

Page 1

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
 2 BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD  
 3  
 4 ASSA ABLOY AB, ASSA ABLOY Inc., )  
 ASSA ABLOY Residential Group, )  
 5 Inc., August Home, Inc., HID )  
 Global Corporation, and ASSA )  
 6 ABLOY Global Solutions, Inc., )  
 )  
 7 Petitioners, )  
 ) Case No. IPR2022-01093  
 8 v. ) Volume I  
 )  
 9 CPC PATENT TECHNOLOGIES PTY )  
 LTD., )  
 10 ) Pages 1 to 166  
 Patent Owner. )  
 11 \_\_\_\_\_ )  
 12 )  
 13 )  
 14 )  
 15 )  
 16 )  
 17 REMOTE VIDEOCONFERENCED DEPOSITION OF SAMUEL HARDIE RUSS, PhD  
 18 Mobile, Alabama  
 19 Wednesday, July 12, 2023  
 20 )  
 21 )  
 22 )  
 23 )  
 24 Reported by:  
 ELIZABETH BORRELLI, CSR No. 7844, CCRR, CLR  
 25 JOB NO. 9874954

Page 3

1 APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:  
 2  
 3 For the Petitioners:  
 4 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
 BY: ANDREW DEVKAR, appearing remotely  
 5 Attorney at Law  
 2049 Century Park East  
 6 Suite 700  
 Los Angeles, California 90067  
 7 (310) 907-1000 (main)  
 (310) 255-9070 (direct)  
 8 andrew.devkar@morganlewis.com  
 9 For the Patent Owner:  
 10 CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
 BY: ANDREW RYAN, appearing remotely  
 BY: STEVEN COYLE, appearing remotely  
 11 Attorneys at Law  
 20 Church Street  
 12 22nd Floor  
 Hartford, Connecticut 06103-3207  
 13 (860) 286-2929 (main)  
 14 ryan@cantorcolburn.com  
 scoyle@cantorcolburn.com  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25

Page 2

1  
 2  
 3  
 4  
 5  
 6  
 7  
 8 Remote Videoconferenced Deposition of  
 9 SAMUEL HARDIE RUSS, PhD, Volume I, taken on  
 10 behalf of the Petitioners, at Mobile, Alabama,  
 11 commencing at 8:01 a.m., Wednesday, July 12,  
 12 2023, before Elizabeth Borrelli, a Certified  
 13 Shorthand Reporter in the State of California,  
 14 License No. 7844.  
 15 \* \* \*  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25

Page 4

I N D E X

|    |  |             |
|----|--|-------------|
| 1  | WITNESS  | EXAMINATION |
| 2  |  |             |
| 3  | SAMUEL HARDIE RUSS, PhD  |             |
| 4  | By MR. DEVKAR  | 5           |
| 5  |  |             |
| 6  |  |             |
| 7  | EXHIBITS   |             |
| 8  |  |             |
| 9  | RUSS   | PAGE        |
| 10 | Exhibit 2039 Expert declaration of Samuel<br>Russ, PhD, 40 pages                               | 8           |
| 11 |  |             |
| 12 | Exhibit 1001 US Patent No. 8,620,039, 17<br>pages  | 9           |
| 13 | Exhibit 1003 European Patent Application<br>EP0924655A2 with inventor<br>Shi-Ping Hsu, 8 pages | 28          |
| 14 |  |             |
| 15 | Exhibit 1005 US Patent No. 6,963,660 B1, 8<br>pages  | 119         |
| 16 |  |             |
| 17 | INFORMATION REQUESTED  |             |
| 18 | (None)   |             |
| 19 | UNANSWERED QUESTIONS   |             |
| 20 | (None)   |             |
| 21 |  |             |
| 22 |  |             |
| 23 |  |             |
| 24 |  |             |
| 25 |  |             |



