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(08:35:27-08:36:51)
1 case?
2 A SeaChange and nCUBE. 5 .
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(08:38:11-08:39:41)
Q Are you aware that there is what's called an
enablement requirement in patent law?
A Somewhat. If I'm -- yeah. I think so.
Q Okay. Realizing that you're not a lawyer --
A Right.
Q -- could you give us your basic understanding of
the enablement requirement?
MR. LU: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion.
A Right. I'm not a lawyer so my familiarity with these terms is somewhat limited. It's -- you know, to the best of my understanding, it's -- the patent should enable one who is of -- who is reasonably
skilled in the art to understand the bounds of the patent claims.

MR. LU: Also going to interpose an objection. It calls for speculation.
BY MS. MANNING:
Q Sure. And -- and when I'm asking you questions today, I'm sure you've gone over some of the -- some of the basics of depositions with counsel, but when I ask you a question today, I'm not asking for you to speculate -- speculate. So to the extent that your answer requires you to speculate, it's fine to flag that for us. I may ask you to give me your best
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(08:39:44-08:40:49)
understanding. I'm entitled to ask for your best
understanding but so you -- but so you -- so you
understand my question that I'm asking, I'm not asking you to speculate --
A Okay.
Q -- okay? Fair enough?
And Mr. Lu just interposed an objection, and I -you went ahead and answered the question. That was the right thing to do. $\mathrm{Mr} . \mathrm{Lu}$ is entitled to make objections for the record, and unless he instructs you not to answer on the grounds of work product or some other technical privilege or discovery immunity, I'll ask you to go ahead and answer the question. Fair enough?
A Okay.
Q Okay? And if there's ever a time when you don't understand one of my questions, please let me know that.
A Will do.
Q I'll try to refrain, rephrase. We can work
together to get to -- to something we both understand.
A I appreciate that.
Q Okay. And I guess if you don't ask me to
rephrase, I'll assume you understood. Fair enough? A Okay.

| (08:40:50-08:42:12) Page 9 |
| :--- |
| 1 Q Okay. And we have somewhat more limited time -- |
| 2 |
| 3 |
| 3 |
| 4 |
| 4 | If you need to take a break at any time, let us know.
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## :42:12-08:43:18)

Q I know the court reporter will appreciate it if we don't talk over each other.
A Right.
Q So I'll try hard to let you finish, and I'm sure
she'll appreciate it if you do the same for me.
A Okay.
Q How have you been advised about the definiteness
requirement of patent laws?
A Have I been?
Q How have you been?
A Through conversations with Mr. Lu and his
assistants.
Q When you say his assistants, who are you
referring to?
A The Somait. I don't know how you say her name.
Q I do.
MR. LU: S-O-M-A-I-T.
BY MS. MANNING:
Q Thank you. Anyone else? Who's --
A Not that I recall, no.
Q And based on your conversations with Mr. Lu and
Ms. Somait --
MR. LU: Somait.
BY MS. MANNING:
Q Somait -- what is your understanding of the

08:43:21-08:45:20)
1 definiteness requirement of the patent laws?
A My -- I understand that to be considered definite a patent claim or to be considered indefinite a patent claim would have to be insolubly ambiguous or unamenable to construction.
Q What does that mean in your mind?
A Well, in order -- if you can find a reasonable construction, then you've shown that it is sufficiently definite or not indefinite.
Q And can you put any -- any flesh on what you mean by the ability to find a reasonable construction as you put it?
A Well, it would have to be consistent with the specification, with the other claim language, with the patent prosecution, with the ordinary meaning of terms in the claim, etc.
Q You said it has to be consistent with the ordinary meaning, is that your understanding?
A Well, that's part of it. That's part of what I said. The -- the -- there are many words in the claims and some of the words have ordinary meanings and so you would want to use those where possible.
Q Do you have a view as to whether some of the words in the claims at issue in this case are appropriately given meanings other than what you would
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## (55:23-08:46:33)

term their ordinary meaning?
MR. LU: Objection. Vague.
A Yeah, maybe you can restate that. I mean, there's a lot of words in these claims so --
Q So stipulated. It's a -- it's a high level question.
A Yes.
Q In some cases you'll look at the claims and apply
the ordinary meanings, and those are the appropriate constructions. Is this -- is this case in your view one where we have to look at something other than the ordinary meaning to properly understand the claims and patents in suit?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague and ambiguous.
Also object to the extent it mischaracterizes the state of common construction law. You can answer.
A Yes, there are terms in the claims that are not ordinary terms.
Q Like what?
A They're technical terms in some of the cases. Arterial bias is one that I know that's being discussed for example.
Q Any other terms that you think should be construed as something other than their ordinary

