115
8.	Claim 13 .....	118
9.	Claim 17 .....	119
10.	Claim 19 .....	121
VIII.	Conclusion .....	124

I, Michael D. Kotzin, Ph.D., do hereby declare as follows:

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

1. I am making this declaration at the request of Apple Inc., Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. in the matter of the *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,472,936 (“the ’936 Patent”) to Rao *et al.*

2. I am being compensated for my work in this matter at my standard hourly rate. I am also being reimbursed for reasonable and customary expenses associated with my work and testimony in this investigation. My compensation is not contingent on the outcome of this matter or the specifics of my testimony, and I have no other interest in this case or the parties thereto.

3. I have been asked to provide my opinions regarding whether claims 1, 8-11, 13, 15, 17, and 19 (“the Challenged Claims”) of the ’936 Patent are unpatentable as they would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art (“POSITA”) at the time of the alleged invention, in light of the prior art. It is my opinion that all of the limitations of the challenged claims would have been obvious to a POSITA.

4. In the preparation of this declaration, I have studied:

- a. the ’936 Patent, Ex.1001;
- b. the prosecution history of the ’936 Patent (“’936 File History”),

Ex.1002;

- c. U.S. Patent No. 5,949,775 to Rautiola *et al.* (“Rautiola”), Ex.1005;
- d. U.S. Patent No. 5,689,708 to Regnier *et al.* (“Regnier”), Ex.1006;
- e. U.S. Patent No. 5,854,985 to Sainton *et al.* (“Sainton”), Ex.1007;
- f. U.S. Patent No. 5,201,067 to Grube *et al.* (“Grube”), Ex.1011; and
- g. U.S. Patent No. 4,989,230 to Gillig *et al.* (“Gillig”), Ex.1012.

5. In forming the opinions expressed below, I have considered:

the documents listed above;

the relevant legal standards, including the standard for obviousness,

and any additional authoritative documents as cited in the body of this

declaration; and

my own knowledge and experience based upon my work in the field

of networking as described below.

6. Unless otherwise noted, all emphasis in any quoted material has been added.

## II. QUALIFICATIONS AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

7. My academic and professional background is in electrical engineering and computer science, and I have been working in those fields since the completion of my B.S. in electrical engineering almost 45 years ago. My complete qualifications and professional experience are described in my *Curriculum Vitae*, a copy of which can be found in Ex.1004. The following is a brief summary of my

# 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.