

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TESLA INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

INTELLECTUAL VENTURES II LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00222
U.S. Patent No. 9,232,158

**DECLARATION OF R. MICHAEL GUIDASH,
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.....	8
III.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	11
IV.	Relevant Legal Standards	12
V.	Technical Background.....	14
	A. Image Sensors.....	14
	B. Dynamic Range	20
	1. True Dynamic Range vs. Intra-Scene Dynamic Range	20
	2. Expanding Intra-Scene Dynamic Range Using Multiple Integration Times.....	21
	C. Exposure.....	23
VI.	The '158 Patent.....	30
	A. Overview	30
	B. Prosecution History	34
VII.	Claim Construction.....	34
	A. “during a frame” (claim 2)	36
VIII.	Identification of How the Claims are Unpatentable.....	38
	A. Ground 1: Claims 1-2, 5, 8-9, 11, 13-16, and 19 Would Have Been Obvious Over Matsushima.....	39
	1. Overview of Matsushima.....	39
	2. Analysis	40
	B. Ground 2: Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-11, 13, and 14 Would Have Been Obvious Over Yu and Miyazaki.....	71

1.	Overview of Yu	72
2.	Overview of Miyazaki	74
3.	Analysis	75
IX.	Conclusion	111

I, R. Michael Guidash, do hereby declare as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I am making this declaration at the request of Tesla Inc. in the matter of the *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 9,232,158 (“the ’158 patent”) to Olsen *et al.*

2. 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 1-2, 4-5, 8-11, 13-16, and 19 (“Challenged Claims”) of the ’158 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 forming the opinions set forth in this declaration, I have reviewed the documents in the following table:

Ex.1001	U.S. Pat. No. 9,232,158 to Olsen et al. (“the ’158 patent”)
Ex.1002	Prosecution History of U.S. Application No. 14/063,236 (issued as the ’158 patent)

Ex.1005	U.S. Pat. No. 6,611,289 to Yu et. al (“Yu”)
Ex.1006	U.S. Pat. No. 7,365,780 to Miyazaki (“Miyazaki”)
Ex.1007	JP Application Publication No. JP2003-319231 to Matsushima (Certified English Translation + Declaration + Japanese) (“Matsushima”)
Ex.1008	Eastman Kodak Company, Shutter Operations for CCD and CMOS Image Sensors, Application Node, MTD/PS-0259, Revision 1 (October 23, 2001) (retrieved from https://web.archive.org/web/20030419002619/http://www.kodak.com/global/plugins/acrobat/en/digital/ccd/applicationNotes/ShutterOperations.pdf)
Ex.1009	Eastman Kodak Company, Kodak CMOS Image Sensors White Paper (November 10, 2000) (retrieved from https://web.archive.org/web/20010611235410/http://www.kodak.com/US/plugins/acrobat/en/digital/ccd/cmos.pdf)
Ex.1010	Eastman Kodak Company, Kodak Digital Science KAC-0311 Image Sensor (August 5, 2002) (retrieved from https://web.archive.org/web/20030411152500/http://www.kodak.com/global/plugins/acrobat/en/digital/ccd/products/cmos/KAC-0311LongSpec.pdf)
Ex.1011	U.S. Pat. No. 7,733,414 to Kobayashi
Ex.1012	Dave Litwiller, “CCD vs. CMOS: Facts and Fiction, Photonics Spectra,” (January 2001)
Ex.1013	U.S. Application Pub. No. 2004/0239771 to Habe
Ex.1014	EP Application Pub. No. EP0858208 to Weldy et al.
Ex.1015	Memorandum in Support of Claim Construction Order, <i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC et al. v. General Motors Company et al.</i> , 6:21-CV-1088 (WDTX), December 1 st , 2022
Ex.1016	Texas Instruments, TC255P 336- × 244-PIXEL CCD IMAGE SENSOR (March 2003)

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.