

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

APPLE INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

MOZIDO CORFIRE – KOREA, LTD.  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2022-01149  
U.S. Patent No. 10,223,692

---

**DECLARATION OF DR. HENRY HOUH,  
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 .....	13
IV.	Relevant Legal Standards .....	14
V.	Background.....	16
VI.	Overview of the '692 Patent.....	17
VII.	Claim Construction.....	24
	A. “from the first portion of the screen” .....	24
VIII.	Identification of how the Claims are Unpatentable.....	27
	A. Ground 1: Claims 1-4 and 11-13 would have been obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hertel in view of Chitti, Spodak, and Tedesco.....	28
	1. Summary of Hertel (APPL-1005).....	28
	2. Summary of Chitti (APPL-1006) .....	35
	3. Summary of Spodak (APPL-1008).....	39
	4. Summary of Tedesco (APPL-1007) .....	40
	5. Overview of Analysis .....	42
	6. Claim 1.....	44
	7. Claim 2.....	117
	8. Claim 3.....	123
	9. Claim 4.....	125
	10. Claim 11.....	127
	11. Claim 12.....	133

12.	Claim 13.....	135
B.	Ground 2: Claims 5-6 and 10 would have been obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hertel in view of Chitti, Spodak, Tedesco, and Bierbaum. ....	140
1.	Summary of Bierbaum (APPL-1010).....	140
2.	Claim 5.....	143
3.	Claim 6.....	148
4.	Claim 10.....	148
C.	Ground #3: Claim 7 would have been obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hertel in view of Chitti, Spodak, Tedesco, Bierbaum and Grigg.....	150
1.	Summary of Grigg (APPL-1012).....	150
2.	Claim 7.....	154
D.	Ground #4: Claim 8 would have been obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hertel in view of Chitti, Spodak, Tedesco, and Ording.....	158
1.	Summary of Ording (APPL-1016).....	158
2.	Claim 8.....	159
E.	Ground #5: Claim 9 would have been obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hertel in view of Chitti, Spodak, Tedesco, and Roman.....	164
1.	Summary of Roman (APPL-1017).....	164
2.	Claim 9.....	165
X.	Conclusion.....	169

I, Henry Houh, do hereby declare as follows:

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

1. I am making this declaration at the request of Apple, Inc. in the matter of the *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 10,223,692 (“the ’692 Patent”) to Min Hwan Jeon.

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.

3. I have been asked to provide my opinions regarding whether claims 1-13 (“the Challenged Claims”) of the ’692 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 ’692 Patent, APPL-1001;
- b. the prosecution history of the ’692 Patent (“’692 File History”), APPL-1002;
- c. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2009/0288012 to Hertel et al. (“Hertel”), APPL-1005;

- d. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2009/0037326 to Chitti et al. (“Chitti”), APPL-1006;
- e. U.S. Patent 8,296,686 to Tedesco et al. (“Tedesco”), APPL-1007;
- f. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2012/0123937 to Spodak (“Spodak”), APPL-1008;
- g. U.S. Patent 7,967,196 to Bierbaum et al. (“Bierbaum”), APPL-1010;
- h. U.S. Patent Publication No. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2012/0197743 to Grigg et al. (“Grigg”), APPL-1012;
- i. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2009/0183120 (“Ording”), APPL-1016;  
and
- j. U.S. Patent 9,116,596 (“Roman”), APPL-1017.
- k. 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 software and telecommunications as described below, as well as the following materials:
    - a. U.S. Patent 7,090,577 to Serizawa et al., APPL-1009;

# 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.