UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD SILICON LABORATORIES, § § INC., COJ COJ COJ Petitioner, 60 [6] § § § CASE IPR2015-00615 § Patent 7,075,585 VS. § § CASE IPR2015-00626 § Patent 7,265,792 § § CRESTA TECHNOLOGY § CORPORATION, § Patent Owner. § ORAL DEPOSITION OF DOUGLAS HOLBERG, Ph.D. VOLUME 1 November 4, 2015

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES 1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 Cresta Ex 2033-1 Silicon v Cresta

IPR2015-00626

1	ORAL DEPOSITION of DOUGLAS HOLBERG, Ph.D.,
2	produced as a witness at the instance of the PATENT
3	OWNER CRESTA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION, and duly sworn,
4	was taken in the above-styled and numbered cause on
5	November 4, 2015, from 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., before
6	Brenda J. Wright, CSR, RPR, in and for the State of
7	Texas, reported by machine shorthand, at the Law
8	Offices of Lee & Hayes, 11501 Alterra Parkway, Suite
9	450, Austin, Texas, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. Section
10	42.53 provisions stated on the record or attached
11	hereto.
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES 1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98d7 @restar 2033-2

1	APPEARANCES
2	
3	For the Petitioner Silicon Laboratories, Inc.:
4	LEE & HAYES 11501 Alterra Parkway
5	Suite 450 Austin, Texas 78758
6	512-505-8162/509-944-4693 (fax) Peter@leehayes.com
7	Maryannm@leehayes.com
8	For the Patent Owner Cresta Technology Corporation:
9 10	-and- Mr. Michael R. Fleming
11	IRELL & MANELLA, LLP 1800 Avenue of the Stars
12	Suite 900 Los Angeles, California 90067-4276
13	310-277-1010/310-203-7199 (fax) Bhaber@irell.com
14	MITEMING@ITEIT.COM
15	Also Present: Mr. Mihai Murgulescu, CTO
16	CRESTATECH 2880 Lakeside Drive
17	Suite 201 Santa Clara, California 95054
18	408-969-0001 Mihai@CrestaTech.com
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98d7-0145722033-3

INDEX 1 Appearances..... 2 3 3 DOUGLAS HOLBERG, Ph.D. 4 Examination by Mr. Haber.... 6 Examination by Mr. Ayers..... 123 5 Further Examination by Mr. Haber..... 129 6 Changes and Corrections..... 132 7 Signature Page..... 133 8 Reporter's Certificate..... 134 9 10 EXHIBITS 11 NO. DESCRIPTION PAGE MARKED 12 2020..... 10 13 Case IPR Unassigned Patent 7,075,585 Declaration of Douglas Holberg in Support of 14 Petition for Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,075,585 15 2021..... 10 Case IPR Unassigned Patent 7,265,792 16 Declaration of Douglas Holberg in Support of Petition for Inter Partes Review of 17 U.S. Patent No. 7,265,792 2022..... 20 18 United States Patent No. 7,075,585 Favrat et al. 19 2023..... 20 United States Patent No. 7,265,792 20 Favrat et al. 2024..... 33 21 United States Patent No. 6,377,316 Mycynek et al. 22 59 2025..... A Digital Tuner for Wideband Receivers 23 2026..... 66 United States Patent No. 6,725,463 24 Birleson 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98d7-**Oresta 2033-4**

1 DOUGLAS HOLBERG, Ph.D. 2 EXHIBITS - CONTINUED 3 4 PAGE NO. DESCRIPTION MARKED 5 74 2027..... 6 United States Patent No. 5,381,357 7 Wedgwood et al. 2028..... 80 United States Patent Application 8 Publication - Pub. No. 2002/0057366 Oku et al. 9 2029..... 81 United States Patent No. 6,411,136 10 Nianxiong et al. 2030..... 93 11 United States Patent No. 6,400,598 Nquyen et al. 12 Civil Action No. 14-CV-03227-PSG 13 Silicon Laboratories, Inc., a Delaware Corporation v. Cresta Technology Corporation, 14 a Delaware Corporation Rebuttal Expert Report of Douglas 15 Holberg, Ph.D. Regarding Validity 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98d7-仍存实行名 但於 2033-5

Silicon v Cresta IPR2015-00626

1	DOUGLAS HOLBERG, Ph.D.,
2	having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:
3	EXAMINATION
4	BY MR. HABER:
5	Q. Good morning, Doctor Holberg. Thank you for
6	coming in today. My name is Benjamin Haber. I'm with
7	Irell & Manella. I represent patent owner Cresta.
8	With me is Mike Fleming, also with Irell, and Mihai
9	Murgulescu.
10	I know that you've been deposed in this
11	matter several other times before, so I'm just going
12	to go over some of the basics. Again, repetition is
13	key.
14	You understand that you're testifying
15	under oath subject to the same obligations to testify
16	truthfully as if you were testifying in court. Is
17	that right?
18	A. Correct.
19	Q. And there is no reason today that you can't
20	give your honest, best testimony. Right?
21	A. Correct.
22	Q. You're not under any drugs or medications
23	that would impair your ability to testify truthfully?
24	A. Correct.
25	Q. I'm going to ask you a series of questions.

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98d7-0145722033-6

1	If you don't understand any of the questions that I
2	ask you, I'll ask you to ask me for clarification.
3	I'll do my best to clarify. If you don't ask for
4	clarification, I will just assume that you understand
5	the question. Is that fair?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. I don't want you to guess or speculate. I
8	want you to testify based on what you know and the
9	research that you have done, so is that something you
10	can do today?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. We have a court reporter here who is going
13	to be transcribing our discussion, so I'll ask you to
14	let me finish my question before you start to answer,
15	and then if you answer verbally, that would be
16	appreciated, I'm sure, by the court reporter. And I
17	will wait until you finish to begin my next question.
18	If you need to, we'll take a break.
19	Just let me know if you need a break. If there is a
20	question pending, I'll just ask you to answer the
21	question before we go on break and then we can do
22	that.
23	Once cross examination begins, I'll ask
24	you to not confer with counsel regarding the subject
25	matter of your testimony. Is that something you can
	WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98d7

1	do today?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. Can you tell me everything that you did to
4	prepare for your deposition today?
5	A. I just reviewed my declarations and final
6	written decision and a few other document I don't
7	remember what other documents, but I looked at a
8	couple of patents.
9	Q. Did you meet with counsel to prepare for
10	your deposition?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. How long did you meet with counsel for?
13	A. Probably between six and eight hours.
14	Q. Was that all in one day?
15	A. No.
16	Q. How many days would you say?
17	A. Two.
18	Q. Did you meet with anyone besides counsel to
19	prepare for your deposition?
20	A. No.
21	Q. You mentioned reviewing final written
22	decisions. What final written decisions did you
23	review?
24	A. The case IPR 2014-00809 on patent 7,265,792,
25	the United States Patent and Trademark Office before

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98d7 ① 存变 招 2033-8

1	the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, Silicon
2	Laboratories versus Cresta Technology Corporation.
3	And then, similarly, IPR 2015-00728, that would be
4	patent 7,075,585.
5	Q. These are previous IPRs in which you
6	provided a written declaration. Correct?
7	A. Correct.
8	Q. I see you have some documents there in front
9	of you. Two of them are the final written decisions?
10	A. Correct.
11	Q. What are the other documents that you have
12	there in front of you?
13	A. This is my declaration on case IPR
14	unassigned patent 7,075,585, and case IPR unassigned,
15	patent 7,265,792.
16	Q. Those are your declarations in this
17	current two IPRs. Right?
18	A. Correct.
19	Q. Do you have any notes or annotations on
20	those documents?
21	A. Yes, there are a few notes.
22	Q. Would you mind if I take a look at them.
23	Are these notes that you made yourself?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. I notice it looks like on the cover there a

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98d7 伊萨斯洛亞於 2033-9

series of numbers. What are those numbers? 1 Those are the -- I think they're the -- the 2 Α. claims that would were resolved on the final written 3 decision on that particular patent. I think. I'm not 4 sure what they are now. That was probably a few days 5 ago. 6 All right. So I have clean copies of these 7 Q. declarations to give you, but you can use these if you 8 would like. I will want to mark them as exhibits just 9 10 since they have some reference of what you did at the deposition. So if we can, I'll hand these back to you 11 in just a second. 12 (Deposition Exhibit Nos. 2020-2021 marked.) 13 Q. (BY MR. HABER) We're marking Exhibit 2020, 14 which is Doctor Holberg's declaration on U.S. patent 15 7,265,792, that will be Exhibit 2021. 16 To correct. I was just looking at these Α. 17 These are the claims for these declarations, numbers. 18 not the previous one ruled on by the board. 19 Regarding Exhibit 2021, there were some Ο. 20 annotations made on page 50 and 51 just that I saw. 21 And you made those annotations? 22 Yes, I did. Α. 23 What was the purpose of those annotations? 24 Ο. Well, I see there was a typographical error 25 Α.

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtesta5Ex72033-10

1	on one of the things, so I noted that. And the other
2	one, I think indicates the difference between this
3	claim and a similar claim that was ruled on by the
4	by the PTAB.
5	Q. What is the typographical error that you're
6	referring to?
7	A. DAC 16 is should be, I think, DAC 21.
8	Q. Is that in paragraph 78?
9	A. Correct.
10	Q. And then what was the the other
11	annotation that you referenced, what page was that on
12	and what paragraph?
13	A. I don't know what you're referring to.
14	Q. You said
15	A. What was the question?
16	Q. You said that there was an annotation that
17	you made related to one of the claims?
18	A. Oh, that was on page 51. Also paragraph 78.
19	Q. Okay. And what exactly was the annotation
20	that you made?
21	A. I underlined, beginning with the first
22	differential output through second output terminal.
23	Q. Why did you underline that again?
24	A. As I recall, I think that there is a similar
25	claim in the patent, one that was ruled on, and as I

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtesta5Ex72033-11

1	recall, I think the difference in those claims is what
2	I underlined. That's my that's my best
3	recollection.
4	Q. So based on your recollection, what you
5	underlined there is additional language in this claim
6	as compared to the claim that was ruled on?
7	A. Or different. I don't remember if it's
8	additional or different.
9	Q. Do you remember what claim it was in
10	particular?
11	A. No, I do not.
12	Q. When did you make these annotations?
13	A. Probably last week maybe. It's been in the
14	last seven days.
15	Q. Are there any other corrections or changes
16	to your declaration that you wanted to wanted to
17	make right now?
18	A. I noticed on page 52, paragraph 82, there is
19	an error in the recitation of the claim, a second
20	analog-to-digital. It should be a digital-to-analog.
21	Q. Anything else?
22	A. What was the question?
23	Q. Are there any other changes or errors?
24	A. None that I saw.
25	Q. That was in your declaration regarding the

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtestas 2033-12

'792 patent. Did you have any errors or corrections 1 to the '585 patent declaration? 2 I don't see any annotations. 3 Α. The other two documents that you have in Ο. 4 front of you, do you have any notes or annotations on 5 those? 6 Yes. On the front of IPR 2014-00809, 7 Α. regarding patent number 7,265,792, I have the number 1 8 through 17 on the front. 9 10 0. And what does that signify? Those were -- I believe those were the 11 Α. claims that were ruled on. I don't see any other 12 annotations in here. I'm not going to say there 13 aren't, but I don't see any. I don't recall making 14 15 any. On IPR 2015-00728, regarding patent 16 number 7,075,585, the annotation on the front is 1-3, 17 comma, 5, comma, 10, and then 16-19. 18 And that, again, is the set of claims that 19 0. was ruled on? 20 I believe so, yes. I don't see any other Α. 21 annotations. 22 23 0. Okay. Do you have any other notes or documents with you? 24 Α. No. 25

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCrestor 2033-13

13

0. In preparing for your deposition today --1 strike that. 2 You understand that there are a set of 3 IPRs that were filed by MaxLinear, do you understand 4 that? 5 Α. Yes. 6 In preparing for your deposition today, did 7 Q. you review any of the IPR material that related to the 8 MaxLinear IPRs? 9 Α. No, I did not review any of the IPR 10 material. You mean, like the declarations and --11 Declarations, exhibits, papers, et cetera. Q. 12 I didn't -- I looked at the Vandeplash Α. 13 patent. 14 Did you look at any of the other patents? 15 0. Α. No. 16 Did you review the -- any of the Ο. 17 declarations that were filed in that IPR? 18 Α. No. 19 There was a declaration filed by a 20 0. Doctor Hashemi. Have you ever spoken with 21 Doctor Hashemi? 22 No, I have not. Α. 23 Have you ever spoken with or met with 24 Ο. counsel for MaxLinear? 25

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dC性的超子2033-14

		Douglas Holberg, Ph.D 11/4/2015
1	A.	No, I have not.
2	Q.	Have you ever met with or spoken with any
3	employees	of MaxLinear?
4	Α.	No.
5	Q.	In preparing for your deposition today, did
6	you review	any material in addition to or in excess
7	of the exh	ibits that were filed in the IPR, any
8	additional	patents or any other documents?
9	Α.	No.
10	Q.	Can you tell me, in general, the process of
11	how your d	eclarations were drafted?
12	Α.	Yeah. In general, it was a collaborative
13	effort bet	ween myself and outside counsel for Silicon
14	Labs.	
15	Q.	Was there anyone else besides yourself and
16	counsel fo	r Silicon Labs involved in the process?
17	Α.	No.
18	Q.	Can you tell me who specifically as counsel
19	to Silicon	Labs collaborated with you on your report?
20	Α.	The team at Lee & Hayes.
21	Q.	Do you recall who specifically?
22	Α.	It was various members of the team.
23	Q.	How many members would you say?
24	Α.	Three, maybe.
25	Q.	Regarding the material that you reviewed in

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtestas 2033-15

your analysis, was that material provided to you by 1 the team at Lee & Hayes? 2 The majority of that I found myself. Α. No. 3 How did you find it? Q. 4 That is pretty broad. Do you have a more --5 Α. patent searching, reviewing material in the IEEE 6 database. Looking at books, looking at data sheets, 7 looking at data books. Google searching. 8 When it came time to physically write the 9 0. report, was the report written by the team at Lee & 10 Hayes? 11 They drafted it, yes. Α. 12 When -- when you were initially asked to Ο. 13 provide analysis in these IPRs, you asked to offer an 14 opinion that the claims are unpatentable. Is that 15 right? 16 MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 17 I don't recall what I was asked. 18 Α. Q. (BY MR. HABER) If you will look to page one 19 of your '585 declaration, in paragraph two. Does that 20 refresh your recollection as to what you were asked to 21 do? 22 Α. Yes. It says I was asked to give my opinion 23 on whether claims 11 through 15 and 20 of the '585 24 patent are unpatentable, in view of prior references. 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtest272033-16

> Silicon v Cresta IPR2015-00626

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015 Yes, that refreshes my recollection. 1 And you are being paid to provide your 2 Ο. 3 opinion that the claims are unpatentable at a rate of \$275 per hour. Right? 4 MR. AYERS: Objection. 5 Form. For the analysis. For the deposition, I'm Α. 6 7 being paid \$400 an hour while I'm here with you guys. (BY MR. HABER) So you are being provided 8 0. one rate to provide your unpatentability analysis and 9 10 you are being paid an additional rate to provide your unpatentability deposition testimony. Is that right? 11 Α. Correct. 12 You say that -- in paragraph five of your 13 0. declaration, you say you're being compensated at your 14 normal rate of \$275 per hour. Is that the same rate 15 that you were being compensated in some of the other 16 ongoing matters between Cresta and Silicon Labs? 17 Restate the question, please. 18 Α. Is the \$275 per hour that you were being Q. 19 paid in connection with your unpatentability opinions 20 in the IPR, is that the same rate that you are being 21 paid in other matters that are currently pending 22 between Cresta and Silicon Labs? 23 Which matters are you referring? 24 Α. I'm thinking of the ITC matter, for example. 25 Q.

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtest272033-17

MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 1 My rate at Silicon Labs is \$275 an hour for 2 Α. 3 everything I've been doing for them for a number of years. So it would include that, yes. 4 (BY MR. HABER) Are there any other matters 5 Ο. that you work on for Silicon Labs where you're paid a 6 different rate than \$275 an hour? 7 Α. No. 8 This inter partes review relates to -- there 9 0. 10 is two inter partes reviews relating to U.S. Patent 7,075,585 -- for shorthand, I'll just refer to that as 11 the '585 patent. Will you understand what I'm 12 referring to if I use that shorthand? 13 Α. Yes. 14 And also the shorthand for the 7,265,792 15 0. patent, I'll refer to as the '792 patent. You'll 16 understand what I'm referring to when I call it the 17 '792 patent? 18 Α. Yes. 19 You've read the '792 patent. Right? 20 0. Yes. Α. 21 Q. Do you understand the '792 patent? 22 23 Α. Yes. You've read the claims in the '792 patent? 24 0. Yes. 25 Α.