| Page 13 | Page 15 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 meaning? | 1 A Yes, it went to trial. I was there. |
| 2 A Well, some of the others that I've opined about | 2 Q But you didn't testify? |
| 3 include reference symmetry. | 3 A That's right. |
| 4 Q Any other terms in these claims? | 4 Q Why not? |
| 5 MR. LU: Just to clarify, Susan, you | 5 A There were two experts on our side, and the other |
| 6 asking about claim terms that are discussed | 6 expert did the -- did most of the testimony and on a |
| 7 his opin | 7 day-by-day basis the counsel was deciding who would |
| 8 BY MS. MANNING | 8 testify as to what, and in the end I wasn't needed. |
| 9 Q I -- yes, I am asking about the -- the claim | 9 Q Okay. And you said this was about ten years ago? |
| 10 terms that you discuss in your declaration. I'll ask | 10 A Yes. |
| 11 you a separate question about whether you've formed | 11 Q Do you know -- do you know what court it was in? |
| 12 opinions about other terms not discussed in your | 12 A Delaware? |
| 13 report -- | 13 Q Have you ever been retained as a consultant to |
| 14 A Okay. | 14 aid attorneys in a patent case other than this case |
| 15 Q -- or declaration | 15 and the SeaChange case? |
| 16 A Right. Well, so there are several parts to my | 16 A To -- you said to what attorneys? |
| 17 report and several different claim terms that are | 17 Q To assist. |
| 18 discussed in there and, you know, I've given you two | 18 A Oh, to aid. I see. Yes, I have. |
| 19 examples and there are probably, if I recall correct, | 19 Q When have you -- when have you been so retained? |
| 20 several other examples -- several other terms in there | 20 A Well, I think it's all in my vitae for |
| 21 that are either technical terms or terms that need to | 21 convenience. So there were, looks like, three or four |
| 22 be construed in the context of the patent in order to | 22 other cases. |
| 23 be understood. | 23 Q Which page are you on |
| 24 Q Okay. My -- my -- my question was specific to -- | 24 A Page 2 of my vita. |
| 25 to whether there are terms that you've discussed in | 25 MS. MANNING: Should we go off the record |
| (08.47.54-08.49.11) Page 14 | (08.51:13-08.54.35) Page 16 |
| (08:47:54-08:49:11) | (08:51:13-08:54:35) |
| 1 your declaration that you think should be construed so | 1 for a minute? Let's go off the record. |
| 2 that -- such that they have a meaning -- meaning other | 2 VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 8:55 and we're |
| 3 than their, quote, ordinary definition. | 3 going off the record. |
| 4 A Right. I think so, yes. | 4 (Discussion off the record) |
| 5 Q You mentioned arterial bias and you referenced | 5 VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 8:58 and |
| 6 reference symmetry. Is there anything else that comes | 6 we're back on the record. |
| 7 to mind as having some meaning other than its ordinary | 7 BY MS. MANNING: |
| 8 meaning? | 8 Q Dr. Kotz, I've hand you -- handed you a copy of |
| 9 A Yes. Well, nothing that comes to mind. I'd have | 9 what the court reporter has marked Google Exhibit |
| 10 to go back and look -- | 10 1001. Could you tell us what that is? |
| 11 Q Okay. | 11 A That is my curriculum vita. |
| 12 A -- to -- to remind myself -- | 12 Q Okay. And before we took our short break you |
| 13 Q Okay. | 13 were referring to I think your own copy of it. On |
| 14 A -- in order to be precise. | 14 page 2 you were going to tell me about your previous |
| 15 Q Let me ask you a couple follow-up questions about | 15 consulting work in support of litigation. |
| 16 the -- your previous experience testifying. Did you | 16 A Right. |
| 17 testify at trial? | 17 Q I see there are five things listed under |
| 18 A No. | 18 consulting. Is this a list of every case in which you |
| 19 Q Did you offer a report -- | 19 have been an expert witness? |
| 20 A Yes. | 20 A Yes. |
| 21 Q -- in that case? Do you know how that case was | 21 Q Okay. And other than the SeaChange case, have |
| 22 resolved? | 22 you given deposition testimony in any of these cases? |
| 23 A In favor of SeaChange. | 23 A No. |
| 24 Q Okay. Do you know whether the case went to trial | 24 Q Have you -- did you prepare reports in any of |
| 25 and you just didn't testify? | 25 these cases? |


| (08:54:36-08:56:07)1 A I don't think so.2 Q And I take it you didn't have trial testimony in3 any of these cases?4 A Right.5 Q Did -- did your work in any of these cases relate6 to validity?7 A I don't remember.8 Q Okay. What was the technology in the -- what you9 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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(08:56:12-08:57:33)
1 level?
2 A I was asked to study the -- Palm and Kessel
3 software to decide whether they were perhaps the same
4 in part.
5 Q Okay. So you analyzed the code itself?
6 A Yes.
7
8
8 never asked to prepare a report in that case?

