

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ERICSSON INC. AND TELEFONAKTIEBOLAGET
LM ERICSSON (“Ericsson”),

Petitioner

v.

INTELLECTUAL VENTURES II LLC (“IV”),

Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 8,682,357

**DECLARATION OF VIJAY K. MADISETTI, PH.D.,
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.68 IN SUPPORT OF PETITION
FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	4
II. EXPERT QUALIFICATIONS AND CREDENTIALS	6
III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	14
IV. LEGAL STANDARDS	16
A. Obviousness	16
B. Claim Interpretation in <i>Inter Partes</i> Review	18
V. TECHNOLOGY OVERVIEW	19
A. Wireless Network Elements	19
B. Paging in Wireless Networks	21
VI. THE '357 PATENT	23
VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	26
A. “ <i>first network device</i> ”	26
B. “ <i>second network device</i> ” (claim 11) / “ <i>network device</i> ” (claim 30)	28
VIII. IDENTIFICATION OF HOW THE CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE	30
A. Challenge #1 – Claims 11, 13, 30, 32, 47, and 49 are unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C § 103 over CATT in view of LG	30
1. Summary of CATT	30
2. Summary of LG	34
3. Reasons to Combine CATT and LG	34
4. Claim 11	39
5. Claim 13	60
6. Claim 30	61
7. Claim 32	65
8. Claim 47	66
9. Claim 49	73
B. Challenge #2 – Claims 12, 19, 31, 38, 48, and 54 are unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C § 103 over CATT in view of LG, further in view of CATT2.	73

1. Summary of CATT2.....	73
2. Reasons to Combine CATT and CATT2.....	74
3. Claim 12	77
4. Claim 19	82
5. Claim 31	84
6. Claim 38	84
7. Claim 48	85
8. Claim 54	86
C. Challenge #3 – Claims 14, 33, and 50 are unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C § 103 over CATT in view of LG, further in view of Huawei 87	
1. Summary of Huawei.....	87
2. Reasons to Combine CATT and Huawei.....	87
3. Claim 14	91
4. Claim 33	94
5. Claim 50	95
IX. DECLARATION	96

I. INTRODUCTION

I, Vijay K. Madiseti, do hereby declare:

1. My name is Vijay K. Madiseti, and I have been retained by counsel for Ericsson Inc. and Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson (collectively “Petitioner,” “Ericsson”) as a technical expert in connection with the proceeding identified above. I submit this declaration in support of Ericsson’s Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,682,357.

2. I am being compensated for my time in this matter at an hourly rate. I am also being reimbursed for reasonable and customary expenses associated with my work and testimony in this matter. My compensation is not contingent on the outcome of this matter or the specifics of my testimony. I have no personal or financial stake or interest in the outcome of the present proceeding.

3. In the preparation of this declaration, I have studied:

- (1) U.S. Patent No. 8,682,357 to Worrall (“the ’357 Patent”), Ex. 1001;
- (2) The Prosecution History of U.S. Patent No. 8,682,357, Ex. 1002;
- (3) CATT, “PCH mapping and Paging Control,” 3GPP RAN1/RAN2 joint meeting on LTE, Athens, Greece, 27-31 March, 2006, R2-060988 (“CATT”), Ex. 1005;
- (4) LG Electronics, “Discussion on LTE Paging and DRX,” Joint RAN WG1 and RAN WG2 on LTE, Athens, Greece, 27-31 March, 2006,

- R2-061014 (“LG”), Ex. 1006;
- (5) CATT and RITT, “Access Procedure for TDD,” 3GPP RAN1/RAN2 joint meeting on LTE, Athens, Greece, 27-31 March, 2006, R2-060905 (“CATT2”), Ex. 1007;
- (6) Huawei, “Inter-cell Interference Mitigation,” 3GPP TSG RAN WG1 Ad Hoc on LTE, Sophia Antipolis, France, 20-21 June, 2005, R1-050629 (“Huawei”), Ex. 1008;
- (7) PCT Publication No. WO2004/057896 to Seidel *et al.* (“Seidel”), Ex. 1009;
- (8) Harri Holma & Antti Toskala, WCDMA for UMTS: Radio Access for Third Generation Mobile Communications (Rev. ed. 2001) (“Holma”), Ex. 1010;
- (9) Andrew Richardson, WCDMA Design Handbook (2005) (“Richardson”), Ex. 1011;
- (10) Theodore S. Rappaport, Wireless Communications, Principles & Practices (1st ed. 1996) (“Rappaport”), Ex. 1012;
- (11) 3GPP Technical Report, Technical Specification Group Radio Access Network, Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA) and Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access Network (E-UTRAN), Radio Interface Protocol Aspects (Release 7), TR 25.813, v.0.6.0

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.