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtest252272033-18

Ο. And you understand the claims of the '792 1 patent? 2 Α. Yes. 3 You've read the specification, reviewed the Q. 4 figures of the '792 patent? 5 Α. Yes. 6 And you understand the specification and 7 Q. figures? 8 Α. Yes. 9 Ο. I have the same questions with regard to the 10 '585 patent. You've read the '585 patent. You 11 understand it? 12 Α. Yes. 13 You've read the claims of the '585 patent. 0. 14 Do you understand them? 15 Α. Yes. 16 You've read the specification and figures of Ο. 17 the '585 patent. Did you understand them? 18 Α. Yes. 19 Can you explain to me, just generally, the 20 Ο. difference at a high level between the claims of the 21 '792 patent and the claims of the '585 patent? 22 MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 23 I don't have the claims in front of me. 24 Α. (BY MR. HABER) Can you just on a high level 25 Q.

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtesta5Ex72033-19

1	tell me
2	A. No.
3	Q without reviewing the patents?
4	A. No, I can't.
5	Q. I'm going to hand you a two documents. They
6	are both labeled Exhibit 1001, so I think we should
7	probably relabel them. I'm going to hand you the copy
8	of the '585 patent. It was Exhibit 1001 in the '585
9	patent IPR. I'm going to relabel it 2022.
10	(Deposition Exhibit No. 2022 marked.)
11	Q. (BY MR. HABER) And I'm going to hand you
12	Exhibit 1001 to the '792 patent IPR. We're going to
13	relabel it Exhibit 2023.
14	MR. HABER: Counsel, I have copies for
15	you if you would like them.
16	(Deposition Exhibit No. 2023 marked.)
17	Q. (BY MR. HABER) So you've asked for copies
18	of the '792 and the '585 patent and I've handed them
19	to you.
20	MR. AYERS: Objection. Form.
21	Q. (BY MR. HABER) And the question was, at a
22	high level, can you tell me the difference between the
23	claims of the '792 patent and the '585 patent?
24	MR. AYERS: Objection. Form.
25	A. One difference is the '585 patent claims

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dC

a -- some details of the GMC filter for the 1 anti-aliasing function. It doesn't appear that the 2 '792 claims are similar. 3 (BY MR. HABER) Anything else? Q. 4 Α. Pardon me? 5 Anything else? 0. 6 I'm looking. 7 Α. Q. Oh. 8 So mapping from the '792 back to the ' '585, 9 Α. 10 the '792 recites the -- the Mpeg format data stream which is not cited -- or not claimed in the '585. 11 There are some details relating to the output 12 circuitry that is claimed in the '792 that's not 13 claimed in the '585. 14 Q. Is it details related to the output 15 circuitry? 16 Α. Yes. 17 What output, what claim is that that you're 18 Ο. referring to? 19 Claim 11 says, the television receiver claim Α. 20 one wherein the signal output circuit provides output 21 signals to an analog or digital signal format. 22 MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 23 In an analoq. 24 Claim 12 says, the television receiver claim Α. 25

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES 1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtesta5Ex72033-21

1	one wherein the signal output comprises one or more
2	output terminals, each of the one or more output
3	terminals of the signal output circuit comprises a
4	single ended output terminal or a differential output
5	terminal. I don't believe that is claimed in the
6	'585.
7	Q. (BY MR. HABER) The claims that are
8	challenged in your declaration regarding the '792
9	patent, do all of those claims include limitations
10	related to output circuitry?
11	A. Ground one is claim 11. And claim 11 is
12	related to output circuitry.
13	Q. I don't mean to interrupt you, but I'm not
14	sure you're looking at the right declaration. I think
15	ground one of the '585 is claim 11.
16	A. Oh, I'm sorry. You're correct.
17	MR. AYERS: Thank you for clarifying
18	that.
19	A. Keep these separate.
20	Q. (BY MR. HABER) You can look feel free to
21	look wherever you like, but if you look at the table
22	of contents, I believe you've see that claims 18, 19,
23	24, 25, 26, 27, 28 and 29 are challenged in the '792
24	patent.
25	A. Yes. Okay. 18 is related to signal output

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtestas 2033-22 1 circuitry. Claim 19 is related to signal output Claim 24 is not related to signal output circuitry. 2 3 circuitry.

4

What is claim 24 related to? Ο.

Α. Claim four says, the television receiver of 5 claim one wherein the plurality of finite impulse 6 response filters are stored in a memory and the signal 7 processor indexes the memory to retrieve one of the 8 plurality of finite impulse response filters. So it 9 10 relates to a finite input response filter.

Claim 25, wherein the signal processor 11 comprises a first computing unit and a second 12 computing -- of claim one, computing unit, the first 13 computing unit processing a real part of the finite 14 impulse response filter operation, while the second 15 computing unit processing an imaginary part of the 16 finite impulse response filter. So claim 25 relates 17 to the finite impulse response filter. 18

19

25

Q. And claim 26?

Are we still comparing? Or are you just Α. 20 wanting me to --21

Q. I just wanted to know if claims 24 through 22 29 are related to output circuitry as well? 23 So 26, then, is further comprising a Α. Okav. 24 format selection circuit coupled to the signal

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCresta5Ex72033-23

	Douglas Holberg, Ph.D 11/4/2015
1	processor, et cetera. That's not related to output
2	circuitry.
3	Q. Okay.
4	A. Let's see. 27. Wherein the format
5	selection signal generates a select signal. That is
6	not related to the output circuitry drivers either.
7	And then 28. Format selection
8	circuit format slash standard selection circuit
9	generates the select signal by detecting carrier
10	signals, identifying one of the formats of the input
11	RF signals. That's not related to the output driver
12	circuitry.
13	Q. And the last one is 29.
14	A. Wherein the input RF signal comprises an RF
15	signal received from terrestrial broadcast, an RF
16	signal received from satellite broadcast, and an RF
17	signal received from cable transmission. That is not
18	related to the output driver circuitry.
19	Q. So then it's fair to say that claims 18 and
20	19 are related to the output circuitry. Right?
21	A. Correct.
22	Q. And claims 24 through 29 are not?
23	A. Correct. Specifically, output driver
24	circuitry.
25	Q. You put emphasis on the word "driver." What

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtestas Ex72033-24

did you mean by that? The driver circuitry? 1 Well, that's what -- it recites first driver 2 Α. 3 circuit in claim 18, first driver circuit, second driver circuit. They're driver circuits. Claim 19. 4 When you say output driver circuit as 5 Ο. opposed to output circuit, does the output -- does the 6 driver part of that have some particular meaning? 7 MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 8 Maybe you could read back the question --9 Α. 10 the earlier question about -- relating to the output. (BY MR. HABER) I'm not sure -- well, what 11 0. additional information do you think you need to answer 12 the question? 13 Well, if I change from watching an analog Α. 14 broadcast to a digital broadcast, the output might 15 change. You're not referring to that, are you? 16 No. So you mentioned, when you were talking 17 Ο. about claims 18 and 19, an output driver circuit. And 18 you added the word "driver" before. And I was just 19 wondering what that particular word means when you are 20 talking about claims 18 and 19? 21 MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 22 It's what it means as the claim recites it. Α. 23 That's -- it describes it in the claim. 24 And what does it mean? (BY MR. HABER) 25 Q. WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtesta 2272033-25

1	A. A first driver circuit for driving the
2	analog output signals. The second driver circuit for
3	driving so that's what the driver does. So when I
4	say a driver circuit, I mean the driver that is
5	described here in the claim.
6	Q. Which particular part of the claim are you
7	looking at? And are you looking at claim 18?
8	A. Claim 18. A first driver is line 50 at
9	column 12. The second driver is line 50, 53.
10	Q. Your opinions in the '585 patent are
11	contained in your declaration. Right?
12	A. Correct.
13	Q. And we discussed this earlier, but sitting
14	here today there is no changes that you want to make
15	to your '585 declaration?
16	A. No.
17	Q. You believe that the statements made in your
18	'585 declaration are accurate?
19	A. Correct.
20	Q. And is it fair to say that your validity
21	opinions depend on the accuracy of the statements that
22	are described in your declaration?
23	A. I don't understand that question.
24	Q. You've reached some conclusions regarding
25	the '585 patent. Right?

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtestas 2472033-26

Α. Yes. 1 Those conclusions are based on the 2 0. 3 statements that are made in your declaration. Right? Α. Yes. 4 So then is it fair to say that your validity 5 0. conclusions are -- you know, rely on the accuracy of 6 the statements that you made in your '585 declaration? 7 Everything that I said in -- I stand by 8 Α. everything I said in this declaration. 9 Ο. Okay. And the same with regard to the '792 10 patent, other than the two typographical corrections 11 that we made earlier, sitting here today, is there 12 anything that you want to change about your 13 declaration? 14 Α. No. 15 0. And you believe that the statements made in 16 your '792 declaration are accurate? 17 Α. Yes. 18 0. And is it fair to say that your validity 19 conclusions regarding the '792 patent depend on the 20 accuracy of statements made in the '792 declaration? 21 MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 22 Α. The structure of your question is odd to me. 23 I stand by what I said in this declaration. 24 Μv opinion is consistent with everything and hasn't 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtest272033-27

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015 changed. 1 (BY MR. HABER) And what you said in that 2 0. 3 declaration is -- your conclusion is that the '792 patent is unpatentable? 4 Α. Yes. 5 And that conclusion rests on those specific 0. 6 7 statements? The claims that were recited in -- I'm only Α. 8 covering these claims. 9 10 0. Fair enough. So your conclusion regarding the unpatentability of the challenged claims in the 11 '792 patent rests on the statements made in your 12 declaration? 13 Α. Correct. 14 I want to ask you -- so in your analysis, 15 Ο. you applied certain meanings to particular claim 16 Right? terms. 17 Α. Yes. 18 You're familiar with the term claim Ο. 19 construction? That you applied particular 20 construction to patent claim terms? 21 Α. I'm familiar with that, yes. 22 23 Ο. And the particular claim constructions that you applied, are those listed in your declaration? 24 Α. They are. 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtestas Ex72033-28

Г

1	Q. And in reaching your conclusions, you didn't
2	apply any other claim constructions that are not
3	listed in your declaration. Right?
4	A. Every word has to be interpreted, so I'm
5	I don't understand what you mean.
6	Q. When you were conducting your analysis, if
7	you assigned a particular meaning to a claim term, you
8	described that meaning in your in your declaration.
9	Right?
10	I'm just trying to understand if if
11	your any particular definitions for the claim terms
12	that you analyzed are contained in your declaration or
13	if there are some other claim meanings that are not
14	contained in your declaration
15	A. I don't recall that would have been. A
16	first digital analog converter, I didn't provide a
17	construction for digital analog converter, but in my
18	mind I have one.
19	Q. And what is that meaning you have in your
20	mind?
21	A. Converts digital signals to analog signals.
22	It's the plain and ordinary meaning.
23	Q. So is it fair to say, then, that if you
24	didn't provide a particular claim construction, you
25	applied the plain and ordinary meaning of the claim

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtestas 2033-29

٦

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015 terms in your analysis? 1 That's fair. Α. 2 In -- I'm looking at your '585 declaration. 3 0. There is a particular section called Claim 4 Construction. When you did apply a particular meaning 5 to the claim terms, is that where your claim meanings 6 are contained? 7 Can you direct me to that page? 8 Α. It begins on page 18 of the '585 9 0. Sure. 10 declaration. Α. Okay. Now that I'm there, now restate the 11 question, please. 12 When you applied a particular meaning to the 13 0. claim term, that particular meaning is contained in 14 Section D of your declaration? 15 Α. Yes. In fact, I said it right here, I agree 16 that each of the constructions adopted by the board 17 for those on page 19, is appropriate to the present 18 proceeding. 19 Towards the end of that section, on page 20, 0. 20 there is a section called Patent Owner Constructions. 21 Do you see that? 22 Α. Yes, I do. 23 I believe it's your opinion that the patent 24 0. owner constructions are not correct. Is that right? 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtesta5Ex72033-30

1	A. That's what I said. In its patent owner
2	response, IPR 2014-00728, patent owner offers
3	construction for several terms. As discussed below,
4	in detail, I do not agree with the patent owner's
5	proposed constructions because they do not reflect the
6	plain and ordinary meaning of those terms to a POSITA.
7	Q. So you don't agree with the patent owner
8	constructions because they don't apply the plain and
9	ordinary meaning. Is that right?
10	A. I'll restate what I wrote. As discussed
11	below in detail, I do not agree with the patent
12	owner's proposed constructions because they do not
13	reflect the plain and ordinary meaning of those terms
14	to a POSITA.
15	Q. So that's a yes. Right?
16	A. I think it is.
17	Q. Okay. There is a construction discussed on
18	paragraph 37 of your declaration.
19	MR. AYERS: Do you have an extra copy
20	for me of his declarations? I can get one if I need
21	to.
22	MR. HABER: Yeah.
23	Q. (BY MR. HABER) There is a portion of
24	Cresta's construction that says that the signal
25	processing processes I'm sorry. I'll start my

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtesta5Ex72033-31

question again. 1 MR. HABER: But before I do, it seems 2 like Counsel was whispering to the witness, and I'll 3 ask you not to do that. 4 MR. AYERS: Oh, I was just asking what 5 page he was on. 20? 6 7 MR. HABER: I'll ask you to --MR. AYERS: I don't know that I 8 whispered at all, but I think he indicated the page 9 10 number. Certainly I would not be whispering to 11 the witness relating to his testimony, but thank you. 12 (BY MR. HABER) So let me ask my question 0. 13 So discussed in paragraph 30 is a specific aqain. 14 meaning proposed for the signal processor, wherein the 15 signal processor processes only one format of RF 16 signal and does not process a plurality of formats in 17 parallel. 18 Α. I'm on paragraph 30 and it says --19 37. Ο. 20 Oh, okay. All right. So you'll have to say Α. 21 that again. 22 0. Paragraph 37, there is statement, patent 23 owner construes these terms to mean, signal processing 24 processes only one format, RF signal, and does not 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtest272033-32

> Silicon v Cresta IPR2015-00626

process a plurality of formats in parallel. 1 Is it your opinion that that is not the 2 3 correct construction? As I said in paragraph 31, as discussed 4 Α. below in detail, I do not agree with the patent 5 owner's proposed constructions. 6 So that would conclude the constructions in 7 Q. paragraph 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39. Right? 8 If those are the patent owner's 9 Α. 10 constructions then, yes. I would like to hand you another document. 11 0. It is Exhibit 1011 of the '585 IPR, but I would like 12 to re-mark it as Exhibit 2024. 13 (Deposition Exhibit No. 2024 marked.) 14 (BY MR. HABER) This is a U.S. patent 15 0. 6,377,316. The assignee is listed as Zenith. And I 16 believe in your declaration you refer to it as Zenith. 17 So if I refer to the patent as Zenith, you'll 18 understand? 19 Α. Yes. 20 And the Zenith patent is one of the patents 21 Ο. that you reviewed in forming your unpatentability 22 23 opinion. Correct? Α. Correct. 24 Can you tell me how the Zenith patent fits 25 Q.

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtesta5Ex72033-33 into your analysis?

1

2

MR. AYERS: Objection. Form.

Α. Paragraph 62 of my '792 declaration, ground 3 three, claim 26 is obvious over Thomson and Harris in 4 view of Zenith. The claim says, the television 5 receiver of claim one further comprising a format 6 slash standard selection circuit coupled to the 7 digital signal processor, the format slash standard 8 selection circuit generating a select signal 9 indicative of a format of the input RF signal and. 10 Thomson discloses a signal processor that is a 11 standard selection -- has a standard selection input. 12 It is my opinion that the standard selection signal 13 provides an explicit suggested to a POSITA that a 14 format slash standard selection circuit should be used 15 to generate this signal. Because --16 It appears that you're just reading from 17 Ο.

18 your report?

19 A. It is.

25

20 Q. So nothing that you have read yet mentions 21 Zenith.

22 MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 23 Q. (BY MR. HABER) Just tell me how Zenith 24 relates to your opinion.

A. Will you give me another minute?

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtestas Ex72033-34

Q. Okay.

A. Thank you.

Because the construction of such a 3 circuit is well-known to those skilled in the art, 4 however, Thomson did not explicitly teach how to 5 construct that. Nonetheless, it is my opinion that 6 Zenith provides an exemplary embodiment of a format 7 slash standard selection circuit that a POSITA would 8 have been motivated to use to generate the select 9 10 signal in Thomson.