88:57:35-08:59:01)
Q Was TMC Patents a nonpracticing entity, do you know?
A I don't know. I don't recall anyway.
Q So you thought it was a -- about parallel
computers. Do you recall what work you did on that case?
A No. Again, this was very short.
Q And I -- I -- I note that this is all quite some time ago.
A Yes.
Q Why nothing between fall of 2002 and your retention in this case?
A I've been very busy. I get lots of inquiries and generally don't have the time, even if I have the interest or the expertise.
Q Okay. You say you're very busy so I have to ask, very busy with what?
A Well, I'm an active professor at Dartmouth with lots of research projects and students, and I'm also an administrator so I have -- and a father. Very busy.
Q So it isn't other consulting work that's taking up your time?
A No.
Q Do you have specialized or technical knowledge
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08:59:07-09:00:51)
that you think will aid the court in considering the issues before it on claim construction?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous.
A Well, I have a lot of technical knowledge about various aspects of wireless networking.
Q What -- what specialized knowledge do you think is relevant to the issues before -- relevant to helping you aid the court here?
A Well, I have been working with wireless networks, specifically WiFi networks, for over ten years, and some of that work involves location, location sensing, location prediction, etc. And I understand the patents in this case are also related to the use of WiFi for localization.
Q Is that different from location sensing or is it the same thing as lo --
A Essentially the same thing.
Q And is location sensing different from location prediction?
A Yes.
Q How -- what's location prediction?
A Well, in the context of my personal research, location prediction is meant for a moving WiFi device, predicting the next access point to which it would connect.

| (09:00:53-09:02:48) Page 21 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Q And you've written several papers on that, |
| 2 | correct? |
| 3 | A Yes. |
| 4 | Q How many papers have you written on location |
| 5 | sensing? |
| 6 | A I -- in the con -- in terms of the papers |
| 7 | relevant to this patent, I think one. |
| 8 | Q And which one is that? |
| 9 | A It's actually cited in the patents. It's a Kim, |
| 10 | et al, in the patents. I'd have to look to find the |
| 11 | title. I don't remember the title per se so -- |
| 12 | Q Is it Risks of Using AP Locations Discovered |
| 13 | Through War Driving? |
| 14 | A Yes. |
| 15 | Q You might have just said this, but let me make |
| 16 | sure. Is that -- that's the only paper that you've |
| 17 | participated in that's -- that's specific to location |
| 18 | sensing? |
| 19 | A Right. |
| 20 | Q Okay. The location prediction work that you've |
| 21 | done, does the technology there rely solely on -- on |
| 22 | WiFi access points or are there other data inputs due |
| 23 | to this location prediction? |
| 24 | MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Compound. |
| 25 | A So the technology in my papers was focused only |
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## :02:55-09:04:51)

