

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

K/S HIMPP,
Petitioner

v.

III HOLDINGS 4, LLC,
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2017-00783
Patent No. 9,191,756

DECLARATION OF ROBERT K. MORROW Ph.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	BACKGROUND	1
II.	LEGAL PRINCIPLES.....	5
III.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	9
IV.	SUMMARY OF THE '756 PATENT (EX1001).....	10
	A. Brief Description of the '756 Patent	10
	B. Summary of the Prosecution History of the '756 Patent	10
	C. The Purported Novelty of the '756 Patent and the State of the Art.....	13
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	14
	A. “smart phone” (claims 1-11 and 18-20).....	14
	B. “communication channel” (claims 1-20)	16
VI.	PRIOR ART.....	17
	A. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0008659 (Waters) – <i>EX1006</i>	17
	B. U.S. Patent No. 5,721,783 (“Anderson”) – <i>EX1007</i>	19
	C. U.S. Patent No. 8,810,392 (“Teller”) – <i>EX1008</i>	19
	D. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2010/0273452 (“Rajann”) – <i>EX1009</i>	22
VII.	FOUNDATIONS FOR FINDING THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS INVALID.....	22
	A. GROUND 1: Claims 1-5, 7, 9-10, 12-14, and 18-20 Are Rendered Obvious by the Combination of Waters and Anderson.....	22
	1. Claim 1 is obvious over Waters and Anderson	23
	2. Claim 2 is obvious over Waters and Anderson	39

3.	Claim 3 is obvious over Waters and Anderson	40
4.	Claim 4 is obvious over Waters and Anderson	43
5.	Claim 5 is obvious over Waters and Anderson	45
6.	Claim 7 is obvious over Waters and Anderson	46
7.	Claim 9 is obvious over Waters and Anderson	48
8.	Claim 10 is obvious over Waters and Anderson	49
9.	Claim 12 is obvious over Waters and Anderson	49
10.	Claim 13 is obvious over Waters and Anderson	50
11.	Claim 14 is obvious over Waters and Anderson	51
12.	Claim 18 is obvious over Waters and Anderson	52
13.	Claim 19 is obvious over Waters and Anderson	56
14.	Claim 20 is obvious over the combination of teachings of Waters and Anderson	57
B.	Ground 2: Claim 8 Are Rendered Obvious by the Combination of Waters, Anderson, and Rajann.....	58
1.	“The smart phone of claim 7, wherein a rate of the tones is increased as a signal strength of the communication channel increases.”	58
C.	Ground 3: Claims 11 and 16-17 Are Rendered Obvious by the Combination of Waters, Anderson, and Teller	60
1.	Claim 11 is obvious over Waters, Anderson, and Teller	60
2.	Claim 16 is obvious over Waters, Anderson, and Teller	66
3.	Claim 17 is obvious over Waters, Anderson, and Teller	68
D.	Ground 4: Claims 6 and 15 Are Rendered Obvious by the Combination of Waters, Anderson, Teller, and Rajann	69

1.	Claim 6 is obvious over Waters, Anderson, Teller, and Rajann	70
2.	Claim 15 is obvious over Waters, Anderson, Teller, and Rajann	72
VIII.	AVAILABILITY FOR CROSS-EXAMINATION	73
IX.	RIGHT TO SUPPLEMENT	73
X.	CONCLUSION.....	73

1. My name is Robert K. Morrow. I have been retained by counsel for K/S HIMPP to serve as a technical expert in this *Inter Partes* review proceeding. I have been asked to provide expert testimony in this declaration regarding the patentability of claims 1-20 of the 9,191,756 Patent (“the ’756 patent”).

I. BACKGROUND

2. I received a Bachelor’s Degree from the United States Air Force Academy in 1974, a Master’s Degree from Stanford University in 1982, and a PhD degree from Purdue University in 1988, all in electrical engineering. My PhD dissertation introduces an improved Gaussian approximation for calculating bit error rates in direct-sequence spread-spectrum communication systems.

3. I am the president of Morrow Technical Services, a business that teaches short courses in wireless engineering, manufactures and distributes collimation enhancement tools for astronomical telescopes, and provides expert services in wireless communication systems.

4. During my 20-year career in the United States Air Force from 1974 to 1994, I was a Tenured Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering and the Director of Research at the United States Air Force Academy, and Deputy Head of the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering at the Air Force Institute of

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.