Q. So is it fair to say that you point to Zenith as disclosing the format standard selection circuit?

14

1

2

A. Yes.

Q. Can you show me in the Zenith patent wherethe format standard selection circuit is?

So on paragraph 65, Zenith discloses the Α. 17 actual details of the format standard selection 18 circuit for generating a select signal based upon the 19 format of the incoming RF signal, as shown in 20 Figure 2. If, in quotes, the presence of syncs 21 corresponding to a demodulated analog type signal, 22 23 unquote, is detected by sync detector 20, microprocessor 22 routes the IF signal from ten to 12 24 to analog demodulator 16. Otherwise, the absence of 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtest272033-35

1	syncs corresponding to demodulated analog type signal
2	microprocessor follows the switch 14 to couple the IF
3	signal to the digital modulator 18.
4	It is my opinion that the detecting
5	syncs in the demodulated analog television signal
6	would include detecting one or more of the horizontal
7	sync signals, since these sync signals are uniquely
8	tied to a specific television standard. Sync
9	detection results in an identification of this
10	television standard.
11	Q. So my question is, can you identify for me
12	in Zenith which component is the standard selection
13	circuit?
14	MR. AYERS: Objection. Form.
15	A. Signal or circuit?
16	Q. (BY MR. HABER) Circuit.
17	A. Accordingly in my opinion, the Zenith
18	microprocessor is a format selection circuit that
19	generates a select signal, which is the output of the
20	microprocessor.
21	Q. Do you have the Zenith patent in front of
22	you?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. Could you maybe circle or identify on one of
25	those figures or somewhere in the patent where the

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtestas 2033-36

٦
signal selection circuit is? 1 I can hand you a pen if you need that. 2 MR. HABER: I'm handing a pen to the 3 witness. 4 (BY MR. HABER) Maybe you could just state 5 0. for the record what it is that you did there? 6 Α. I circled block 22. As stated in paragraph 7 66, in my opinion, the Zenith microprocessor is a 8 format selection circuit. And that's what I've 9 10 circled. Block 22 in which particular --11 0. Α. Figure 2. 12 And maybe you could just identify signal 13 0. selection circuit or something on the figure so that 14 we can keep the record clear. 15 Α. You want me to write it down? 16 So we can go back and look. 0. Yes. 17 What words do you want me to use? 18 Α. Is it your opinion that's the standard 19 Q. selection circuit? 20 Α. Okay. 21 Q. So how did you annotate that? 22 Format slash standard selection circuit. 23 Α. Now, I think you annotated Figure 2. 24 0. So I think, sticking with Figure 2, can you identify for me 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015 the select signal, 2.2, in Figure 2? 1 That would be the output of the 2 Α. 3 microprocessor. Can you just identify that on the figure? 4 Q. And what did you identify? 5 The output of the microprocessor block 22. Α. 6 And where does that output go? 7 Q. It goes -- it's an arrow pointing downward 8 Α. on the page. It is controlling switch 42. 9 0. So the standard selection circuit has an 10 output that goes to switch 42. And as a result of 11 that output, it's fair to say that switch 40 -- that 12 the pole of switch 42 is changed. Is that right? 13 MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 14 Α. I'm going to read from the patent, starting 15 on column three, line 13. As in Figure 1 16 embodiment -- well, let me change that. Because 17 that's do -- we want to do Figure 2 because that's 18 what we're talking about. 19 (BY MR. HABER) Of course, you could feel 0. 20 free to look anywhere, but if you look at the bottom 21 of column two, that discusses Figure 2, starting 22 around line 59. 23 Α. So I've reviewed it. What was the question 24 again? 25

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015 MR. HABER: Could you read the question 1 one more time. 2 (The requested text was read back.) 3 Yeah. So that's -- the output, which is one Α. 4 of the poles of the switch, which is not labeled in 5 the figure, is the junction of inductor 30 and 6 capacitor 28, that point either switches to node A or 7 to node D based upon the output driven from the 8 microprocessor. Because that's a single pulse double 9 throw switch. 10 Back up a little bit. What is a pole on a 11 0. Can you explain what a pole is? switch? 12 I haven't prepared -- you brought the term Α. 13 Maybe you should explain it to me. 14 up. It's mentioned in the patent here. 15 Ο. Ιt mentions a --16 Where is it mentioned, and I'll give --Α. 17 I think what you just read. And also, you 18 0. mentioned a single pole double throw switch? 19 Yeah, okay. So pole is a -- the way a Α. 20 switch is constructed -- one of the ways, is to have 21 electrical contact to a circuit with a movable arm of 22 some sort. And that first contact would be a pole. 23 And the connections that the arm might make to other 24 circuitry would be another pole or more than --25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1	additional poles. So they're really the contacts to
2	the to the control or the I don't know the
3	definition of a pole. I mean, that's a term we just
4	use and we know what it means. I know what it means.
5	I can't write you a definition of it. But it's a
6	contact point.
7	Q. Okay.
8	A. Of the switch.
9	Q. So contact points of the switch?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. So then, it's fair to say that the
12	microprocessor sends a signal to switch 42, which will
13	change the contact points between A or D. Right?
14	A. Yes. It switches the output of the tuner
15	circuitry to either A or D.
16	Q. And so it's your opinion, then, that the
17	that the output of the switch is flipped in response
18	to whether or not the incoming signal is analog format
19	or digital format. Correct?
20	A. I think what the patent recites is what I
21	read a while ago. If the presence of syncs I'm
22	reading from paragraph 65 corresponding to a
23	demodulated analog type signal is a detected by sync
24	detector 20, microprocessor 22 routes the IF signal
25	from tuner 12 to analog demodulator 16.

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1	Q. Where are you reading from?
2	A. Paragraph 65. Continuing. Otherwise, in
3	the absence of syncs corresponding to a demodulated
4	analog type signal, microprocessor calls the switch 14
5	to couple the IF signal to digital demodulator 18.
6	Q. And so I understand, the result of that
7	process is that, you know, kind of in response to
8	whether or not the incoming signal is analog format or
9	digital format, the microprocessor sends a signal that
10	switches the pole of the switch. Right?
11	A. I think what you said is consistent with
12	what the patent reads, yes.
13	Q. Other than flipping the pole of that switch,
14	does Zenith describe any other information that is
15	sent by the microprocessor in response to the analog
16	digital format?
17	A. I don't recall.
18	Q. You said you don't recall?
19	A. I don't recall.
20	Q. Sitting here right now, you don't know one
21	way or the other?
22	A. I don't recall.
23	Q. Looking at Figure 2, which is what we've
24	been talking about, I'm trying to understand here
25	exactly how this selection works. If an analog signal

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

is sent in to the input tuner, what happens with 1 regard to the switch? 2 Let's see what the patent says. So your 3 Α. question was, does the microprocessor do anything 4 else? 5 My question is kind of directed to more or 0. 6 less the data path. So an RFN includes an analog 7 formatted data, goes through a tuner, hits the switch, 8 and so the switch has to be in some setting initially. 9 10 So if you look at the figure, it's in the setting to close the analog circuit. Right? 11 Α. Correct. 12 So the analog format comes in, then what Ο. 13 ultimately would hop in with the state of the switch? 14 Α. Well, if it detected the sync signal 15 indicating an analog signal, it remains in that 16 position. 17 So the microprocessor will -- you're not 18 0. sending any signal or sending something to -- a stay 19 signal? Stay in the same state? 20 MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 21 Α. Stay in the same state. 22 23 Ο. (BY MR. HABER) Now, assume that same configuration, we have a digital signal coming in in 24 the RFN. It goes through the tuner. Right? Hits the 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtest272033-42

> Silicon v Cresta IPR2015-00626

switch, and then what happens? 1 In the absence of syncs corresponding to a 2 Α. demodulated analog type signal switch, it calls us to 3 switch 14. Is that in this print -- let me... 4 So in referring to Figure 1, in column 5 two, line 38, specifically, in the presence of syncs 6 corresponding to a demodulated analog type signal, 7 microprocessor 22 calls on switch 14 to connect its 8 pole 14 A to terminal A, which routes the IF signal 9 10 from tuner 12 to analog demodulator 16. And in the absence of the syncs corresponding to modulated 11 analogy type signal, microprocessor calls on switch 14 12 to connect its pole, 14 A, to terminal D, to couple 13 the IF signal to digital demodulator 18. 14 So that's with regard to the embodiment in 15 0. Figure 1. Right? 16 Α. Correct. 17 It talks about switch 14, which appears to 18 Ο. be just a different type of switch. Right? 19 Α. Yeah. I think it's analogous to switch 42, 20 in Figure 2. 21 0. So what would happen, then, is -- just stick 22 with Figure 2, because that's the one we've been 23 marking on -- the digital signal would go through the 24 analog demodulator, right? Because that's the pole 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015 that's connected? 1 Uh-huh. 2 Α. And then output from the analog demodulator, 3 Ο. if it was a digital formulated signal, that would just 4 be junk data. Correct? 5 State that again? Α. 6 If a digital formatted signal went through 7 Q. the analog demodulator, that would just -- the result 8 would just be some sort of junk data? 9 Α. The microprocessor -- you wouldn't get a 10 sync detect. 11 So the sync detect would return zero or 0. 12 something, and then the -- a signal would go to the 13 microprocessor, and the microprocessor would send, you 14 know, a switch signal and flip the switch to D. 15 Right? 16 I believe so. Α. 17 And then as the rest of the RF digital 18 0. signal came, it would be sent to the digital 19 demodulator and be properly demodulated? 20 Α. Correct. 21 Q. Now, what would happen if that digital 22 23 signal was coming in and all of a sudden the RF input was switched to analog? 24 How is it switched? Α. 25

Q. The channel change, switch to an analog
 channel.

A. I suspect what happens is, the microprocessor detects the channel change, switches to analog, switches the switch to pole A. A test to see if the sync is there, and if it's there, then it's an analog signal and it stays there. Is it's not, it would switch back to D.

9 Q. You say that you suspect that's what
10 happens. Is there any specific teaching in Zenith as
11 to what would happen?

12

Α.

I don't recall them teaching that, no.

Q. Assuming that the switch was set properly so that analog formatted data flowed through the analog demodulator, would the output of the demodulator be baseband signal?

17

MR. AYERS: Objection. Form.

A. I think the board construed baseband, and
I'll defer to their construction on baseband, which
is -- I'll read from the final written decision on IPR
2015-00728 for the 7,075,585.

Q. (BY MR. HABER) Before you begin, I'm not sure that question came across right. I'm not asking for the definition of baseband signal, I'm just wondering if -- as the board construed it, or under

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtestar 2033-45

> Silicon v Cresta IPR2015-00626

any definition, if the output of the analog 1 demodulator is a baseband signal? 2 MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 3 Well, I'm just refreshing my memory on Α. 4 baseband construction. 5 (BY MR. HABER) Okay. Why don't we take a 0. 6 quick break and then you can look at it and we can 7 come back to it. 8 MR. AYERS: Are you going to withdraw 9 10 that question, then? Because -- is there a question pending or --11 MR. HABER: No. So the witness said he 12 wanted to refresh his recollection, so I'll come back 13 to the question after the break. 14 THE WITNESS: Okav. 15 (RECESS.) 16 MR. HABER: All right. We're back on 17 the record. I do have a couple of housekeeping 18 matters to take care of before we start. 19 We're proceeding in two IPRs 20 concurrently, which will be on a single transcript. 21 That is IPR -- it's IPR 2015-00615 and IPR 2015-00626. 22 (BY MR. HABER) Also, I just wanted to 23 0. repeat some of the instructions I mentioned earlier. 24 During our last session you were nodding at times. Ιt 25

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtesta5Ex72033-46

46

would be helpful if you could answer verbally, yes, 1 no, and proceed to expand if you need to. 2 It's a habit that lot of people have. 3 Α. Okay. 4 Also, I wanted to remind you again that you 5 0. are under oath and when we go on break you're still 6 under oath and you are not to speak with your attorney 7 during the breaks regarding the substance of your 8 deposition or the case generally. Is that right? 9 10 Α. Okay. During the last break did you speak with 11 Ο. counsel regarding anything that was discussed? 12 Α. No. 13 And you understand that when you're under Ο. 14 oath, counsel can't coach you, act as an intermediary, 15 direct you to answer the questions a certain way, 16 interpret the questions for you. We're here to get 17 your testimony. Do you understand? 18 Α. Yes. 19 And also, unless it's to protect a 0. 20 privilege, counsel cannot instruct you not to answer. 21 Unless you receive an instruction not to answer, 22 23 you're to answer the questions that are asked to you. Right? 24 MR. AYERS: Objection. 25 Form.

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015 Α. Yes. 1 (BY MR. HABER) Co-counsel has pointed out 2 0. to me that I asked you a question and you nodded 3 If you could answer yes or no, that would be 4 again. helpful. 5 MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 6 Α. I think I answered with the nod. 7 (BY MR. HABER) So a verbal answer is what 8 Q. we need so the court reporter can take that down. 9 10 Α. Yes, I understand. 11 0. Okay. So am I instructed not to nod? Α. 12 To the extent that you catch yourself doing 13 Q. it, please answer yes or no. Certainly, not -- a 14 verbal answer is what we need to keep an accurate 15 record. 16 Α. Okay. 17 Before we went on the break, I had asked you 18 0. a question. You said you wanted to review some 19 additional documents. 20 MR. HABER: Could we have the last 21 question read back. 22 23 (The requested text was read back.) Okay. The board construction of baseband, 24 Α. as I'm reading from the seven -- the '585 final 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1	decision, make correspond to a single signal that
2	encodes both video and audio information without
3	transmission modulation. So I think the operative
4	term is without transmission modulation. So that's
5	the that's the construction now. And the context
6	of the question?
7	Q. So the question is, under that construction,
8	is the output of the analog demodulator baseband
9	signal?
10	A. Yeah. Uh-huh.
11	Q. And you said the operative part of the
12	construction is transmission modulation. What is
13	transmission modulation?
14	MR. AYERS: Objection. Form.
15	A. I don't recall if there was specific
16	construction made of that portion of the term.
17	Q. (BY MR. HABER) Well, just
18	A. But I think it's may I finish?
19	Q. Yeah, go ahead.
20	A. But I think it's the transmission
21	modulation would be the modulation occurring when the
22	signal is being transmitted.
23	Q. What generally does that entail? What
24	modulation is occurs when the signal is
25	transmitted?

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 1 There are all forms of modulation. I didn't 2 Α. 3 prepare to go through that in my -- today. (BY MR. HABER) As part of transmission 4 Ο. modulation -- strike that. 5 Are you familiar with the term carrier 6 signal? 7 Α. I am. 8 What is a carrier signal? 9 0. 10 Α. It would be, by way of example, a local radio station is KLBJ, 590 AM band, and it's 11 transmitted on a carrier signal of 590 kilohertz, I 12 believe. So that is a -- the carrier is the signal 13 that is used to carry the modulation. 14 So the carrier signal is part of the 15 Ο. transmission modulation? 16 MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 17 Α. Yes. 18 Q. (BY MR. HABER) The output of the digital 19 demodulator, is that also a baseband signal? 20 MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 21 Α. Yes. 22 23 0. (BY MR. HABER) And so the output of the analog demodulator and the digital demodulator, they 24 do not include transmission modulation. Right? 25

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015 Α. Correct. 1 So output from analog demodulator 16 in 2 0. Figure 2, there is a line that goes to a Box 20, sync 3 debt. Do you see that? 4 Is that a question? 5 Α. I just want to make sure we're looking at 0. 6 7 the same portion. I'm looking at Figure 2. And there is a 8 Α. block 16 analog demodulator and there is a block 20, 9 10 so I see those two blocks. And block 20 operates on the demodulated 11 0. signal from the analog demodulator. Right? 12 Well, let me refer to the patent and see Α. 13 what it says just to be sure. 14 Sure. 15 Ο. Α. I would like to direct you to column two, 16 line 35. It simply says that the analog demodulator 17 16 supplies a sync separator 20 for separating sync 18 signals in the demodulated analog signal. 19 So the question that I had was, the block 20 0. 20 sync debt operates on the analog demodulated signal. 21 Right? 22 Α. It does, yes. Because it says that right 23 here. 24 And the function of sync debt 20 is to find 25 Q.

