# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO.,	) IPR2022-01248
LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS	) PATENT 8,842,653
AMERICA, INC., and APPLE,	)
INC.,	)
	)
Petitioner,	)
	)
vs.	)
SMART MOBILE TECHNOLOGIES	) ) )
Patent Owner.	) )

REMOTE DEPOSITION OF MICHAEL JENSEN, PH.D.

PROVO, UTAH

THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 2023

MAGNA LEGAL SERVICES 866-624-6221 WWW.MAGNALS.COM JOB NO.: 952152 DORIEN SAITO, CSR 12568, CLR

# **MAGNA**



```
3
           UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
                                                                  APPEARANCES:
 2
            BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD
                                                              2
                                                                       FOR PETITIONER SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
 3
                                                              3
                                                                       SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.; and APPLE
     SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO.,
 4
                                     ) IPR2022-01248
                                                                       INC.:
     LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS
                                     ) PATENT 8,842,653
                                                              4
     AMERICA, INC., and APPLE,
                                                                          FISH & RICHARDSON
     INC.,
                                                              5
                                                                          By: AAMIR KAZI, Attorney at Law
                                                                          1180 Peachtree Street NE
                Petitioner.
                                                              6
                                                                          Atlanta, Georgia 30309
 7
                                                                          (404) 724-2811
           vs.
                                                                          kazi@fr.com
 8
                                                              8
                                                                       FOR PATENT OWNER:
                                                                          LOWENSTEIN & WEATHERWAX LLP
                                                              9
     SMART MOBILE TECHNOLOGIES
                                                                          By: PARHAM HENDIFAR, Attorney at Law
                                                             10
                                                                          1016 Pico Boulevard
                                                                          Santa Monica, California 90405
10
                Patent Owner.
                                                                          (310) 307-4514
                                                             11
                                                                          hendifar@lowensteinweatherman.com
11
                                                             12
12
                                                                       ALSO PRESENT:
13
               REMOTE DEPOSITION OF MICHAEL
                                                             13
               JENSEN, PH.D., taken on behalf of
14
                                                                          PHILIP GRAVES
1.5
               PATENT OWNER, in Provo, Utah,
                                                             14
16
               commencing at 9:08 a.m., Thursday,
                                                             15
17
               April 13, 2023, before DORIEN
                                                             16
                                                             17
1.8
               SAITO, CSR 12568, CLR.
                                                             18
19
                                                             19
20
                                                             20
21
                                                             21
22
                                                             22
23
                                                             23
24
                                                             24
2.5
                                                             25
 1
                  INDEX
                                                                         PROVO, UTAH; THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 2023
                                                               1
  2
        WITNESS:
                                                               2
                                                                                9:08 A.M.
  3
        MICHAEL JENSEN, PH.D.
                                                               3
                                                                                 -0o0-
  4
            EXAMINATION BY MR. HENDIFAR
                                                                                  ***
                                                               4
  5
                                                               5
                                                                          THE REPORTER: Good morning. Because
  6
        INFORMATION REQUESTED:
                                                               6
                                                                     we are all appearing remotely, I would like to
  7
                    (NONE)
                                                               7
                                                                     remind everyone to be more conscious than ever of
  8
                                                               8
                                                                     not speaking over each other. When there are
        QUESTIONS INSTRUCTED NOT TO ANSWER:
  9
                                                               9
                                                                     simultaneous speakers, I will not be able to hear
                    (NONE)
                                                              10
                                                                     any of the words that are being said.
10
                                                              11
                                                                          Pauses are very important to ensure that I
11
                                                             12
                                                                     have time to clarify the record and to ensure all
12
        EXHIBITS:
                                                              13
                                                                     objections are on the record.
13
        PETITIONER'S
                          DESCRIPTION
                                                  PAGE
                                                             14
                                                                          Please also be aware that noises around
        Exhibit 2020 Microsoft Computer Dictionary
14
                                                             15
                                                                     your microphone cause disruptions in how words come
                Fourth Edition
                                                              16
                                                                     through on a virtual platform. If you are not
15
                                                              17
                                                                     speaking, please mute yourself.
16
17
                                                              18
                                                                          I will now swear in the witness.
18
                                                              19
19
                                                              20
                                                                            MICHAEL JENSEN, PH.D.,
20
                                                              21
                                                                        having been duly administered an oath
21
                                                              22
                                                                          in accordance with CCP 2094, was
22
                                                              23
                                                                          examined and testified as follows:
23
                                                              24
                                                                     ///
24
                                                              25
                                                                     ///
25
```



2 (Pages 2 to 5)





3 (Pages 6 to 9)



- Q. How did you come to learn of the existence of the declaration? A. Counsel pointed me towards this reference. O. Did you have any familiarity with the inventor of Yegoshin, Mr. Yegoshin, prior to this IPR? A. No, sir, I did not. Q. Okay. Same question for the Johnston
  - Q. Okay. Same question for the Johnston reference marked as Exhibit 1005. Did you identify the Johnston reference to be used in your declaration?
  - A. So this one's slightly differently because this one cites my work. I was aware of this patent, but Counsel had also independently identified it.
  - Q. And which are -- I'm sorry. Would you please point me to where Johnston cites your work, please?