800.211.DEPO (3376)  
 EsquireSolutions.com

Page 5

1 MOBILE, ALABAMA; WEDNESDAY, JULY 12, 2023  
2 8:01 A.M.  
3  
4 SAMUEL HARDIE RUSS, PhD  
5 having been duly administered  
6 an oath in accordance with CCP 2094,  
7 was examined and testified as follows:  
8 EXAMINATION  
9 BY MR. DEVKAR:  
10 Q. Good morning, Dr. Russ.  
11 A. Good morning.  
12 Q. Can you please state your full name for  
13 the record.  
14 A. Samuel Hardie, H-A-R-D-I-E, Russ, R-U-S-S.  
15 Q. It's good to see you again. And I know we  
16 went through this process just a short time ago so  
17 we'll be doing it again today. I'll just briefly  
18 review the ground rules that you probably remember  
19 them well from last time, if that's all right?  
20 A. Sure.  
21 Q. So, first, we should make an effort not to  
22 talk over one another. This makes it easier for the  
23 court reporter to record what is being said. Does  
24 that sound all right?  
25 A. Yes.

Page 6

1 Q. If you don't understand a question, would  
2 you please let me know and I will clarify?  
3 A. Yes.  
4 Q. During the deposition we'll make reference  
5 to a number of exhibits from these IPR proceedings,  
6 and my intent is to place any such exhibits in the  
7 chat window so that you can download them to your  
8 local machine. I think that's what we did last time  
9 as well. Does that process work for you?  
10 A. It does. And while we're on the subject  
11 and on the record, I do have clean copies of these  
12 files on my computer. Is it okay if I -- if I  
13 access those clean copies on my local computer?  
14 Q. That's fine with --  
15 A. Or would you --  
16 Q. That's fine with me. Is -- all of the  
17 materials that you have with you are clean; is that  
18 correct?  
19 A. Yes, yeah, clean -- clean materials, no  
20 notes, no sticky notes, no -- yes.  
21 Q. And are all of the materials that you have  
22 with you from the record of the IPR proceedings?  
23 A. Yes.  
24 Q. All right. Yeah, so as long as we're  
25 referring to the same exhibit numbers, which I'll

Page 7

1 try to be clear about, then you can refer to any  
2 copy you would like, but I'll still go ahead and  
3 place the copies in the chat window so that the  
4 court reporter has them and you're free download  
5 them as -- as you would like.  
6 A. Right. And I'll -- I'll be sure to  
7 synchronize my remarks to those exhibit numbers so  
8 that the record is clear.  
9 Q. Great.  
10 Are you aware of any reason that you are  
11 not able to give full and truthful answers to my  
12 questions today?  
13 A. No reason that I'm aware of.  
14 Q. What did you do to prepare for today's  
15 deposition?  
16 A. I read the materials involved in this,  
17 including the patents, the prior art references that  
18 are being cited, my declaration, the petition. I  
19 believe I looked at -- anyway, I reviewed the  
20 materials associated with the IPR. I also met with  
21 counsel.  
22 Q. When you said you met with counsel, was  
23 that with Mr. Ryan?  
24 A. It was with Mr. Ryan and Mr. Coyle.  
25 Q. And when did you meet with counsel?

Page 8

1 A. Yesterday.  
2 Q. Did you talk to anyone other than Mr. Ryan  
3 and Mr. Coyle in preparing for today's deposition?  
4 A. No, not that I recall.  
5 Q. Today we'll be addressing your declaration  
6 in connection with two related IPRs, which are IPR  
7 2022-01093 and IPR 2022-01094.  
8 Is it your understanding that you  
9 submitted a declaration in each of these IPRs?  
10 A. That's my -- that's my offhand  
11 recollection, yes.  
12 Q. I'm going to place your declaration for  
13 these IPRs in the chat window so that we have those  
14 two exhibits handy.  
15 So in the chat window I've placed  
16 Exhibit 2039 from each of the two subject IPRs. I  
17 believe this -- these exhibits, 2039 are your  
18 declarations in each of the IPRs. When you can  
19 access those, can you see if that appears to be  
20 correct to you?  
21 (Whereupon Exhibit 2039 was marked for  
22 identification.)  
23 THE WITNESS: All right. Let's see. I'm  
24 pulling up the first one now. Yes, that -- that one  
25 appears to be correct. Let me pull up the second