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015 analog sync signals in the transmitted analog 1 information. Right? 2 Α. Yes. 3 MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 4 (BY MR. HABER) And so sync debt operates on 5 0. the transmitted information after it has been 6 7 demodulated? You say the transmitted information. 8 Α. The -- an analog format --9 0. We haven't talked about the transmitter Α. 10 here. The received information. 11 Received information. Q. 12 Α. Okay. 13 So the RFN is a received analog modulated 0. 14 signal, it goes through the system, it goes through 15 the demodulator, the information is demodulated, there 16 is some underlying television content information in 17 the signal, and the sync debt operates on that 18 demodulated underlying analog information? 19 Α. Yes. 20 What exactly does sync debt do? 21 Ο. Α. It says it separates the sync signals in the 22 23 demodulated analog signal. Is it easier to operate on the analog data 24 0. to find the sync signals after it has been 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

demodulated? 1 MR. AYERS: Objection. 2 Form. Α. I didn't try to figure that out. 3 (BY MR. HABER) So you don't have an opinion Q. 4 one way or the other? 5 No. Α. 6 You mentioned that the output from the sync 7 Q. debt was essentially a state signal. Right? 8 Α. I think I said the output from the 9 microprocessor was a state signal, but I have -- you 10 know, that's what I recall. 11 So you say the output from the 12 Ο. microprocessor is a state signal? 13 Α. Right. 14 It's essentially like a bit, like a one or a 15 0. zero? 16 Probably. Yeah. Α. 17 And that -- that bit or state will tell the 18 0. switch to flip poles. Right? 19 The patent doesn't go into the Α. Yeah. 20 details of -- down to component level. This is 21 somewhat symbolic. It could be a bit that flips a 22 switch, yes. 23 So in your opinion, there is nothing else 24 0. described in Zenith about what that signal is other 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtesta522033-53

53

1	than perhaps a state?
2	MR. AYERS: Objection. Form.
3	A. Well, I'll have to look back, since you
4	asked it that way. I know at least it provides that.
5	Q. (BY MR. HABER) So at least it provides some
6	state, and there is nothing else that you there is
7	nothing else in Zenith that it provides that you know
8	of?
9	A. In Figure 2, it shows the microprocessor
10	controlling the state of switch 42. The
11	microprocessor probably does a lot of other things. I
12	don't I didn't offer an opinion on that.
13	Q. But so as far as controlling the switch, all
14	that it would need to do is provide some state signal?
15	A. I would think so, yes.
16	Q. And, again, as far as controlling the
17	switch strike that.
18	Looking again at Figure 2. Is there a
19	signal processor taught by Zenith?
20	MR. AYERS: Objection. Form.
21	A. As construed by the PTAB, just to be clear,
22	and I am reading from 7,075,585 patent, IPR 2014-0078.
23	A digital module that processes signals in the digital
24	domain. So, yes, there is a signal processor at least
25	in block 16.

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

Q. (BY MR. HABER) Is there anywhere else? 1 Do what? What was the question? 2 Α. Is there a signal processor anywhere else in 3 0. Figure 2? 4 There is no detail on the analog demodulator Α. 5 so I don't know. 6 What about in block 18? 7 0. Α. Okay. Pardon me. Can you -- I may need to 8 correct my testimony because I didn't -- my copy is 9 10 fuzzy. What was the original block I identified with the digital demodulator? With the signal processor? 11 MR. HABER: Can you identify that? 12 (The requested text was read back.) 13 Α. That's incorrect. It's 18. Sorry. That's 14 why I brought this. 15 (BY MR. HABER) Fair enough. So there is a 0. 16 signal processor in block 18, the digital demodulator? 17 Α. Correct. 18 And going back, there a signal processor in Q. 19 block 16? 20 Α. I don't know. 21 Q. So you can't tell by looking at Zenith or 22 block 16 whether it includes signal processor? 23 Correct. Because the board's construction Α. 24 requires a digital module that processes signals in 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtesta 2272033-55

55

the digital domain, and I don't have any indication in 1 this diagram whether it's done in the digital domain 2 or not. 3 Are you familiar with the term channel 4 Q. filter? 5 Α. Yes. 6 Do either of these blocks 16 or 18 include a 7 Q. channel filter? 8 MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 9 Α. Yeah. I'll have to recall how I used that 10 term. 11 (BY MR. HABER) Is there something that you Q. 12 need to review? 13 I'd review everything in front of me. Α. Yeah. 14 I'm trying to remember channel filter. 15 Okay. So now that I've reviewed the 16 patents, what was the question? You asked me what --17 where is the channel filter? 18 Q. So what was the -- let me just ask the 19 question again. The question I asked is, is there a 20 channel filter in block 16 or block 18? 21 MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 22 Α. Well, the way -- I don't have the details of 23 what is inside of those, but I suspect they would at 24 least comprise -- on the digital side, which is block 25

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1	18 let me just make sure the the patent doesn't
2	speak to the question before I answer.
3	Yes.
4	Q. (BY MR. HABER) It's been a while since we
5	asked the question, so I'll just ask it again. So is
6	there a channel filter in block 16 and block 18? I
7	think you just said the answer was, yes?
8	A. Yes, I believe there is.
9	Q. So we'll just break this down. There is a
10	channel filter in block 18. Correct?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. And is there a channel filter in block 16?
13	A. Yes. Well, let me say it this way. To be
14	clear, they don't really say what they do, but I
15	believe it it could very well be implemented with
16	the channel filter, as I understand a channel filter
17	from the two patents that the '585 and '792, so it
18	would be in both, yes.
19	Q. So as you understand channel filter, the
20	analog demodulator block 16 would include an analog
21	channel filter. Right?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. And the digital demodulator, block 18, would
24	include a digital channel filter. Right?
25	MR. AYERS: Objection. Form.

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1	A. Well, I don't know that I distinguish
2	between analog or digital channel filter when I used
3	the term channel filter. But maybe I do. Let me just
4	look.
5	Yes.
6	Q. (BY MR. HABER) All right. So just for
7	clarification. The digital demodulator 18 would
8	include a digital channel filter. Right?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. If you look at we can look at Figure 2,
11	but these two these two blocks, block 16 and block
12	18, they are separate demodulators. Right?
13	A. Correct.
14	Q. The having these separate demodulators,
15	that was one of the goals of the patent. Correct?
16	The Zenith patent?
17	MR. AYERS: Objection. Form.
18	Q. (BY MR. HABER) And you can feel free to
19	look anywhere, but I'm looking at column one starting
20	around line 40.
21	A. Line 14?
22	Q. 40. 40.
23	A. Yeah, the question the goal was to feed
24	the tuner output to separate demodulators. I don't
25	think that's the way you asked the question, but

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1	Q. Okay. So what you said is that the goal is
2	to feed the tuner output to separate demodulators.
3	Right?
4	A. Yes. Or the goal was to have a low cost
5	switching system to do that.
6	Q. I want to hand you another exhibit,
7	previously marked Exhibit 1005, referred to as Harris.
8	For clarity, I'm going to re-mark it 2025.
9	(Deposition Exhibit No. 2025 marked.)
10	Q. (BY MR. HABER) You're familiar with this
11	particular document. Right?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. The document is referred to as Harris in
14	your declaration. So if I refer to Harris, you'll
15	understand I'm referring to Exhibit 2025?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. Is it your opinion that the strike that.
18	So there is a component discussed in
19	Harris called a DDF. Do you recall that?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. What is a DDF?
22	A. I recall but I'm going to refer to the
23	document.
24	Digital he called them digital
25	decimating filters. I would have said digital

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015 decimation filters, but essentially, they're the same. 1 And Harris discusses using DDFs in a 2 0. wideband receiver. Right? 3 Α. Correct. 4 Is it your opinion that the DDF used in the 5 0. Harris wideband receiver is reconfigurable? 6 MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 7 Α. Yes. 8 (BY MR. HABER) What is the basis for that 9 Ο. 10 opinion? In my declaration for the '792, paragraph Α. 11 49, Harris further teaches that if this filter is used 12 in systems where the second IF filter state consists 13 of a bank of filters to support various operational 14 modes, cost and work space can be saved by -- or be --15 an error in the actual text, [sic] -- by reconfiguring 16 a single DDF to implement the filter required by each 17 operational mode. 18 Q. I'm sorry. What page were you reading from? 19 Paragraph 49. Α. 20 How specifically is the Harris DDF 21 Ο. reconfigured? 22 The DDF can be rapidly reconfigured via a 23 Α. standard microprocessor interface. 24 How is that standard microprocessor Q. 25

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015 interface used to reconfigure the Harris DDF? 1 In other words, this filter combined with 2 Α. 3 the microprocessor can retrieve the FIR filter coefficients from memory and store those in 4 coefficient RAM. 5 So just so I understand, the microprocessor 0. 6 inputs updates or provides some filter coefficients to 7 the Harris DDF? 8 MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 9 10 Α. The microprocessor is involved in updating the coefficient RAM in the Harris DDF. 11 (BY MR. HABER) When you say it's involved 0. 12 in updating the coefficient RAM, what do you mean 13 "involved in"? 14 Α. Well, it may select the coefficients from 15 memory and then provide it to the coefficient RAM of 16 the DDF. 17 Is there a memory in Harris' DDF? 18 0. Α. It says, Harris -- the Harris digital 19 decimation filter DDF includes a 512 tap FIR filter 20 coupled to a coefficient RAM that stores the FIR 21 filter coefficients. RAM is memory. 22 0. How many FIR filter coefficients can be 23 stored in the coefficient RAM? 24 Objection. MR. AYERS: Form. 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

Α. In the Harris application or in general? 1 In the Harris DDF. (BY MR. HABER) 2 0. Α. I don't recall. Let me reread it again and 3 I'll see if I can give you an answer. 4 So you've reviewed Harris for several 5 0. minutes now. Do you still have --6 Α. So it doesn't say, but it's a 512 tap FIR 7 And I believe it's a low-pass. I think I filter. 8 read that somewhere. So the coefficients are probably 9 not symmetric. So the coefficient RAM has to at least 10 have 512 coefficients for each tap. It may have a lot 11 more, but at least that much. 12 I'm not sure that was actually the question 13 0. The question I was trying to ask was, how I asked. 14 many sets of coefficients will be stored in 15 coefficient RAM? 16 All right. Let me --Α. Oh. 17 MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 18 Α. I was trying to resolve a different 19 question. 20 And, again, I'll ask you to MR. HABER: 21 refrain from whispering or speaking under your breath. 22 I said, objection, form. 23 MR. AYERS: MR. HABER: There was a little bit of a 24 whisper before that. 25

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1	MR. AYERS: I'm not sure what you're
2	referring to.
3	A. So I don't think it states how many in the
4	text, how many coefficients or how many sets.
5	Q. (BY MR. HABER) So then, at least as to that
6	issue, how many sets of coefficients are in the RAM,
7	the Harris reference is somewhat vague?
8	A. Yeah. But it says it could reconfigure, so
9	there must be at least another set.
10	Q. When you say, it says it can reconfigure, so
11	there must be at least another set, what is the basis
12	of that opinion?
13	A. Well, let me find the phrase.
14	In my declaration, I said, on page 29,
15	the paragraph 49, the DDF can be rapidly reconfigured
16	via a standard microprocessor interface. And I didn't
17	make that up, I got that from the reference.
18	Q. Is it fair to say that one way to
19	reconfigure the DDF in Harris would be to load a new
20	set of coefficients into the coefficient RAM?
21	A. Yes, that would be one way.
22	Q. Is there any other way described in the
23	Harris reference?
24	A. I don't think so.
25	Q. If you'll look at Figure 6 of the Harris

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1	reference, it's somewhat small and hard to read. It
2	appears that there is a a bank of parallel DDFs
3	there. Is that right?
4	A. I can't read this copy. It's just blurry.
5	I can read a few words, but the rest of it's blurry.
6	Let me see if there is maybe a description of the
7	Q. Okay.
8	A. I believe that's the case, yes.
9	Q. Just so we're clear. You believe that those
10	items in the center of Figure 6 are a parallel bank of
11	DDFs. Right?
12	A. Well, what the text says is, as shown in
13	Figure 6, the channelized receiver is constructed of
14	multiple sets of similar hardware that tune to the
15	center frequencies.
16	Now, I believe I can't really tell
17	from the diagram and I don't recall, you know maybe
18	I offered an opinion on this before, but I don't
19	recall. I believe that those are the items described
20	in the in the general architecture and that they do
21	include a DDF.
22	Q. So looking at the
23	A. Because the DDF includes an HSP 43220.
24	Yes, I believe they do contain the
25	DDFs.

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES 1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtesta Ex72033-64

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015 Ο. And looking at Figure 6, there appear to be 1 several of them in parallel. Right? 2 Α. What do you mean by parallel? 3 Do you have an understanding of the term Q. 4 parallel? 5 Yes, I do. And, yes, they are. Α. 6 Also in Harris, there is a -- if you look on 7 0. page five, the second column, there is reference to a 8 standard microprocessor interface. It's towards the 9 10 middle. Where on page five? 11 Α. The second column. Q. 12 Halfway down? Α. 13 Halfway down towards the middle, the end of 0. 14 the first full paragraph. 15 Α. Yes. Okay. 16 So there is a reference to a standard 0. 17 microprocessor interface. Is that microprocessor 18 interface what is used to update the coefficients in 19 the coefficient RAM? 20 Yes. Α. 21 Ο. I'm going to hand you another document. 22 23 It's a document previously marked 1015. I'm going to re-mark it Exhibit 2026. It's U.S. Patent number 24 6,725,463 to Vince Birleson, referred to in your 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015 declaration as Birleson. 1 (Deposition Exhibit No. 2026 marked.) 2 0. (BY MR. HABER) So you'll understand when I 3 refer to Birleson, you'll understand I'm referring to 4 2026? 5 Α. Yes. 6 7 So in your declaration you offer an opinion 0. that claim 14 is unpatentable over a number of 8 references, including Birleson. Right? 9 10 Α. What page is that in my declaration? I'm looking page 52 of the '585 declaration. 11 Ο. Page 52 of the declaration '585 patent 12 which is the --13 I have it. Α. 14 0. Okay. 15 So, yes, Birleson is one of my references. Α. 16 Other than claim 14, none of your other Ο. 17 unpatentability conclusions rests on Birleson. 18 Is that right? 19 Let me check. Α. 20 I believe, for the '585, that is 21 22 correct. On claim 14 you point to Birleson as 23 0. disclosing the user selection feature of claim 14. 24 Is that right? 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

A. Correct.

1

25

2 Q. How does that user selection in Birleson 3 work?

Paragraph 80, Birleson discloses an 4 Α. automatic carry detect, ACD, circuit, that determines 5 whether the signal being processed is in the digital 6 or analog format. The signal is tested by the ACD 7 when the channel is changed or, alternatively, the ACD 8 testing can be initiated by a user causing the 9 10 selection circuit to generate the select signal. ACD can be automatic or user initiated. For example, a 11 television system may provide a function on a remote 12 control which allows the user to select the test mode. 13 In other cases, the input format may have to be 14 manually selected by the viewer. 15

Birleson provides several examples, a User-initiated generation of a standard select signal. For example, when the ACD is operating in a test mode, it either switches SIFF B -- and that's S-I-F-F B --20 109, out or leaves it in the signal path, depending on 21 whether an analog or digital signal is detected.

Q. So from what you just read, is it that the user somehow tells the ACD to try to determine that there is a new format?

MR. AYERS: Objection. Form.

Α. Well, it says, the signal is tested by the 1 ACD when the channel is changed, so that's my 2 position. That's one way. 3 (BY MR. HABER) So a user changes the 4 Q. channel? 5 The user changes the channel. Α. 6 And then that causes the ACD --7 Q. Α. To do the test. 8 To do the test. And then the result of that 9 0. test, then, will be what? 10 Well, I state in my declaration, when the 11 Α. ACD is operating in test mode, it either switches 12 SIFF B 109 out or leaves it in the signal path 13 depending on whether an analog or digital signal is 14 detected. 15 Ο. So I think I understand. So a user takes 16 some action, changes the channel, for example, and 17 that causes the ACD to enter a test mode, to test the 18 incoming format. Right? 19 Well, I read what I said. The signal is Α. 20 tested by the ACD when the channel is changed or, 21 alternatively, the ACD testing can be initiated by a 22 user, causing the selection circuit to generate the 23 test signal. That's what it does. 24 I think that's what I asked you. Okay. So 25 Q.

