

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.

IPR2022-00982
U.S. Patent No. 8,472,937

**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.....	6
III.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	9
IV.	Relevant Legal Standards	10
V.	Overview of the '937 Patent.....	12
VI.	Claim Construction.....	15
VII.	Identification of how the Claims are Unpatentable.....	15
A.	Ground 1: Claims 1-3 and 16-18 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Rautiola in view of Regnier and Sainton.....	16
1.	Summary of Rautiola.....	16
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 2.....	74
7.	Claim 3.....	78
8.	Claim 16.....	81
9.	Claim 17.....	81
10.	Claim 18.....	82
B.	Ground 2: Claims 5-6 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Rautiola in view of Regnier, Sainton, and Wilson.....	85
1.	Summary of Wilson.....	85
2.	Reasons to Combine Rautiola, Regnier, Sainton, and Wilson.....	87
3.	Claim 5.....	92

4.	Claim 6.....	96
C.	Ground 3: Claim 10 is obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Rautiola in view of Regnier, Sainton, and Salazar	98
1.	Summary of Salazar.....	98
2.	Reasons to Combine Rautiola, Regnier, Sainton, and Salazar	98
3.	Claim 10.....	102
D.	Ground 4: Claim 13 is obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Rautiola in view of Regnier, Sainton, and Crites.....	104
1.	Summary of Crites	104
2.	Reasons to Combine Rautiola, Regnier, Sainton, and Crites	105
3.	Claim 13.....	107
E.	Ground 5: Claims 1-2, 5-6, 10, and 17 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Grube in view of Gillig.....	109
1.	Summary of Grube	109
2.	Summary of Gillig	111
3.	Reasons to Combine Grube and Gillig.....	113
4.	Claim 1.....	115
5.	Claim 2.....	129
6.	Claim 5.....	130
7.	Claim 6.....	132
8.	Claim 10.....	132
9.	Claim 17.....	133
VIII.	Conclusion.....	135

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. 8,472,937 (“the ’937 Patent,” Ex.1001) 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 1-3, 5-6, 10, 13, and 16-18 (“the Challenged Claims”) of the ’937 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 ’937 Patent, Ex.1001;

- b. the prosecution history of the '937 Patent (“’937 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. 5,400,246 to Wilson *et al.* (“Wilson”), Ex.1008;
- g. U.S. Patent No. 5,802,467 to Salazar *et al.* (“Salazar”), Ex.1009;
- h. U.S. Patent No. 6,097,380 to Crites *et al.* (“Crites”), Ex.1010;
- i. U.S. Patent No. 5,201,067 to Grube *et al.* (“Grube”), Ex.1011; and
- j. 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.

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.