800.211.DEPO (3376)  
EsquireSolutions.com

Page 9

1 one.  
2 That one also appears to be correct.  
3 BY MR. DEVKAR:  
4 Q. Okay. So Exhibit 2039 is your declaration  
5 in each of the two subject IPRs; is that -- is that  
6 correct?  
7 A. That's correct.  
8 Q. Now, your two declarations relating to the  
9 '039 patent have substantially identical content.  
10 Is that your understanding?  
11 A. That's my recollection, yes.  
12 Q. Do you recall any differences in this --  
13 in the content of these two declarations?  
14 A. I don't recall any differences.  
15 Q. I'm also going to add Exhibit 1001 to the  
16 chat window. This is the '039 patent.  
17 (Whereupon Exhibit 1001 was marked for  
18 identification.)  
19 MR. DEVKAR: And for the record, the  
20 subject patent, which we will refer to the -- as the  
21 '039 patent, is US patent 8,620,039, which is  
22 designated as Exhibit 1001 in each of the two IPR  
23 proceedings.  
24 BY MR. DEVKAR:  
25 Q. Dr. Russ, is it your understanding that

Page 10

1 Exhibit 1001 is the '039 patent in each of the  
2 subject IPRs?  
3 A. Yes. That's -- that seems correct, yes.  
4 Q. And can we agree that when either of us  
5 refers to the '039 or '039 patent, that we are  
6 referring to the patent at Exhibit 1001?  
7 A. Yes.  
8 Q. I believe my questions today will focus on  
9 the central arguments in your declaration,  
10 Exhibit 2039, in both of these IPRs. And I'll  
11 intend for my questions to apply to your declaration  
12 in both of these IPRs, however, if there are any  
13 differences you are aware of between your  
14 declarations in the two patents, we can focus on  
15 them, but I -- I intend for my questions to  
16 generally apply to both of your declarations unless  
17 otherwise stated. Is that fair with you?  
18 A. Yes, that is fair.  
19 Q. So I'd like to then refer to your  
20 declaration, Exhibit 2039. And for simplicity I'm  
21 going to refer to your declaration in the IPR  
22 2022-01093.  
23 Can you please let me know when you have  
24 that declaration handy?  
25 A. I have that declaration up on my computer

Page 11

1 now. Thank you.  
2 Q. I'd like to turn to paragraph 64 of your  
3 declaration, Exhibit 2039.  
4 A. Okay.  
5 And Counselor, I'm sorry to interrupt your  
6 line of questioning. There were two typographical  
7 errors I noticed in my review yesterday and I wasn't  
8 sure, and I don't know quite what the rules are and  
9 when would be a good time to address those. I  
10 understand you have a line of questioning you're  
11 about to embark on, so I apologize for interrupting  
12 that, but --  
13 Q. No, no problem. Why don't we cover your  
14 typographical errors first. Can you please explain  
15 where those typographical errors?  
16 A. Certainly. And I appreciate your  
17 indulgence.  
18 Let's see. The first is at the end of  
19 paragraph 34, which is on page 13 or PDF page 16 of  
20 my declaration.  
21 Q. Okay.  
22 A. The last sentence is incomplete. It says,  
23 "the fifth step in this method requires," and then a  
24 period. I meant to say, "the fifth step in this  
25 method requires the completion of all previous

Page 12

1 steps."  
2 Q. Thank you. I recall reading that sentence  
3 and figuring that something was left out there, so  
4 thanks for clarifying.  
5 A. Yeah, good. Thank you.  
6 And then in paragraph 41.  
7 Q. Okay.  
8 A. The last sentence says "set forth above in  
9 paragraph 38." That should say "set forth above in  
10 paragraph 40."  
11 Q. Okay. I understand.  
12 Are those the only errors that you're  
13 aware of as we sit here right now in your  
14 declaration?  
15 A. Yes, those the only errors I'm aware of at  
16 the moment, yes, thank you.  
17 Q. Okay. Let's turn back then to paragraph  
18 64, please, of your declaration.  
19 A. Okay. I am there now.  
20 Q. In paragraph 64 of your declaration you  
21 identify three types of data storage solutions that  
22 were common at the time of the '039 patent  
23 invention; is that correct?  
24 A. That is correct.  
25 Q. Can you briefly summarize what each of