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1	the user does some action, changes the channel or
2	initiates a test mode, which signals the ACD to enter
3	its test and determine format. Right?
4	A. I'm going to stick with what I said. I
5	don't need it to be rephrased.
6	Q. I'm not trying to rephrase, I'm just trying
7	to understand what you said here.
8	A. Okay.
9	Q. So to get the the user takes some action,
10	and as a result of that action, the ACD will enter a
11	test mode and, essentially, sends a determine the
12	underlying format and send some signal. Right?
13	A. Let me just read the whole paragraph. There
14	are several paragraphs in the spec that address this.
15	So to understand the ACD, column three,
16	lines 18, 19, 20-ish, the IF signal path then passes
17	through the SIFFs while the ACD circuit monitors the
18	output of the SIFFs to determine whether the signal is
19	in analog or digital format. So that is what the ACD
20	is doing.
21	Q. So it's determining whether the incoming
22	signal is analog or digital?
23	A. I just read it. Let's read it again.
24	The ACD circuit monitors the outputs of
25	the SIFF to determine whether the signal is in an
-	WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015 analog or digital format. 1 So I think that is what I said. 2 0. Yes. 3 Right? Well, why -- I would only ask, why am I 4 Α. having to qualify your response --5 I'm just trying to --Ο. 6 Α. Okay. Fine. 7 -- get your opinion, based on --8 Q. Then I have to process every word you say to 9 Α. 10 make that you haven't changed something. I'm not trying to be tricky. I'm just 11 0. trying to get your opinion on what is disclosed here 12 on Birleson. 13 Α. So what is the next question? 14 The question that I have is, I'm trying to 15 Ο. understand, what is it is your opinion is with regard 16 to the ACD. What it does is sense the underlying 17 format, whether analog or digital, and send an output 18 signal, a selection signal? 19 All right. Well, I just described the SIFFs Α. 20 part. Let me find the paragraph that describes the 21 selection part. 22 23 0. Well, so just breaking it up. It does sense the underlying data format? 24 Α. Yes. 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1	Q. And then the second part was, the output.
2	A. Correct. So let me see if I can't find that
3	paragraph that talks about that.
4	Q. Okay.
5	A. So the response of the ACD detection, column
6	11, starting at 12, when ACD 30 analyzes the outputs
7	of filters 106 and 109, the signal path of tuner 10 is
8	configured for analog television. That is, SIFF B 109
9	will be selected into the signal path by switch 108.
10	Following the comparison, if the signal is determined
11	to be digital television format signal, SIFF B 109
12	will then be switched out of the signal path and
13	attenuator 110 will be selected by switch 108.
14	So that's what that's one thing the
15	ACD does.
16	Q. Where are you reading from?
17	A. Column 11, starting at line 12.
18	Q. Are there if you look at, for example,
19	Figure 1 of Birleson, are there any channel filters?
20	A. I don't know. I didn't
21	Q. Disclosed here?
22	MR. AYERS: Objection. Form.
23	A. I wasn't using Birleson for channel filters.
24	There may be.
25	Q. (BY MR. HABER) Can you look at Figure 1 and

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015 identify any channel filters? 1 Objection. MR. AYERS: Form. 2 Α. I don't know how to draw -- I wouldn't -- I 3 would have to spend some time to draw the box. 4 There are certainly components of the channel filters in the 5 ACD converters. 6 (BY MR. HABER) Well, I mean, do you have a 7 0. If you want to just draw a box around the 8 pen? channel filters? 9 Α. No, I don't -- you know, I would have to 10 spend some time, some quality time to figure out the 11 work through to make sure I got everything just right. 12 So, no. 13 So can you -- could you right now circle for Ο. 14 me channel filters on Figure 1? 15 Α. Maybe. 16 What do you mean "maybe"? 0. 17 Well, let me think about it. Let me do some 18 Α. analysis of this block diagram. 19 No, it does not contain a channel 20 filter. 21 Ο. So after reviewing Birleson for several 22 minutes, the question was, is there a channel filter 23 in Figure 1. And you said, Figure 1 does not include 24 a channel filter? 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES
Α. Correct. Figure 1 does not include the 1 channel filter. 2 MR. AYERS: Is this a good time to 3 break for lunch? 4 MR. HABER: Could we go off the record. 5 (LUNCH RECESS) 6 (BY MR. HABER) We're back from lunch. 7 Q. Α. Very good. 8 I want to turn to a page in your '585 9 0. 10 declaration. I'll get there. Α. Okay. 11 And it will be page 38. 12 Q. Go to page 40, starting at paragraph 13 63. So this paragraph 63 is addressing a portion of 14 claim 11 recited immediately above paragraph 63. 15 Right? 16 Α. I see that, yes. 17 And so is it your opinion that reference 18 Ο. referred to as Grumman discloses the claim element 19 listed above paragraph 33 -- or paragraph 63? 20 Α. Yes. 21 Q. There is a claim element, signal processor 22 indexes said memory. Can you tell me what 23 specifically -- which component in Grumman corresponds 24 to that claim element? 25

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

Α. Yeah. So there is coefficient memory in 1 bank zero and bank one, and the swap control swaps in 2 a set of coefficients -- or swaps in another set of 3 coefficients. So that is the indexing. 4 Okay. And I'm asking about, said signal 5 Ο. What in Grumman corresponds to said signal processor. 6 processor? 7 MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 8 Well, Grumman discloses the signal 9 Α. processor. You see in -- can I have back -- by the 10 way, did y'all give me Grumman? 11 (BY MR. HABER) I'll give that you right 12 Ο. now. 13 I'm going to hand you a document that 14 was previously marked Exhibit 1008. We'll mark it 15 again as Exhibit 2027, which is U.S. patent 5,381,357. 16 The assignee is the Grumman Corporation, the patent 17 that you referred to as Grumman. I'll hand that to 18 you. 19 (Deposition Exhibit No. 2027 marked.) 20 (BY MR. HABER) The question that I asked Ο. 21 was, the signal processor recited in the claim element 22 23 of claim 11, what is the signal processor of Grumman that you identify? 24 The Grumman describes a complex adaptive FIR 25 Α.

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

Г

1	filter, and so a FIR filter is a signal processor. So
2	I would say that Grumman describes the signal
3	processor.
4	Q. Okay. So just for clarification, the
5	complex adaptive filter described by the Grumman
6	patent is the said signal processor of claim 11?
7	A. Well, I'll just read all of claim 11 just to
8	make sure.
9	I am relying on Grumman just for the
10	finite impulse response filters.
11	Q. So the said signal processor here in claim
12	11, you don't find that claim element in Grumman. Is
13	that right?
14	A. I didn't
15	MR. AYERS: Objection. Form.
16	A. I didn't need it in Grumman, because it was
17	in ten and that ten has been ruled by the PTAB. So
18	I believe and I believe that that's based on
19	Thomson and Harris.
20	Q. (BY MR. HABER) Okay. So then, you rely on
21	Grumman for the finite impulse response filters of
22	claim 11. Is that right?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. I want to switch over to your declaration on
25	the '792 patent, specifically, with regard to claim

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtestas 2033-75

٦

1	18.
2	It's your opinion that claim 18 of the
3	'792 patent is unpatentable over a number of
4	references. Is that correct?
5	A. Correct.
6	Q. Can you tell me exactly what references it
7	is that you base your unpatentability conclusion on
8	claim 18 on?
9	A. I list Thomson claim 18 is obvious over
10	Thomson and Harris in view of Oku, Ericsson and
11	Nguyen.
12	Q. Earlier you testified that claim 18 of the
13	'792 patent is directed to output driver circuitry.
14	Do you recall that?
15	A. Yeah, I do recall that.
16	Q. Would you
17	A. Well, let me correct that. I think the
18	question to me was how is this different how is
19	these claims different from the '585, and I noted that
20	one of the differences was the drivers. Maybe I
21	should ask for my complete transcription on that so
22	that I know what I said. I'm not sure I said what you
23	just said I said.
24	Q. Well, so that's fine. I just wanted to
25	if you want to have it read back, that's fine.

Α. Well, I mean it's -- certainly, drivers are 1 an important element of claim 18. 2 I think that's fair. 3 0. Would you agree that one of the 4 characteristics of the output driver circuit of claim 5 18 is that it provides output on two physical pins? 6 MR. AYERS: Can I have that read back. 7 (The requested text was read back.) 8 MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 9 Α. So strictly speaking, I don't think the '792 10 uses the term "pin." I think it uses the term 11 "terminal." But let me -- so it certainly provides 12 output to two terminals. What was the specific 13 question again? Two pins you said? 14 (BY MR. HABER) I asked about pins, but you 15 Ο. say that it uses the word terminal, so let me just 16 reformat the question. 17 Does the output driver circuit of claim 18 18 provide output to two physical terminals? 19 MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 20 Yes. It says, the second driver -- it says, Α. 21 the second driver for driving the analog output 22 signals from the first digital analog converter to the 23 second driver, comprising a differential output driver 24 having a first differential output terminal and a 25

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

second differential output terminal. So that, yes, 1 certainly the second one does. And the first driver 2 provides an output on a first terminal. 3 Well, it certainly recites a first 4 differential output terminal and a second differential 5 output terminal. 6 Look at the '792 patent, Figure 2. Do you 7 0. know what is depicted here in Figure 2? 8 I understand all of those elements. Α. Yes. 9 Ο. Is claim 18 particularly directed to one of 10 the different configurations here in Figure 2? 11 I think it is. Α. 12 Which one would that be? 0. 13 I don't recall, but I'll look. Α. 14 I think it's described in 740, the 15 block 740. I think it's the claim 18 on 740. 16 And -- I mean, 740 --0. 17 I think so. I mean, I could --Α. 18 Q. No. I was actually asking another question. 19 In 740, there are two physical terminals. Right? 20 Α. Correct. Well, they're terminals. Ιt 21 doesn't describe them as physical, but, you know, if 22 you want to call them physical, I guess that could --23 it's certainly possible. 24 So 740 has two terminals? Q. 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtesta52x72033-78

Silicon v Cresta IPR2015-00626

Α. Two terminals, certainly. 1 Can you identify the two terminals in 740? 2 Ο. So claim 18 uses terminals two different Α. 3 ways, I think. A differential output terminal, which 4 would be the output of, say, 744, and then a first 5 output terminal and a second output terminal. So 6 those first and second output terminals would be 708 7 and 709. 8 What is the purpose of the first and second 9 0. 10 output terminals? MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 11 Well, the first driver, 743, drives the Α. 12 CVBS signal, which I think is -- the patent calls that 13 composite video based band signal. I think that's 14 what it is. That's what the patent says it is. And 15 the other two signal -- the other -- so that's 16 terminal 708 in one mode. Or it's one terminal of 17 DTV, low-IF signal, and then the other one is sound-IF 18 in one mode, or the other is differential output of 19 DTV in another mode. 20 What about terminal 709? 21 0. Α. Yeah, that's what I said. That's the other 22 signal that I just mentioned. It's sound-IF or DT --23 DTV low-IF. 24 So is it fair so say that the purpose of 25 Q.

these two terminals is to carry either the two analog 1 baseband signals or a differential signal 2 3 corresponding to the digital signal? The DTV low-IF, yes. Α. 4 If you will go to paragraph 77 of your 5 0. report. You mentioned a reference, Oku. I'll hand 6 that to you. I'm going to hand you what has 7 previously been marked Exhibit 1018. I'll mark it 8 again as Exhibit 2028, which is a patent publication, 9 U.S. 2002-0057366, the first named inventor is 10 Mr. Oku. 11 (Deposition Exhibit No. 2028 marked.) 12 (BY MR. HABER) And this is what you refer 0. 13 to here as Oku. Correct? 14 Α. Correct. 15 Ο. Is there any teaching in Oku of using 16 differential signaling for output? 17 MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 18 Α. I don't recall differential outputs in Oku. 19 (BY MR. HABER) So if you look at the claim 20 0. element in the bullet above paragraph 79, there is 21 a -- it recites the first differential output terminal 22 being coupled with a first output terminal and a 23 second differential output terminal being coupled to a 24 second output terminal. That claim element is not 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015 disclosed by Oku. Right? 1 I relied on a person of ordinary skill in 2 Α. 3 the art would know how to implement differential outputs as well as Kurth's reference, Exhibit 1021. 4 So you don't rely on Oku for that claim 5 0. element? 6 MR. AYERS: Objection. 7 Form. So restate the question. Α. 8 (BY MR. HABER) You don't rely on Oku to 9 0. 10 teach the first differential output terminal being coupled to the first output terminal and the second 11 differential output terminal being coupled to the 12 second output terminal? 13 Α. No, I do not. 14 Is it your opinion that differential 15 Ο. signaling, generally, is taught by Ericsson? 16 Did you give me that reference? Α. 17 I'm sorry. I'll do that. We have 18 0. previously marked Exhibit 1024. I'm going to mark it 19 again as Exhibit 2029, U.S. patent 6,411,136, 20 assignee, a long German name that ends in Ericsson. 21 Which is the patent you refer to as Ericsson, I 22 23 believe. (Deposition Exhibit No. 2029 marked.) 24 (BY MR. HABER) So my question is, in your Q. 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

opinion, differential signaling is generally disclosed in Ericsson. Right?

A. Yes. That's what is being disclosed there. I was confused with the name, why we used the name Ericsson and not the patent inventor, but anyway.

Q. Okay. So it's your opinion that this
particular claim element, the first differential
output terminal being coupled to the first output
terminal and the second differential output terminal
being coupled to the second output terminal, that is a
well-known design choice. Is that your opinion?

12

1

2

3

4

5

A. Yes.

Q. Can you identify -- point to me where specifically in Ericsson this claim element is found, the first differential output terminal being coupled to the first output terminal and the second differential output terminal being coupled to the second output terminal?

19MR. AYERS: I'm going to have to take a20break to get on that 3:00 call. Is there a question21pending?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, there is.
Can we revisit it when we come back?
MR. HABER: I think that's fair.
(RECESS.)

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES 1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtestar 2033-82

MR. HABER: Would you mind reading back
 the last question that was pending when we took a
 break.

(The requested text was read back.) 4 So the majority of this claim 18 has been 5 Α. ruled on by the board. I'm just throwing that out. 6 The terminal elements here -- basically, what I'm 7 relying on, as I say here, I said, a person of 8 ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to 9 10 use signaling, a well-known design choice, see Kerth, for example. Such a choice would provide numerous 11 advantages, including reduced interference effects or 12 noise within a circuit, increased output voltage 13 swing, ideal for low-voltage systems, integrated 14 circuits is easier to use, and reduced even-order 15 harmonics. See Karki. 16

And an example, one such example of one 17 such differential driver is disclosed in Figure 2 of 18 Ericsson. So I'm presenting Ericsson as an example of 19 a differential driver which could be used to meet the 20 claim limitations -- claim 18 of this section. 21 Different drivers were ubiquitous since I first 22 23 started designing circuits in 1978, so it's nothing unique here. 24

25

Q. So this specific connection, where you have

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtestas Ex72033-83

Silicon v Cresta IPR2015-00626

a first differential output terminal being coupled to 1 a first output terminal and a second differential 2 output terminal being coupled to a second output 3 terminal, that specific connection is not in Ericsson? 4 Α. I didn't plug Ericsson into the '792 5 circuit. 6 Q. Okay. And the '792 circuit, those specific 7 connections are not in Ericsson. Right? 8 They have terminals. They have first and 9 Α. 10 second terminals, there is drivers, there is DAC, there's differential, but we didn't wire this 11 specific -- I didn't wire this specific implementation 12 into block 740. I relied on POSITA, this is a 13 no-brainer. A person of ordinary skill in the art 14 could look at Ericsson and easily have implemented 15 what is described in that claim. 16 Okay. I think I'm asking kind of the 0. 17 reverse of that. This specific connection in this 18 claim, is that in Ericsson? 19 Two terminals? Α. 20 The specific connection here in claim 18? 21 Ο. MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 22 23 Α. That specific connection being a differential output terminal coupled to a first output 24 terminal and a differential output terminal coupled to 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

a second output terminal? There is a differential output and there is two terminals that I can identify in Ericsson.

Q. Okay. And I'm asking specifically about
this language, the first differential output terminal
being coupled to the first output terminal and the
second differential output terminals being coupled to
the second output terminal. That specific
configuration, is that in Ericsson?

A. Well, as you see, the antecedent of first output terminal is -- is -- comes from the earlier part of the claim, a first driver circuit for driving the analog output signals from the first digital analog driver to a first output terminal. That's the antecedent of the first output terminal.

The second output terminal is a second output -- a second output terminal being coupled to a second output terminal. So you're asking me to say that this is connected when I don't have all of the elements in this claim to meet the antecedent basis. So I'm confused.

22

Q.

