

Filed: June 30, 2023

Filed on behalf of Sony Electronics Inc.

By: Gregory S. Gewirtz
Russell W. Faegenburg
LERNER DAVID LLP
Telephone: 908.654.5000
Facsimile: 908.654.7866
Email: ggewirtz@lernerdavid.com
rfaegenburg@lernerdavid.com
litigation@lernerdavid.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SONY ELECTRONICS INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

JAWBONE INNOVATIONS, LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2023-01153
U.S. Patent No. 11,122,357

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
CLAIMS 1-20 OF U.S. PATENT NO. 11,122,357**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	vi
TABLE OF EXHIBITS.....	viii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
I. BACKGROUND.....	3
A. Griffiths and Jim Publish Their Seminal GSC Article in 1982.....	3
B. Over the Next Two Decades, the GSC was Used in Microphone Arrays to Reduce Noise.	5
C. Published in 2001, Brandstein Illustrates How to Use a GSC with a Microphone Array to Reduce Noise.....	6
D. Contemporaneously, Gannot Taught Adapting The GSC To Handle Arbitrary Transfer Functions.	10
E. Other Concepts in the '357 Patent Were Well Known.	12
1. Filtering And Summing In The Time Domain Were Well Known.....	12
2. Delaying Signals Based On Geometry To Adjust For Differences In Arrival Times Was Well Known.....	13
II. THE '357 PATENT.....	14
A. The '357 Patent Discloses Nothing Innovative.....	14
1. The '357 Patent Purports To Distinguish I tself From The Prior Art By Using A Virtual Microphone Designed To Capture Only Noise, Which Had Been Known For Decades.	14
2. The '357 Patent Concedes It Relies on Known Techniques to Form Virtual Microphones from Physical Microphones.....	15
3. The '357 Patent Discloses Formulas For The Purportedly	

	Innovative Set Of Virtual Microphones, But These Formulas Rely On Near-Field Design.....	17
B.	The Claims Recite Generic Virtual Microphones And Generic Signal Processing.	19
C.	The Claims Were Not Carefully Scrutinized During Prosecution	20
III.	STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED	21
A.	Grounds	21
B.	The Earliest Priority Date the ' 357 Patent Claims Is June 13, 2007.	21
C.	The References Are Prior Art.	21
D.	The Asserted References Are Analogous Art.	22
IV.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL.....	22
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	23
VI.	GROUND OF UNPATENTABILITY	23
A.	Ground 1: Brandstein and Gannot	23
1.	Claim 1.....	23
a.	Preamble.....	23
b.	First Virtual Microphone Comprising a Combination of Signals from First and Second Physical Microphones	24
c.	Second Virtual Microphone	26
d.	Substantially Similar Responses to Noise and Substantially Dissimilar Responses to Speech	27
e.	A Signal Processor Operative to Combine Microphone Signals by Filtering and Summing in the Time Domain.....	29

f.	Applying a Varying Linear Transfer Function.....	31
g.	Generating an Output Signal with Reduced Noise.....	33
2.	Claim 2.....	35
3.	Claim 3.....	35
4.	Claim 4.....	36
5.	Claim 5.....	39
a.	Claim 5 Encompasses Standard Near-Field Time-Alignment.....	39
b.	Brandstein Discloses or Renders Obvious Standard Near-Field Time-Alignments for the GSC.....	40
6.	Claim 6.....	46
7.	Claim 7.....	49
8.	Claim 8.....	49
9.	Claim 9.....	49
10.	Claim 10.....	50
11.	Claim 11.....	51
12.	Claim 12.....	52
13.	Claim 13.....	53
14.	Claim 14.....	55
15.	Claim 15.....	56
a.	Preamble.....	56
b.	First Virtual Microphone.....	57
c.	Second Virtual Microphone	57
d.	Substantially Similar Responses to Noise and Substantially Dissimilar Responses to Speech.....	57

e.	Virtual Microphone Array with a Single Null	58
f.	Signal Processor	59
g.	Applying a Varying Linear Transfer Function	59
h.	Generating an Output Signal with Reduced Noise.....	59
16.	Claim 16.....	60
17.	Claim 17.....	60
18.	Claim 18.....	61
19.	Claim 19.....	62
20.	Claim 20.....	62
B.	Ground 2: Brandstein, Gannot, and Griffiths-Jim	62
C.	Ground 3: Brandstein, Gannot, and McCowan.....	64
VII.	SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NONOBVIOUSNESS	67
VIII.	DISCRETIONARY DENIAL UNDER § 314(A) IS NOT APPROPRIATE.....	68
A.	Co-Pending Litigation (<i>Fintiv</i>).....	68
1.	Factor 1: Potential Stay.....	68
2.	Factor 2: Proximity of Trial to FWD.....	69
3.	Factor 3: Investment in Parallel Proceeding.....	69
4.	Factor 4: Overlapping Issues	69
5.	Factor 5: The Parties	70
6.	Factor 6: Other Circumstances	71
B.	Prior IPR Petitions (<i>General Plastic</i>).....	72
IX.	DISCRETIONARY DENIAL UNDER § 325(D) IS NOT APPROPRIATE.....	73
X.	MANDATORY NOTICES.....	74
A.	Real Parties-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)).....	74

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.