800.211.DEPO (3376)  
EsquireSolutions.com

Page 13

1 these three common solutions for data storage are?  
2 A. A searchable data rate -- excuse me, a  
3 searchable database of records, an array of records  
4 of fixed size, and having pointers to the records.  
5 Q. Each of these types of data storage were  
6 well-known before the time '039 patent application;  
7 is that correct?  
8 A. I believe that's correct, yes.  
9 Q. Can you please turn to paragraph 10 of  
10 your declaration.  
11 A. Okay. I am there now.  
12 Q. In paragraph 10 you refer to a product by  
13 the name of eN-Touch 1000, which is eN-Touch, space,  
14 1000, for the record.  
15 Do you see that?  
16 A. I do.  
17 Q. And within paragraph 10 of your  
18 declaration you state that, "The eN-Touch 1000 could  
19 capture human signatures (and transmit them for  
20 storage)."  
21 Do you see that?  
22 A. I do.  
23 Q. Do you know how the human signatures would  
24 have been stored in the eN-Touch 1000?  
25 A. Well, the signatures were not stored in

Page 14

1 the eN-Touch 1000. They would have been stored at  
2 the location to which they were transmitted. I  
3 mean, the eN-Touch 1000 would store the signature  
4 temporarily in RAM memory, transmit it for storage  
5 to some other facility, and then I imagine clear  
6 memory and use it -- so that it would be available  
7 again for another signature. So the actual storage  
8 would be done at a database that the customer that  
9 was using the eN-Touch 1000 would be working with.  
10 Q. Thanks for that clarification.  
11 In the database in which the human  
12 signatures would have been stored, what type of data  
13 storage solution would have been used?  
14 A. I -- I don't know. I did not work the  
15 development of those, but I would imagine it was a  
16 database of some sort.  
17 Q. Referring back to the common types of data  
18 storage that you refer to in paragraph 64 of your  
19 declaration, would any of these types of common data  
20 storage have been suitable for storing human  
21 signatures captured by the eN-Touch 1000?  
22 MR. RYAN: Objection. Form.  
23 THE WITNESS: Well, I -- I know the  
24 database method at least would be suitable. I  
25 haven't considered the other two methods.

Page 15

1 BY MR. DEVKAR:  
2 Q. Are you aware of any reason why the other  
3 two methods would not have been suitable?  
4 A. Well, I express opinions towards the end  
5 of my report, roughly paragraphs 63 through 70, to  
6 explain why the array approach would have been  
7 unwieldy, and I think those opinions would be  
8 relevant here as well.  
9 Q. When you said that you believe the  
10 database method of storing signatures would have  
11 been at least one suitable to store the human  
12 signatures captured by the eN-Touch 1000, are you  
13 referring to a searchable database of records as  
14 stated in your paragraph 64?  
15 A. Well, first off, I'm not sure how this is  
16 relevant to the matter at hand. Secondly, that --  
17 that might be one way to do it or another way to  
18 think about it would be the database of Hsu.  
19 Q. The database of Hsu, meaning the H-S-U,  
20 Hsu prior art reference, the subject IPRs?  
21 A. Yes.  
22 Q. Okay. So the database that was used in  
23 Hsu would have been, in your opinion, a suitable way  
24 of storing the human signatures captured by the  
25 eN-Touch 1000?

Page 16

1 A. Well, haven't considered this in detail --  
2 I'm sorry, Andy, did you have --  
3 MR. RYAN: Yeah, objection to form. Go  
4 ahead, Sam.  
5 THE WITNESS: Okay. I haven't considered  
6 this in detail. I'm not sure why this is relevant.  
7 But just I -- you know, I would -- I would just  
8 think that a database would be a way to store the  
9 data of the eN-Touch 1000 -- excuse me. Would be a  
10 way to store the information that the eN-Touch 1000  
11 transmitted to a remote location.  
12 BY MR. DEVKAR:  
13 Q. And a searchable database of records was  
14 at least one well-known storage technique as of the  
15 time period before 2000 when the eN-Touch 1000 was a  
16 commercial product; is that correct?  
17 A. Yes, a searchable database of records, an  
18 array of records of fixed size, and an unstructured  
19 collection of records having pointers to each were  
20 all well-known ways even prior to 2000.  
21 Q. I'd like to refer to the institution  
22 decision in each of the subject IPR proceedings  
23 today. I've put one of those institution decisions  
24 in the chat window, which is for IPR 2022-01093. My  
25 questions, however, will relate to the content of