1

2

3

So is it then --

A. Because your question stated -- and you can
read it back to confirm -- that you said, is it the
first output terminal and the second differential

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

output terminal being coupled to the second output 1 terminal, and there is no "the second output terminal" 2 in that claim. 3 Maybe I said a poor question. Let me read 4 Q. it again. 5 So it I'm looking at the last part of 6 7 the claim element discussed above paragraph 79. Ιt says, the first different output terminal being 8 coupled to the first output terminal and the second 9 10 differential output terminal being coupled to the second output terminal -- to a second output terminal. 11 Α. Thank you. 12 Is that specific configuration in Ericsson? Ο. 13 If you look at Figure 1 of Ericsson, Yeah. Α. 14 it shows a differential output amplifier. And the 15 differential outputs on the left side of R sub T would 16 be differential output terminals. And you could -- I 17 could call the right side of R sub T a first output 18 terminal of the upper R sub T, and the lower R sub T a 19 second output terminal. 20 So what you've identified here in Figure 1 21 Ο. is -- on the left side of R sub T, is a first 22 23 differential output terminal? It's a -- inverting output with a negative. 24 Α. And what you identified on the right side of 25 Q.

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtest272033-86

86

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015 R sub T is the first output terminal? 1 Α. Correct. 2 What makes what is on the right side of R 3 0. sub T an output terminal? 4 Because it's the input terminals to the 5 Α. transformer, or input terminal to the transformer, one 6 of the input terminals to the transformer. 7 So it's an output terminal because it's an 8 0. input terminal through some other component in the 9 10 system? It's an output terminal because it's an 11 Α. output, and it's a terminal just because it's a 12 terminal connection. 13 What do you mean, a terminal connection? 0. 14 It's a connection. Α. 15 0. So is any connection a terminal? 16 Α. You can pretty much say that, I think. 17 That's a very broad term. I think you were calling 18 them pins earlier. 19 When you combine Oku and Ericsson, are you Ο. 20 relying on this Figure 1 for the combination? 21 Α. Oku illustrates a number of -- a number of 22 23 things. What I showed you there is prior art. What I relied on -- the differential line driver in Ericsson 24 receives input from digital analog converter and 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

outputs a pair of current outputs. In 2:23 through 1 24, the general concept of invention may be 2 understood, Figure 2. 3 A line driver is providing with a pair 4 of current inputs, INP and INN. The line driver 5 inside the dash has a pair of current outputs which 6 are provided with termination resistors RT connected 7 to drive voltages, DDDA, and connected to transformer 8 winding with another winding, connected to a twisted 9 10 copper pair. As is apparent, there is, inside the dashed rectangle, a set of two output current 11 amplifiers, AP and ace again. 12 So in my declaration that is the 13 specific reference within Ericsson that I pointed out. 14 I just, in my comments, added the fact that it's 15 easier to understand Figure 1 than it is to understand 16 the -- it would probably be easier for you to 17 understand, so that's why I described it. And it is 18 prior art too, so... 19 Okay. And going on to paragraph 83, there 0. 20 is another claim element there. Is it your opinion 21 that this claim element is also the product of a 22 23 design choice? It's a product of a what? 24 Α. Of a design choice. Rather than some 25 Q.

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

specific --1 This claim element is in claim 13 Yeah. 2 Α. 3 which, again, was ruled on by the PTAB. Let me review this section. 4 All right. So, 83. Oku discloses a 5 second digital analog converter, DAC 16, which 6 receives processed digital output signals from the 7 signal processor. Although the output DAC 16 is 8 coupled to driving circuit 17 to drive a monitor, in 9 10 my opinion, it would have been a mere design choice to input digital signals encoding audio information into 11 a digital-to-analog converter when audio signals are 12 desired. Accordingly, it is my opinion that is 13 element is met by Oku. 14 What you're saying there is that this claim 15 0. element is mere design choice, it's not specifically 16 disclosed by Oku? 17 Α. Yes. 18 Q. The next claim element above paragraph 64 --19 actually, in paragraph 64, you mention that the first 20 and second output terminals are multiplexed or coupled 21 together or -- to either one or two. What do you 22 mean, multiplexed or coupled to? 23 I think you're on the wrong paragraph. 24 Α. I'm looking at paragraph 84. 25 Q.

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015 Α. Oh, you said 64. 1 I'm sorry. 2 0. So in paragraph 84, the first and 3 second output terminals are multiplexed or coupled to. 4 What does that mean? 5 It's -- you need a -- an explanation of Α. 6 multiplexed? 7 So I'm asking you, what does it mean Yes. 8 0. when you say here, in which the first and second 9 10 output terminals are multiplexed or coupled to either -- and then one or two? 11 It's -- it explains that in the "or" Α. 12 statement. It's coupled to either one, the first and 13 third driver circuits or the second differential 14 driver circuit. That is what it means. 15 Q. What does multiplexed mean in this sentence? 16 It means coupled to either one, the first Α. 17 and third driver circuits or the second differential, 18 one of those sets of signals coupled to the first and 19 second output terminals. 20 Okay. So what you say multiplexed or 0. 21 coupled, you're really saying, multiplexed means the 22 same as coupled? 23 Multiplexed does not mean the same as 24 Α. coupled. 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES 1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtestas Ex72033-90

Q. That's what I'm trying to get to, when you 1 say multiplexed or coupled, are you saying --2 Α. No, you need the entire phrase. The entire 3 Multiplexed or coupled to either, one, the 4 phrase. first and third driver circuits or the second 5 differential driver circuits. 6 So multiplexed or -- and then what you're --Ο. 7 this -- what you have after the "or" is kind of 8 defining what you mean by multiplexed? 9 10 Α. Yes. Sorry. I shook my head. Is there a specific reference in Oku that 11 0. shows the third driver circuit for driving the analog 12 output signals from the second digital analog 13 converter onto the second output terminal? Is that 14 specific claim element in Oku? 15 Α. So as I said, Oku discloses a third driver 16 circuit driving circuit 17, in Figure 4, for driving 17 the analog output signals from a second 18 digital-to-analog converter, DAC 16, onto the second 19 output terminal. Does that answer your question? 20 I'm not -- I don't think that did. 0. I'm 21 trying to understand if this specific configuration 22 described in this claim element, the third driver 23 circuit for driving the analog output signal from the 24 second digital analog converter onto the second output 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

terminal, that specific configuration is present in 1 Oku? 2 Α. That's what I say here. What I just read. 3 Seven -- driver 17 being driven by DAC 16. 4 And the multiplexing that you describe in 5 0. the preceding paragraph, is that multiplexing in Oku? 6 Α. Well, I try to address that as follows: Oku 7 discloses many different embodiments of output 8 circuitry, including multiple driver circuits. Look 9 10 at Figures 1, 5, 6, 7, 9 through 11. The specific configuration of output circuitry is dependent upon 11 the desired design factors. In the case of claim 18, 12 the receiver can be connected to a component that 13 receives an analog signal corresponding to an input RF 14 signal that is either analog or digital television 15 format, but not both. 16 In my opinion, a person of ordinary 17 skill in the art would naturally choose to design a 18 circuit that multiplexes the output lines connected to 19 the differential and the -- and to signal ended 20 drivers to reduce the pin count. Such multiplexing 21 architecture is shown elsewhere. 22 We haven't gotten to the next 23 reference, but this is all -- this is design choice. 24 This is all trivial. 25

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015 Ο. So in your opinion, these are design 1 choices, but that specific choice is not in Oku? 2 Α. Correct. 3 You mentioned another reference. I assume Q. 4 you're referring to the Nguyen reference? 5 Nguyen. Α. 6 And I'll hand that to you. 7 Q. So your opinion generally is that the 8 Nguyen reference discloses the general idea of 9 10 multiplexing. Let hand you what has previously been marked Exhibit 1031, U.S. patent 6,400,598 to Khai 11 That will be remarked as Exhibit 2030. Nquyen. 12 (Deposition Exhibit No. 2030 marked.) 13 0. (BY MR. HABER) So the question is, it's 14 your opinion that Nguyen generally discloses the idea 15 of multiplexing? 16 Such multiplexing architecture is Α. Yeah. 17 shown in Nguyen, which discloses driving -- a driving 18 circuit architecture that is selectively controlled by 19 control logic so that two input-output I/O pins are 20 coupled to either, one, a differential driver, element 21 600 or, two, two single-ended drivers, element 60. 22 23 Thus, it's my opinion that it would have been obvious to a POSITA to combine the analog 24 differential driver as disclosed in Ericsson with the 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

driver disclosed in Oku, using the multiplexing 1 architecture of Nguyen. 2 Okay. Just so I understand. Is it your 3 0. opinion that Nguyen actually specifically discloses 4 this claim element? Or that a POSITA designing the 5 product would -- would -- that's a poorly phrased 6 7 question. I'll withdraw that and try again. Is it your opinion that Nguyen 8 specifically discloses a third driver circuit for 9 10 driving the analog output signals from the second digital-to-analog converter onto the second output 11 terminal, or is it that a POSITA would kind of use 12 this information in the background while it's making 13 its design choices? 14 Α. Well, my position is exactly what I said 15 here, which I can read again. 16 Okay. So from what you said here, it's just 0. 17 not clear to me if it's your opinion that Nguyen 18 specifically discloses a third driver circuit for 19 driving the analog output signals from a second 20 digital-to-analog converter onto the second output 21 22 terminal? 23 Α. Nguyen is not showing the digital out -analog converter. It's showing -- and I said, 24 combining Nguyen, Ericsson, with Oku, is what we're 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-98dCtest272033-94

> Silicon v Cresta IPR2015-00626

doing here. 1 Okay. So Nguyen itself does not 2 0. 3 specifically disclose all of this claim element, a third driver circuit for driving the analog output 4 signals from the second digital-to-analog converter 5 onto the second output terminal? 6 Nguyen does not describe a digital-to-analog 7 Α. converter. 8 Okay. The next claim element is on top of 9 Ο. 10 paragraph 86. It begins, wherein -- it's a long -- do you understand this wherein clause to describe the two 11 output terminals that we discussed earlier, for 12 example, in item 740 of Figure 2? 13 Α. Yes. 14 And so is it fair to say that the purpose of 15 0. this wherein clause is to describe the feature of the 16 two output terminals where those two output terminals 17 are both used for audio signals and digital signals? 18 MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 19 Α. Could you repeat the question? 20 (The requested text was read back.) 21 MR. AYERS: Objection. Form. 22 Well, I read it exactly as it's written in 23 Α. Wherein the first and second output the claim. 24 terminals, which has antecedent basis from the earlier 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1	part of the claim, provide differential output signals
2	indicative of video and audio information encoded in
3	the input RF signal. So the "wherein" is telling me
4	something more about the output terminals.
5	Q. Now, after the semicolon there, and the
6	first output terminal provides video information
7	encoded in the input RF signal, and the second output
8	terminal provides signals indicative of audio
9	information encoded in the input RF signal when the
10	input RF signal has an analog television format.
11	Right?
12	A. Where did you you started after the
13	semicolon?
14	Q. After the semicolon, discussing the digital
15	signal format.
16	A. Okay. I find it I thought you were
17	somewhere else here. So after the semicolon, it says,
18	and the first output terminal provides video
19	information encoded, dot, dot, dot. Is that where you
20	want to talk? Okay. So
21	Q. Yeah.
22	A. So I know where you are in the claim, what
23	was the question again?
24	Q. So the question is, looking at what you have
25	here, above paragraph 86, is that describing kind of a
•	

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

high level purpose where you have two output terminals 1 and those two output terminals will either be used for 2 3 analog video format or digital video format? MR. AYERS: Objection. 4 Form. It's saying that the output terminals --5 Α. it's so clear to -- it's saying exactly what it's 6 saying. The first and second output terminals provide 7 differential output signals indicative of video and 8 audio information encoded in the input RF signal when 9 the input RF signal has a digital signal format, and 10 the first output terminal provides video information 11 encoded in the RF signal and the second output 12 terminal provides signals indicative of audio 13 information encoded in the input RF signal when the 14 input RF signal is analog television format. That's 15 so clear to me. 16 0. Okay. 17 It says -- it does exactly what this is Α. 18 saying. I understand it. So what is the question? 19 Okay. So what I'm trying to understand is 0. 20 the -- I think earlier you testified that what is 21 depicted here in Figure 2, 740, is an embodiment of 22 claim 18. Right? 23 Figure 2 of what? 24 Α. Figure 2 of the '792 patent. 25 Q.

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

Α. Okay. Yeah, I think I identified block --1 the -- it's got block 740 in it. 2 And then block 740 has these two output 3 Ο. terminals, 708 and 709? 4 Α. Correct. 5 And so what I'm trying to understand is, 0. 6 what we're getting at here, the purpose of this 7 wherein clause is to cover this feature where you have 8 these two output terminals that will either contain 9 10 the analog formatted data or the digital formatted data? 11 Α. I agree. 12 The -- is there -- strike that. Q. 13 Does Oku disclose that underlying 14 purpose anywhere? 15 Α. If you're asking me, does Oku teach the 16 multiplexing of the output signals for analog and 17 digital, I think I already answered that question, 18 didn't I? 19 What was the answer? 0. 20 Well, let's see what it was. You asked Α. 21 22 somewhere back about, does Oku teach multiplexing or something, so let's find that and see what I said. 23 I'm not sure I asked that exact question, so 24 Ο. I'll just -- I'll ask it again. 25

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1	Does Oku teach the the two terminal
2	purpose that we discussed for or this wherein
3	clause of claim 18?
4	A. Oku does not teach the multiplexing of the
5	digital TV differential output on the same terminals
6	as the analog video and audio outputs.
7	Q. Okay.
8	A. That multiplexing is covered by the other
9	references.
10	Q. Okay.
11	A. And taught and understood by a POSITA. It's
12	trivial.
13	Q. Does Ericsson teach the underlying purpose
14	of the wherein clause here where we have two output
15	terminals, digital and analog, on the same terminal?
16	A. Pardon me while I find Ericsson.
17	Q. I think it should say 1024 on the cover.
18	A. Oh, okay. This is Ericsson. It's right in
19	front of me. My wife informs me of that problem
20	regularly. Anyway, what is the question?
21	Q. So the question is, does Ericsson teach
22	the the purpose of the wherein clause here, where
23	you have two output terminals that have analog or
24	digital on the same terminal?
25	MR. AYERS: Objection. Form.

de822c66-d309-463f-98dCresta5Ex72033-99

1	A. Ericsson teaches a differential line driver.
2	It doesn't teach multiplexing. A POSITA would combine
3	Ericsson, as I earlier stated.
4	Q. (BY MR. HABER) And does the Nguyen
5	reference teach this basic purpose of the wherein
6	clause, where you have two output terminals, the same
7	two output terminals that contain analog or digital?
8	A. Analog or digital television signals?
9	Q. Yes.
10	A. Nguyen doesn't teach television signals, I
11	don't think, but let me check.
12	Since it's Alterra, and Alterra makes
13	FPGAs, they very well could be used in televisions,
14	and most likely are.
15	So Ericsson or sorry Nguyen,
16	teaches the multiplexing, but it doesn't teach analog
17	or digital television, as far as I can I did a
18	quick search. I didn't see it.
19	Q. I wanted to talk about claim 19 for a
20	second. Page 57, you start talking about claim 19.
21	Claim 19 recites a low-pass filter coupled between the
22	first digital-to-analog converter and the first and
23	second driver circuits, the low-pass filter the
24	low-pass filter providing a low-pass filtering
25	function. Is the low-pass filter configuration of

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-9@74547 22033-100

Silicon v Cresta IPR2015-00626

claim 19 disclosed in Oku? 1 So first of all, claim 19 depends on 18. 2 Α. 3 And it appears to be identical to claim 16, depending on 13, both which were ruled on by the patent board. 4 What I said here in my report, simply including a 5 low-pass filter at the output of a digital-to-analog 6 converter is a mere design choice based upon the 7 properties of the DAC and downstream circuitry. A 8 low-pass filter smooths out waveforms, reduces and 9 10 eliminates high frequency noise which may be introduced by the electronic circuitry, including the 11 DAC. Such high frequency noise may result in unwanted 12 EM radiation. Because EM radiation of consumer 13 electronics is highly regulated, a POSITA would be 14 motivated to use a low-pass filter at the output and 15 reduce this possibility. The design choice is within 16 the skill of a POSITA and would lead to predictable 17 results. It's in my opinion that it would be obvious 18 to anyone of ordinary skill in the art to provide 19 low-pass filtering of a baseband signal for 20 attenuation of unwanted frequencies being output by 21 baseband audio and video. 22 I relied upon POSITA for that claim 23 24

element that was ruled on previously by the patent board.