A. Sure.

So in that reference, I -- in the other publications, my work is the final paper in that list. And there are -- if you'd like me to find, there are places in the patent where he refers to it in talking about prior art.

Q. No. I found the paper. I just wanted to confirm. That's okay.

Same question about the Billstrom reference. Did you identify the Billstrom reference that was used in your declaration?

- A. So no, I did not find this reference.
- Q. And were you familiar with Billstrom's named inventor, Billstrom, prior to this IPR?
  - A. No, sir.

- Q. And did I understand you correctly that you were familiar with Johnston, the inventor of Exhibit 1005, prior to this IPR?
- A. I did not know Mr. Johnston, but I was aware of the -- the patent.
  - Q. Understood.

Same question for Exhibit 1007, the Bernard reference. Did you identify the Bernard reference you used in your declaration?

- A. No, sir.
- Q. And were you familiar with Mr. Bernard, the named inventor of the Bernard reference, prior to this IPR?
- A. No, sir.
- Q. When you were retained for this IPR, did you conduct any prior art search to identify references to be used in your declaration?

A. Yes, sir, I did.

Q. Okay. Is it fair to say that you did not find any prior art that you found sufficiently close to the invention to be the basis of your grounds in

your declaration?

MR. KAZI: Objection to form.

THE WITNESS: I -- I don't know if that's fair to say. I think, in review, I did find references in review of the references. The set that we selected were the ones that I felt were the -- were the best to try to keep it to as few references as possible.

BY MR. HENDIFAR:

- Q. Okay. Have any of your opinions stated in your declaration, Exhibit 1003, changed since you submitted the declaration?
  - A. No, sir.
- Q. And did you draft your declaration in Exhibit 1003?
- A. So -- so that's a -- that's a big question. Would you like some detail about how that came to be? I did not draft everything in that declaration.
  - Q. Which parts did you draft?
- A. Well, certainly the figures and the annotated figures, Counsel helps me with those, under my guidance of what I would like to show.

There's legal language in my declaration, that first draft by Counsel, so that I could review it and -- and edit it. And then the other parts were collaborative.

There were first drafts, and I couldn't tell you which parts were which, where Counsel helped. But in the end, I edited and every -- every part of the declaration and it became my own document.

Q. I understand. And thank you very much for that explanation. I appreciate it.

In preparing your declaration, Exhibit 1003, did you review the prosecution history of the '653 patent?

- A. Briefly.
- Q. Briefly. And when you say "briefly," could you elaborate on the extent of your review, please?
- A. Well, this was some time ago. I -- I am -- I know that I didn't read every single word and digest the whole of the file, but I did go through the entire document and read different parts more carefully than others. That's my recollection.
- Q. In preparing your declaration in Exhibit 1003, did you review the prosecution history of any other patents in the same family as the '653

MAGNAD

4 (Pages 10 to 13)



16

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

17

it -- it didn't happen. I don't recall the details of -- of discussions on claim construction.

Q. When, approximately, were you first made aware of, for example, petitioners' district court claim construction position with respect to the term "multiplexing"?

A. So I know I was reminded of it recently in the last few weeks. Whether I had seen that before, I just don't recall.

Q. Did you do any analysis to confirm that your opinions in your declaration in Exhibit 1003 do not conflict with petitioners' district court positions?

A. So when I became aware within the last few weeks, I did such an exercise to ensure that the way I was applying the term "multiplexing" was not in conflict with that -- with that proposed construction.

Q. But you did not do so at the time you submitted 1003?

A. Again, I don't recall that exercise. If it happened, I don't recall it.

Q. And how can you identify the district court documents that you have reviewed today in connection with petitioners' claim construction positions in

1 the district court?

MR. KAZI: Objection to form.

THE WITNESS: Did I step on somebody? Sorry. There maybe was an echo.

petitioners' claim constructions. That doesn't mean

I -- I believe I have such a document in my email inbox that I would have to bring up and find the email and the document.

BY MR. HENDIFAR:

Q. Is it just one document?

A. I just don't recall. There may have been two. It wasn't a lot of documents. I know that much.

Q. Is it in one email?

A. Yes, I think so.

Q. Do you happen to have access to it on your computer now?

A. Yes. I have email closed, but I can open it.

Q. I appreciate it. Sure. And generally, I don't mind if you need to look at any documents on your computer as long as you share with me what you're looking at and they're not marked.

But I -- yes, if you could maybe bring up the email to let me know what documents from the district court you have reviewed in connection with

MAGNAD

5 (Pages 14 to 17)



25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

deposition?

# DOCKET

# 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.