800.211.DEPO (3376)  
EsquireSolutions.com

Page 17

1 each of these institution decisions, which will be  
2 the same for this line of questioning.  
3 Can you please let me know when you've  
4 downloaded or can access the institution decision  
5 for IPR 2022-01093?  
6 A. I have the institution decision on my  
7 screen right now.  
8 Q. I'd like you to turn to page 36 of the  
9 institution decision. And that would be page 36  
10 using the page number on the bottom of the pages.  
11 A. I see that.  
12 Q. Beginning on page 36 of the institution  
13 decision should be a section relating to the  
14 construction of the defining claim limitation. Do  
15 you see that?  
16 A. I do.  
17 Q. This defining limitation is a subject of  
18 much of the content and opinions in your  
19 declaration; is that correct?  
20 A. That's correct.  
21 Q. I'd like to start by talking through the  
22 various claim constructions or claim interpretation  
23 of this defining claim limitation.  
24 Are you aware that several different  
25 constructions for the defining limitation have been

Page 18

1 considered by both the parties and the board in  
2 these proceedings?  
3 A. Yes, I am aware of that.  
4 Q. So what I'd like do is step through each  
5 of the constructions that have been either presented  
6 or considered by the parties and board and talk  
7 about what you agree or don't agree with from each  
8 of those constructions.  
9 Is that all right?  
10 A. Okay.  
11 Q. Let's start with the first interpretation  
12 offered by petitioner, which is set forth on page 36  
13 of the institution decision. Do you see that?  
14 A. Yes.  
15 Q. And the first interpretation reads, "A  
16 memory location is somehow determined from (or is  
17 dependent on) the card information. Under this  
18 interpretation, the system can look up or otherwise  
19 determine a specific memory location from a user's  
20 card information."  
21 Do you see that proposed construction?  
22 A. I do.  
23 Q. Do you agree with that construction for  
24 the defining claim limitation?  
25 MR. RYAN: Objection. Beyond the scope of

Page 19

1 the declaration, but the witness can answer.  
2 THE WITNESS: I don't recall expressing an  
3 opinion as to whether I agree or disagree with this  
4 claim interpretation.  
5 Now, I note that because this talks about  
6 "looking up," it appears to apply to a verification  
7 step and not an enrollment step. But I don't recall  
8 expressing an opinion either agreeing or disagreeing  
9 with this interpretation.  
10 BY MR. DEVKAR:  
11 Q. And can you please clarify why you believe  
12 it refers to an enrollment step but not a  
13 verification step?  
14 MR. RYAN: Objection. Misstates  
15 testimony.  
16 MR. DEVKAR: Oh, I'm -- I'm sorry. Strike  
17 that.  
18 BY MR. DEVKAR:  
19 Q. Can you please explain why you believe the  
20 first construction refers to a verification step but  
21 not an enrollment step?  
22 A. The claims are the -- or I should say the  
23 claim language that's in dispute is -- well, let's  
24 find the claim language that's in dispute.  
25 Q. I believe it's stated right on page 36 of

Page 20

1 the institution decision.  
2 A. It -- here, yes, and I'm actually on --  
3 just under paragraph 44 of my declaration, which is  
4 where I have some -- some of the claims listed  
5 verbatim.  
6 You know, the -- it talks about defining a  
7 memory location and then subsequently storing data  
8 at that memory location. Or in Claim 3, providing  
9 card information -- no wait. I'm sorry. If the  
10 provided card information -- sorry, down to 3[D(1)],  
11 storing the information at a memory location defined  
12 by the provided card information. You know, these  
13 are the claim limitations that are in dispute and  
14 they -- they're talking about defining a memory  
15 location and then storing data at it. And so the  
16 claim limitations that are in dispute pertain to the  
17 step of enrolling.  
18 Now, the first interpretation talks about  
19 looking up a memory location from a user's card  
20 information. That -- that seems to imply that the  
21 memory location is already -- has already been  
22 established and you're looking it up. And so to the  
23 extent that the interpretation does that, I  
24 disagree. The -- this first interpretation I think  
25 kind of strays a little bit away from the enrollment



800.211.DEPO (3376)  
EsquireSolutions.com

# 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.