25

1	Q. So when you say
2	MR. HABER: Why don't we take a a
3	break. We've been going for about an hour.
4	(RECESS.)
5	Q. (BY MR. HABER) I want to talk a little bit
6	more about claim 18 of the '792 patent. And you offer
7	opinions regarding, essentially, reasons for
8	combinability of the prior art references. Right?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. And those reasons are integrated here in
11	your discussion of claim 18; they're not found
12	elsewhere in the report?
13	A. I don't think so. So you're asking me the
14	reasons for that I used for combining Thomson,
15	Harris, in view of Oku, Ericsson and Nguyen are
16	contained in paragraphs 76 and follows? Yes. The way
17	I wrote this, I wouldn't have put my arguments for
18	those elsewhere, I don't think.
19	Q. Okay. So what I want to do is discuss those
20	reasons, and I just want to make sure that I'm in the
21	right section of the report.
22	A. Okay.
23	Q. If you go to paragraph 79, at the bottom of
24	that paragraph, there is a sentence, Such a choice
25	would provide numerous advantages. Do you see that?

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

Yeah, I see that. Is that sentence an explanation of the

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015

Q. Is that sentence an explanation of the reasons for combinability of Ericsson and Oku regarding this claim element?

Α.

1

2

3

4

A. I'm simply saying what the benefits ofdifferential signaling are.

Q. And those benefits of differential signaling, that would be the reason why a POSITA would combine the prior art reference as you described?

10 A. That would at least be some of the reasons11 he might do that, yes.

12 Q. Are there any other reasons described in13 your declaration regarding this claim element?

A. So I don't remember where I said it, but I
think I said it, if something you were driving needed
a differential input, you would need to provide it.
So, I mean, that would be another reason why a POSITA
would do that.

Q. And if you needed to implement the system
described in Oku, for example, with a differential
output for these reasons here, would that increase the
cost of the Oku system?

A. You know, I haven't really considered a cost
analysis of the Oku system, so I don't know that I
have -- I don't have an answer to that.

0. Would implementing a differential circuit 1 for the reasons that you describe here in Oku, for 2 example, increase the complexity of that system? 3 Complexity in what way? Α. 4 Well, did you consider whether implementing 5 Ο. a differential output circuit in Oku, for example, 6 would increase the complexity of the system? 7 So you're asking, would adding a 8 Α. differential output circuit to Oku increase its 9 10 complexity? Yes. Well, first, my initial question was, 11 0. did you -- in performing your analysis, did you 12 consider that question? 13 I don't recall whether I did or not. Α. But 14 the -- I may well have, I just don't recall. Okay. 15 So that's the answer to your first question, I don't 16 know. 17 Okay. And then --0. 18 Α. The second question. 19 -- the second question is, would 20 Ο. implementing a differential output circuit in Oku 21 increase its complexity? 22 I have implemented differential output Α. 23 circuits on a number of occasions on circuits that 24 I've designed, both ECL -- pseudo ECL output circuits 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1	and analog differential output circuits, and I don't
2	recall that complexity was an issue that determined my
3	choice of doing it or not. It was more driven by the
4	needs of the solution, the overall solution.
5	Q. So the initial question is, does
6	implementing a differential driver circuit increase
7	the complexity of the system in which you're
8	implementing it?
9	A. You mean, more transistors? Is that what
10	you mean by complexity?
11	Q. Do you have a particular meaning for
12	complexity?
13	A. No. I'm trying to answer your question. I
14	need you to tell me how you construe it so I can
15	answer your question.
16	Q. Is an increased number of transistors more
17	complex?
18	A. A differential driver could possibly have a
19	few more transistors, yes.
20	Q. Would implementing such a differential
21	driver, for example, in Oku, would that increase the
22	complexity of the system?
23	A. As I said, if I added a differential driver
24	that was not there, certainly I would be adding
25	transistors. And if you're saying, adding transistors

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

is adding complexity, then it would add complexity by 1 virtue of adding transistors. 2 I'm not trying to limit the definition to 3 Ο. adding transistors. I'm just -- in your opinion, 4 would that make the system more complex? 5 Well, complexity can be understood on many Α. 6 different levels. The complexity of the user to use 7 the device, the complexity of the test platform to 8 test the product before it goes out the door. 9 0. That's fair. 10 There are so many -- it's on so many levels. 11 Α. And well, let's consider the level of a Q. 12 Would a POSITA consider implementing a POSITA. 13 differential output circuit in Oku, for example, to --14 15 Α. He would not look at that and say, that's a complex problem, no. He would just do it and be done 16 in a couple of days. It's trivial. 17 The numerous advantages here that you list 18 0. at the end of paragraph 79, that sentence doesn't 19 include a citation to Oku or Ericsson or Nguyen, for 20 example. Are you relying on either of those three 21 references to support this sentence? 22 Α. All right. The previous sentence says, 23 because digital television circuits frequently use 24 differential inputs, it is my opinion -- yeah, that's 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

Г

1	what I had written earlier that I was referring to.
2	Sorry. It is my opinion that a person of ordinary
3	skill in the art would have been motived to use
4	differential signaling, a well-known choice. Such a
5	choice would provide numerous advantages. So such a
6	choice, that whole that whole sentence, an
7	antecedent basis for such a choice is the previous
8	sentence, the well-known design choice, which cites
9	Kerth, for example.
10	And then so all this is in
11	solving these problems, a POSITA would naturally do
12	this, and it offers many advantages. And here are
13	some of them.
14	Q. Okay. But what you have here, these
15	advantages specifically, you're not getting from Oku
16	or Ericsson or Nguyen?
17	A. I suspect that Ericsson mentions some of
18	these advantages. I don't know that Oku does. But
19	these are these are POSITA knows these
20	advantages; I know these advantages. Just because
20 21	advantages; I know these advantages. Just because these are fundamental principles that you learn in
20 21 22	advantages; I know these advantages. Just because these are fundamental principles that you learn in you know, generally before you get out of college with
 20 21 22 23 	advantages; I know these advantages. Just because these are fundamental principles that you learn in you know, generally before you get out of college with a E.E. degree.
 20 21 22 23 24 	<pre>advantages; I know these advantages. Just because these are fundamental principles that you learn in you know, generally before you get out of college with a E.E. degree. Q. Okay. So fair enough. With the background</pre>

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1 advantages without --

A. Certainly a POSITA in our case is a Master's
degree with four years of -- you know, experience
doing mixed signal system design, yes, he would know
this.

Q. And he wouldn't need to get those specific7 teachings from Oku, Ericsson, Nguyen?

He knows this is fundamental in the way he, 8 Α. you know, works on a day-to-day basis, yes. Knowing 9 10 those things are his bread and butter so to speak. In fact, all of these output schemes would be well within 11 POSITA, just because they're all straightforward 12 It's no -- they're all straightforward. schemes. 13

Q. Okay. So it's your opinion, then, that all of the output schemes described in claim 18 are within the level of skill of a POSITA without reference to Oku, Ericsson, or Nguyen?

I'm simply saying that a -- a person with a 18 Α. Master's degree in electrical engineering with four 19 years experience in mixed signal design, when 20 confronted with needing a differential output, would 21 know how to solve that. When confronted with needing 22 a single signal output, would know how to solve that. 23 When confronted with needing to multiplex those two 24 outputs onto same signals, would know that. This is 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES
what he knows. 1 This is buttressed by the fact that we 2 can use actual art in the -- in terms of Oku, et al, 3 to support that these are demonstrated examples. 4 You know, look on paragraph 85. There is a 5 0. sentence towards the end of the page, In my opinion, a 6 person of ordinary skill in the art would naturally 7 choose to design a circuit that multiplexes the output 8 lines connected to a differential and two single-ended 9 10 drivers to reduce pin count. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Α. 11 What in Ericsson, Nguyen, or Oku Ο. 12 specifically discusses reducing pin count? 13 I don't recall them discussing reducing pin Α. 14 count, but let me look at Ericsson just in case. 15 In Nguyen -- let me look at Nguyen for 16 a minute. 17 Okay. So the Nguyen reference that's 18 Exhibit 2030, Exhibit 1031, under Summary of 19 Invention, column one, starting at line 45. It says, 20 these and other objects of the invention are 21 accomplished in accordance with principles of one 22 aspect of the invention by providing PLDs with 23 input/output, I/O, pins that are connected in parallel 24 to several different kinds of input and/or output 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-907egt存在经2033-109

Г

1	buffers, including LVDS input and/or output buffers.
2	The PLD is programmable to allow any of the input
3	and/or output buffers to which an I/O pin is connected
4	to be used. This allows the PLD to provide LVDS
5	capabilities, if that is what is desired, without
6	having to dedicate I/O pins to that particular type of
7	use. Because an LVDS connection requires a pair of
8	I/O pins, while many other signaling protocols require
9	only one I/O pin per connection, the PLD circuitry is
10	programmable to allow I/O pins to be used in pairs for
11	LVDS or individually for other types of signaling.
12	So in that paragraph, one of the
13	sentences I read says, this allows the PLD to provide
14	LVDS capabilities, if that is what is desired, without
15	having to dedicate I/O pins to a particular type of
16	use. While that doesn't say, conserve pins, it does
17	say that if you had to dedicate certain pins to
18	something and you still needed the other
19	functionality, you would need more pins. So the
20	technique does save pins. Or, I guess, the term I
21	used here was to reduce pin count. Because if you had
22	all of that functionality outputted to the pins, you
23	wouldn't you would need more pins. So by
24	multiplexing, you save pins.
25	Q. And in your opinion, saving pins is the same

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-9@74547 Ex2033-110

as reducing pin count? 1 It's a -- let me just restate that. 2 Α. By doing this technique, you can reduce 3 pin count. 4 Is the Nguyen reference directed to the 5 Ο. field of television receivers? 6 I believe you already asked that question, 7 Α. and I think I already answered it. 8 I'm not sure that I asked it, so I'll just 9 0. 10 ask it again --And I said something to the effect that this 11 Α. is an FPGA and it could very well have been used for 12 television applications. But I did not notice the 13 mention of television in the patent, so I said -- I 14 think I said something very similar to that. 15 What you have listed here in Ο. Okay. 16 paragraph 85, is this paragraph 85 where you list the 17 reasons that you combine Ericsson and Oku and Nguyen 18 to reach the claim element that you list above in 19 paragraph 84? 20 Yeah. I think -- also, I mentioned this, Α. 21 the claim -- this element is in claim 13, which was 22 ruled on by the PTAB. So the discussion in 84 and 23 85 -- yeah, paragraph 85 is discussing that claim 24 element above, paragraph 84. 25

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015

IPR2015-00626

1

Q. And it's discussing it specifically with regard to reasonings for combinability?

A. Yeah. It discloses Oku and Nguyen and POSITA, making the argument also with respect to Ericsson, I believe.

Q. And this sentence here at the bottom that
discusses multiplexing the output lines connected to
the differential and two single-ended drivers to
reduce pin count, if that particular approach was
taken to implement the systems described by Nguyen and
Oku, for example, would that -- did you consider
whether that would increase the cost of the Oku
system?

14

A. I didn't analyze the cost of the Oku system.

Q. And did you consider whether implementing a circuit that multiplexes the output lines in Oku, as you describe here, did you consider whether that would increase the complexity of the Oku system?

A. I would say this, back to the cost.
Whenever you reduce pin count, you reduce the cost.
So whenever you're able to multiplex pins, you're
saving money. And so then the complexity question?
What was the complexity question? Did it -- well, you
state the question.

25

Q. Did you consider whether implementing the

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-9@745487E22033-112

1	system you describe here that multiplexes the output
2	lines would increase the complexity of the Oku system?
3	A. No. But I don't think it would have any
4	I don't know what you you mean by complexity, but
5	it would be fairly trivial. It wouldn't be a complex
6	problem in any way.
7	Q. I think in your answer to my previous
8	question, you said that any time you reduce pin
9	counts, you reduce costs?
10	A. Pins when you calculate the cost of an
11	integrated circuit, part of the cost is the package,
12	and the package cost is, in part, a function of the
13	number of pins. So more pins, more cost.
14	Q. So if you were to take a single strike
15	that.
16	If you were to take a driver circuit
17	from Oku that has a single output and include a
18	differential output on that driver circuit, you would
19	increase the number of pins, wouldn't you?
20	A. Not if they're multiplexed.
21	Q. What is described in Oku doesn't describe a
22	multiplexed system. Right?
23	A. You're asking me, if I were to add a
24	differential driver onto Oku, what would POSITA do.
25	You would multiplex the pins.

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-9@7454772033-113

1	Q. And in your opinion, then, the system in Oku
2	can be multiplexed, as you've described?
3	A. Yeah. I'm not going to I can't redesign
4	Oku on the fly here, so I'm not a hundred percent
5	certain that that you can just drop the
6	differential driver multiplexed on the Oku. But in
7	general, to solve this kind of problem, you would
8	consider multiplexing the outputs when they're
9	they're not used when they perform different
10	functions that are not occurring at the same time.
11	It's a very common design technique for system design,
12	and I've done it myself.
13	Q. And the assumption that you're making is
14	that the system is performing different tasks that are
15	not happening at the same time. Right?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. Would you go to paragraph 86. The last
18	sentence of paragraph 86 discusses outputs the
19	outputs are normally mutually exclusive. Do you see
20	that?
21	A. The sentence that starts with, It is my
22	opinion?
23	Q. Yes.
24	A. I'll just read it so we're all on the same
25	page.

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

It's my opinion that such a 1 multiplexing scheme would have been an obvious design 2 choice to a POSITA because the outputs are mutually 3 exclusive. 4 0. If the outputs were not mutually exclusive, 5 would the multiplexing scheme that you discuss here, 6 would that have worked differently? 7 Yes, they would work differently. 8 Α. For clarification, just to make sure I 9 10 understand what you meant, because maybe I don't understand what you mean by "work differently." Can 11 you tell me what that means so I can amend my answer 12 in case it means something different than what I 13 thought you meant? 14 Okay. I think -- I don't mean anything in 15 Ο. particular. 16 Okay. Well, it'll work differently or it Α. 17 won't work or it'll work better, it will do something. 18 It'll be different, that's for sure. 19 And what you said is, it'll work Ο. Okay. 20 differently. It might not work, it'll do something --21 Α. It all depends on the design, what you're 22 trying to achieve. 23 And if we have a system where the outputs 24 0. are not mutually exclusive, just sitting here right 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-9@745487E22033-115

now, can you predict exactly what would happen? 1 My first sense is that if they're not Α. 2 mutually exclusive, they're probably not going to work 3 if you're trying to -- unless you -- you know, there 4 is ways to do it within the time domain, but I'm not 5 going to get into that. You know, for a moment in 6 time they would be mutually exclusive. 7 Okay. If -- if you look at paragraph 88, 8 0. the last sentence you have there starts with, To 9 10 reduce the number of input/output pins. Α. Okay. I see it. 11 This function you have here, selectively 0. 12 couple either differential drivers or two single-ended 13 drivers to upward lines, would that increase the 14 complexity of the system in which you were taking that 15 approach? 16 It's not a complex problem to solve. Α. 17 If you look at paragraph 90, there is a 18 0. sentence in the middle that talks about, the design 19 choice referenced in paragraph 90 is within the skill 20 of a POSITA and would lead to predictable results. 21 Do you see that sentence? 22 That starts with, The particular 23 Α. Yes. configuration? 24 I'm looking at the sentence that starts 25 Q.

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-9@74547522033-116

with, This design choice is within the skill of a 1 POSITA and would lead to predictable results. 2 In paragraph 90. 3 Α. Paragraph which? 4 90. 0. 5 Oh, okay. I found it. And that's in Α. 6 reference to including a low-pass filter? 7 So that was going to be my question. When 8 0. you say "this design choice," what design choice are 9 10 you referring to? The low-pass filter. 11 Α. What about the low-pass filter? 0. 12 I said, This design choice is well within Α. 13 the skill of a POSITA and would lead to predictable 14 results. 15 So I don't -- can you rephrase your 16 question? 17 It's just not clear to me when you say "this 0. 18 design choice." What design choice exactly is it --19 Α. To put a low-pass filter on the output of 20 the digital-analog converter. 21 Q. And the reason that you list here for 22 23 including a low-pass filter on that output is what? I'll just read the whole paragraph. 24 Α. Including a low-pass filter at the 25

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-9@745487E22033-117

1	output of a digital-analog converter is a mere design
2	choice based upon the properties of the DAC and
3	downstream circuitry. A low-pass filter smooths out
4	waveforms and reduces or eliminates high frequency
5	noise which may be introduced by the electronic
6	circuitry, including the DAC. Such high frequency
7	noise may result in unwanted EM radiation. Because EM
8	radiation of consumer electronics is highly regulated,
9	a POSITA would be motivated to use a low-pass filter
10	at the output and reduce this possibility. This
11	design choice is well within the skill of a POSITA and
12	would lead to predictable results.
13	Q. And so you're referring to here, adding in a
14	low-pass filter smooths out the waveform and reduces
15	EM, et cetera?
16	A. Yes. The design choice is the including a
17	low-pass filter at the output of a digital-analog
18	converter is a mere design choice. And then that's
19	the antecedent of "this design choice."
20	Q. Are there any reasons discussed in your
21	declaration here for including the low-pass filter as

22 a design choice, in addition to what you list here,

23 | two sentences before that?

A. Did I say anything about it anywhere else?Is that what you're asking me? I don't recall.

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-9@74547 Ex 2033-118

Silicon v Cresta IPR2015-00626

1	Q. Yes. So that I'm asking if you offer any
2	additional reasons besides what you list here in
3	paragraph 90?
4	A. So you asked me if I offered any additional
5	reasons elsewhere in my declaration? Or are you
6	asking me, do I have any new ones that I'll introduce
7	now? What are you asking me?
8	Q. I'm asking you about your declarations.
9	A. Yeah. I don't recall. This is the only
10	ones I recall entering, but there may be something
11	else. We can read it and find out.
12	Q. I think
13	A. I don't think you want to do that.
14	Q. The would adding a low-pass filter, for
15	example, to the system described in Oku, for these
16	reasons here you discuss in paragraph 90, would that
17	increase the cost of the Oku system?
18	A. Yeah. It an example of a low-pass filter
19	is a resistor and a capacitor, and so that would
20	increase the cost.
21	Q. And would that increase the complexity of
22	the Oku system?
23	A. It would add two more insertions into the
24	if it were discrete devices, into the PC board. If it
25	was integrated, it wouldn't even be it wouldn't add

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-9@74547522033-119

any real complexity. It would add another wire, add some area for the capacitor. It's not a complex issue 2 to me. 3

1

25

And so the question that I'm asking about 4 0. complexity, it's not about how easy or difficult it 5 would be to design, it's whether or not the end 6 circuit would be more complex? 7

You know, for me, complexity is a -- is a 8 Α. high bar. It's a lot higher bar than adding a 9 10 resistor and a capacitor. That's not adding complexity. So, no, adding a resistor and a capacitor 11 does not add complexity in the way I think about 12 complexity. 13

I want to introduce another exhibit that's 0. 14 not been previously marked, so we will mark it as 15 Exhibit 2031. 16

(Deposition Exhibit No. 2031 marked.) 17 (BY MR. HABER) Exhibit 2031 is a document 0. 18 entitled, Rebuttal expert report of Douglas Holberg, 19 Ph.D. regarding validity. 20

Are you familiar with this document? 21 Α. Yes, I think so. I mean, I don't know if 22 23 you printed the whole thing out, but... 24

And what is this document? Ο.

This is -- this is a rebuttal to the Α.

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-9@7esta7Ex2033-120

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015 validity report submitted from CrestaTech. 1 And you drafted this document? 2 0. Α. Yeah, I did. 3 Just sitting here right now, do you have any Q. 4 reason to believe that this is not an accurate copy? 5 There is no -- I mean, it's 71 pages. Α. No. 6 As I recall, that's how long it was. 7 This document contains some of your validity 8 Q. opinions. Correct? 9 10 Α. Yes. And this document contains an explanation 11 0. for the various validity opinions that you list? 12 Α. Yes. 13 Sitting here today, is there anything about 0. 14 the statements that you made in this rebuttal expert 15 report that you would like to change? 16 Maybe. Point me to some. Α. 17 I'm just asking, off the top of your head, 18 0. is there anything --19 No. Offhand, no. Α. 20 So you believe the statements made in this 21 Ο. report are accurate? 22 Α. I believe they are. 23 And when you were making these statements, 24 0. you were testifying truthfully? 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-9@74547EX2033-121

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015 Α. Yes. 1 And the methodology that you used in 2 Ο. performing your validity analysis, you believe that's 3 a reliable methodology? 4 Α. 5 Yes. MR. HABER: I think at this point we 6 can pass the witness. 7 MR. AYERS: I am going to have some 8 follow-up questions, but can I request a copy of the 9 expert report of Mr. Murgulescu to which this responds 10 since you've introduced this as an exhibit? Do you 11 have a copy of that? 12 MR. HABER: I don't have a copy. 13 MR. AYERS: Well, we'd ask that that be 14 produced to us as -- under optional completeness or 15 possibly as inconsistent with the position you may be 16 taking in this case and --17 MR. HABER: We'll consider that. 18 MR. AYERS: Thank you. 19 Why don't we go off the record, then, 20 and just give us a few minutes and we'll come back and 21 I'll do my redirect. 22 MR. FLEMING: Peter, are you aware that 23 the board has changed their policy about talking with 24 the witness? 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-9@745487E22033-122

MR. AYERS: On redirect? 1 MR. FLEMING: Yes. 2 MR. AYERS: Okay. Well, you can ask 3 him whatever you want on --4 5 MR. FLEMING: Are you aware that you're -- you cannot coach the witness? 6 7 MR. AYERS: I'm not going to coach him. You can -- you can ask him about whatever we discuss. 8 9 (RECESS.) EXAMINATION 10 BY MR. AYERS: 11 Doctor Holberg, I just have a few follow-up 12 0. questions for you. 13 Can I have you turn to the '792 patent, 14 please. 15 Α. Okay. 16 And, in particular, have you turn to claim 17 Ο. 26 of that patent on column 14. 18 Α. Okay. 19 And you were asked some questions by patent 20 0. holder's counsel about the format/standard selection 21 circuit of claim 26? 22 Α. Correct. 23 And claim 28 depends from claim 26. Is that 24 Ο. right? 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-9@74547722033-123

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015 Α. Correct. 1 And it further clarifies the format/standard 2 0. selection circuit of claim 26. Correct? 3 MR. HABER: Objection. Leading. 4 (BY MR. AYERS) You may answer. 5 Q. Yes, it does. Α. 6 7 And claim 28, in particular, recites, Q. wherein the format/standard selection circuit 8 generates the select signal by detecting carrier 9 10 signals, identified one of the formats of the input RF signals? 11 Α. Yes. 12 And in your opinion, does the Zenith sync 0. 13 detector satisfy that limitation of claim 28? 14 MR. HABER: Objection. Leading. 15 Α. Yes. 16 MR. AYERS: What was your objection? 17 MR. HABER: Leading. 18 Q. (BY MR. AYERS) Could I have you turn to 19 Zenith, which is -- Exhibit 1015. Oh, no, I'm sorry. 20 Exhibit --21 Α. 1011. 22 23 0. Yes. Thank you. Do you have that? 24 Yeah, I do. Α. 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-9@745457E22033-124

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015 Q. And, in particular, Figure 2 of Zenith? 1 Α. I've got it. 2 You've got that? And you were asked some 3 Ο. questions about this figure earlier in your 4 deposition. Do you recall that? 5 Α. I do. 6 Okay. And I don't want to put words in your 7 0. mouth, but it seemed like there was some -- some 8 questions around whether or not the sync detector in 9 10 20 detects -- generates the select signal by detecting carrier signals. Do you recall that? 11 MR. HABER: Objection. Leading. 12 I do. Α. 13 (BY MR. AYERS) And is it your opinion that 0. 14 the sync detector 20 of Zenith generates a select 15 signal by detecting carrier signals, identified one of 16 the formats of the input RF signal? 17 I do. Α. 18 MR. HABER: Objection. Leading. 19 (BY MR. AYERS) And I think that the Ο. 20 implication, at least from the question as I 21 understood it, was that the output of the analog 22 demodulator 16 of Zenith doesn't contain a carrier 23 signal because the transmission modulation has been 24 removed. Okay? Do you -- if that was the 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-9@745487E22033-125

1 implication, do you agree with that? Objection. MR. HABER: 2 0. (BY MR. AYERS) That a signal that has had 3 the transmission modulation removed by an analog 4 demodulator doesn't contain carrier signals? 5 MR. HABER: Objection. Leading. 6 7 Compound. I think it's somewhere in one of these. Α. 8 0. (BY MR. AYERS) And what are you referring 9 10 to? That talks about that particular function in Α. 11 the -- either the '792 or '585. 12 Let me have you turn to column five of the 13 0. '585 patent. See if this is what you're referring to. 14 Α. Okay. 15 Could I have you read the sentence starting Ο. 16 at line 12, beginning, In the present embodiment? 17 Yeah. In the present embodiment, auto Α. 18 detection is implemented by detecting in the baseband 19 signals the presence or absence of carrier signals, 20 which uniquely identify the television standards. 21 So in this sense, carrier signals 22 23 take -- is talking about carrying the sync signals, the -- the video signals. It's not referring to 24 transmission carrier. 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-9@74547522033-126

1	Q. Okay. And let me have you turn to Figure 2
2	of the '585 patent. Do you is there a standard
3	selection circuit shown in Figure 2 of the '585
4	patent?
5	A. Yeah, it's block 68.
6	Q. And where is that standard selection circuit
7	relative to the demodulators 66 in Figure 2?
8	A. It comes out of the the demodulator
9	provide an output that goes into the standard
10	selection circuit.
11	Q. So is the standard selection circuit
12	downstream of the demodulators?
13	MR. HABER: Objection. Leading.
14	A. Yes. Essentially.
15	Q. (BY MR. AYERS) And does that standard
16	selection circuit generate the standard selection
17	signal using the baseband signals that have had the
18	transmission modulation removed?
19	MR. HABER: Objection. Leading.
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. (BY MR. AYERS) And did that figure in the
22	corresponding description in column five help inform
23	your opinion that the sync detector 20 of Zenith
24	satisfies the limitation of claim 28 of the '792
25	patent?

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES 1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-9@765t97E&2033-127

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. Let me ask you one other question about
3	Zenith.
4	You were asked some questions about
5	whether Zenith describes a signal processor. Could I
6	have you take a look at the microprocessor 22 in
7	Zenith.
8	A. Okay.
9	Q. And in your opinion, does would that
10	microprocessor satisfy the board's construction of a
11	signal processor?
12	MR. HABER: Objection. Leading.
13	A. Again, let me refer back to the board's
14	construction.
15	It's a digital module that process
16	signals in the digital domain, and that's what a
17	microprocessor does.
18	MR. AYERS: Thank you. I have no
19	further questions.
20	Well, actually I do have one more.
21	Q. (BY MR. AYERS) During the break, did I in
22	any way suggest the answers to you for the questions
23	that I've just posed to you?
24	A. No.
25	MR. AYERS: Thank you.

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-9@74547 22033-128

1		MR. HABER: I do have just a few
2	follow-up	questions.
3		FURTHER EXAMINATION
4	BY MR. HAN	3ER:
5	Q.	When we went on break after your cross
6	examinatio	on, we broke for about ten minutes. Did you
7	speak with	n counsel regarding the testimony you have
8	given?	
9	Α.	Do what now?
10	Q.	Did you speak with counsel
11	Α.	When? Just now?
12	Q.	When we went on break after your cross
13	examinatio	on period ended, we were on break for about
14	ten minute	25.
15	Α.	When we left the room and then came back?
16	Q.	Yes.
17	Α.	No, he didn't talk about my what he
18	talked abo	out was the questions that he was going to
19	ask me.	
20	Q.	So you spoke with counsel about the
21	questions	that he was going to ask you?
22	Α.	Correct.
23	Q.	He told you in advance the questions that he
24	would ask	you?
25	Α.	Yeah, he told me the questions.

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-9@74549722033-129

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015 Ο. Did you identify specific answers that you 1 were going to give to those questions? 2 Α. No, I did not. 3 Can you tell me everything that you spoke Q. 4 about when you were on break? 5 That was it. What you just said. Α. 6 And how long would you say you spoke 7 Q. regarding the questions that counsel was going to ask 8 you for redirect? 9 Α. Oh, well, the ten minutes. And he was off 10 trying to get the printer to work and I was in the 11 restroom, so we were only talking for four minutes --12 three -- three or four minutes. 13 And all of the questions that he said he was Ο. 14 going to ask you, did he end up asking you those 15 questions? 16 Α. No. 17 What other questions did he say he was going 18 0. to ask you --19 I don't remember. But I said, you don't Α. 20 need to ask that question. 21 Q. Why not? 22 Α. Because I think my -- it was clear -- that 23 part of my testimony was clear and didn't need 24 clarification. 25

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-9@705467 EX2033-130

1	Q. So you in determining the questions that
2	you were going to be asked, counsel asked which
3	questions you thought would be appropriate?
4	A. No, he did not. He said, I'm here is the
5	questions I'm going to ask. And I said, you don't
6	need to ask that question. I don't need to answer
7	that question.
8	Q. So there were certain questions that he
9	wanted to ask you that you told him not to ask you?
10	A. I said I wasn't going to answer those
11	questions.
12	MR. HABER: I have no further questions
13	at this time.
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-9@7esta Ex2033-131

1	CHANGES AND CORRECTIONS
2	DOUGLAS HOLBERG, Ph.D November 4, 2015 VOLUME 1
3	[DISREGARD IF WAIVED]
4	
5	conform to the facts; (3) to correct a transcription
6	PAGE/LINE CHANGE REASON CODE
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-9@7454# Ex2033-132

> Silicon v Cresta IPR2015-00626

1	SIGNATURE
2	
3	I, DOUGLAS HOLBERG, Ph.D., have read the
4	foregoing deposition and hereby affix my signature
5	that same is true and correct, except as noted above.
6	
7	
8	DOUGLAS HOLBERG, Ph.D.
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES 1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-9@765ta7EX2033-133

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE 1 BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD 2 3 SILICON LABORATORIES, § § INC., 4 [0] [0] [0] Petitioner, 5 § 6 § § 7 § § CASE IPR2015-00615 8 § Patent 7,075,585 VS. 9 § CASE IPR2015-00626 § § Patent 7,265,792 10 § § 11 CRESTA TECHNOLOGY § CORPORATION, § 12 Patent Owner. 8 13 14 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION ORAL DEPOSITION OF 15 DOUGLAS HOLBERG, Ph.D. VOLUME 1 16 November 4, 2015 * 17 I, BRENDA J. WRIGHT, Certified Shorthand 18 Reporter in and for the State of Texas, hereby certify 19 to the following: 20 That the witness, DOUGLAS HOLBERG, Ph.D., was 21 duly sworn by the officer and that the transcript of 22 the oral deposition is a true record of the testimony 23 24 given by the witness; I further certify that the signature of the 25

Douglas Holberg, Ph.D. - 11/4/2015

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-907egt有 在来2033-134

1	deponent:
2	X was requested by the deponent and/or a
3	party before completion of the deposition and is to be
4	returned within 30 days from date of receipt of the
5	transcript. If returned, the attached Changes and
6	Corrections and Signature pages contain any changes
7	and the reasons therefor;
8	That \$ is the deposition
9	officer's charges for preparing the original
10	deposition transcript and any copies of exhibits,
11	charged to PATENT OWNER CRESTA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION;
12	That pursuant to information given to the
13	deposition officer at the time said testimony as
14	taken, the following includes all parties of record:
15	For the Petitioner Silicon Laboratories, Inc.:
16	LEE & HAYES 11501 Alterra Parkway
17	Suite 450 Austin Texas 78758
18	512-505-8162/509-944-4693 (fax) Peter@leebayes.com
19	Maryannm@leehayes.com
20	For the Patent Owner Cresta Technology Corporation:
21	IRELL & MANELLA, LLP 1800 Avenue of the Stars
22	Suite 900 Los Angeles California 90067-4276
23	310-277-1010/310-203-7199 (fax) Bhaber@irell_com
24	Mfleming@irell.com
25	I further certify that I am neither attorney

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-9@74549722033-135

	Douglas Holberg, Ph.D 11/4/2015
1	nor counsel for nor related to nor employed by any of
2	the parties to the action in which this deposition is
3	taken;
4	Further, I am not a relative nor an employee of
5	any attorney of record in this cause, nor am I
6	financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of
7	the action.
8	Certified to by me this 11TH day of NOVEMBER,
9	2015. Bul Rin
10	Toural O T
11	BRENDA J. WRIGHT, Texas CSR No. 1780 Expiration Date: 12-31-16
12	WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES Firm Registration No. 225
13	Expiration Date: 12-31-15 1250 S. Capital of Texas Highway
14	Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746
15	512-474-4363/512-474-8802 (fax) www.wrightwatson.com
16	JOB NO. 151104BJW
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

WRIGHT WATSON & ASSOCIATES

1250 South Capital of Texas Highway, Building 3, Suite 400 Austin, Texas 78746 (512) 474-4363 de822c66-d309-463f-9@74549722033-136

Silicon v Cresta IPR2015-00626