on WiFi, although we always imagined that it would have application to other types of wireless networks. Q And the location prediction technology, does that involve determining the location of a device with a WiFi radio?
A No.
Q But location sensing does, I take it?
A Yes.
Q You sort of shrug as if maybe not entirely. If
there's something more to it then, please explain.
A Location sensing is -- is -- is a phrase that
could have many meanings -- meanings, but in the
context of our conversation, yes.
Q To be clear, your paper was about determining
location of a device with a WiFi radio?
A You're referring to the risks paper?
Q Yes.
A Yes, it was related to that. Our -- the paper is about the risks that one has in determining location if you use war driving data.
Q Dr. Kotz, have you ever taught a class that -- in
which you discussed the technology behind determining the location of a device with a WiFi radio through the use of WiFi access point signals?
25 A Well, I have taught several courses about
(09:0
6:20)
wireless networks and mobile computing. I can't recall whether we studied papers related to wireless WiFi based location determination, but I -- we may have.
Q So you just don't recall one way or the other?
Okay.
A Those courses were several years ago.
Q Okay. Were all of your students undergraduates?
A No.
Q They were graduate students as well?
A Yes.
Q Do you have graduate students that you're
supervising now?
A Yes.
Q Typically how many do you have at a time?
A Typically four or five.
Q The -- the courses on wireless computing, have
those -- that you've taught, have those been at the undergraduate level, graduate level, both?
A Both.
Q Could you describe the courses that you're referring to?
A Well, let's see. Like I said, they were several years ago, and the -- probably in the early 2000s. So -- so -- it doesn't have the years in here. Sorry.
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09:06:24-09:07:45)
1 Q You're referring to?
A I'm referring to my CV again.
Q Okay.
A Yes.
Q Exhibit 1001. What page of it please?
A Page 40. So this is a list of courses I've
taught at Dartmouth College, and midway through the
page you'll see one, a seminar on wireless networks and handheld computers but, unfortunately, I don't -didn't list the date here. But that would have been around 2000, 2001, somewhere around that time frame. So it was a long time ago. And I'm -- I've forgotten your question.
Q I -- thank you for your candor. I had asked you to -- to describe for me the -- the courses you were referring to when you -- when you mentioned that you taught courses in wireless computing.
A Oh, right. So that was -- that course was a seminar-style course, meaning that I selected several dozen papers from the research literature and each class meeting we would meet to discuss some of the papers from the literature.
Q Okay. Any of the other -- any other course that you can recall either listed here or that would relate to wireless computing?

| 07:49-09:0 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | A I taught the standard computer networks course |
| 2 several time -- times, and that usually includes a few |  |
| 3 days about wireless computing -- wireless networking. |  |
| 4 Q And in that course -- I'm sorry, you called it |  |
| 5 the standard networking course? |  |
| 6 A Standard networking course, which is listed as CS |  |
| 778 in the vita there. |  |
| 8 Q And did any of your -- your teaching in the |  |
| 9 computer networks course relate to using WiFi access |  |
| 10 points to locate a user device? |  |
| 11 A No, I don't think so. |  |
| 12 Q And the -- it's listed here as CS 88/188, the |  |
| 13 seminar wireless networks and handheld computers? |  |
| 14 A Right. That's what we talked about before. |  |
| 15 Q Right. And you described several papers. Did |  |
| 16 any of those papers relate to -- specifically to |  |
| 17 WiFi -- using WiFi access points for location? |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| 21 Q I'm asking you -- to be clear, because I wasn't, |  |
| 22 I'm asking, you mentioned that what you would do in |  |
| 23 that course is you would have several papers you would |  |
|  |  |
|  | Im asking, did any of the pap |
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:09:31-09:11:41)
that were discussed in -- in your course there relate to using WiFi access points to locate user devices?
A I can't recall for sure.
Q Okay. So let me see if I've got -- if I can
accurately summarize here. You've written the -- the risks paper --
A Yes.
Q -- that does talk about doing location using WiFi
access points. And if I understood you correctly, you
don't think you've ever taught that subject in a
course?
MR. LU: Objection to the extent it mischaracterizes the witness's testimony.
A I said I don't recall teaching that subject in a course. I may have.
Q And other than -- other than the work related to
the risks paper, which we'll talk about, do you recall any other work that you've done specific to using wireless access points to determine location of a -of a mobile device?
A Nothing that comes to mind, no.
Q Okay. Okay. And I have not asked you about
every item in your 42 page CV that is Exhibit 1001. Is your CV , to the best of your knowledge, an accurate -- accurate?

09:11:42-09:14:01)
1 A Yes.
Q Is there anything you're aware of that is
material to your opinions in this case that's not listed in your CV?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous. BY MS. MANNING:
Q I'm asking for your view, sir.
A Nothing that I'm aware of.
Q Okay. Dr. Kotz, I'm actually going to hand you two documents. Google Exhibit 1002 is entitled -it's entitled Notice of Subpoena to David Kotz, Ph.D. It's several pages and -- and I'm going to hand you a second document, Google 1003, entitled Objections to Subpoena to David Kotz, Ph.D. Okay.
So on Exhibit 1002, I'm going to ask you to flip past the notice, which is the first three pages. And there you will find a Subpoena, and behind the Subpoena itself you will find an attachment to the Subpoena. Have you -- have you seen that part of Exhibit 1002 before, the Subpoena and the attachment? A I've never seen this document before.
Q To be clear, I'm not asking about the notice part. I'm asking about the Subpoena and the attachment. It starts on page -- the fourth page of the document. One back. Starting there. Have you
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14:10-09:15:23)
seen that before?
A No.
Q No?
A No.
Q Have you -- well, if you could flip to page 4 of the attachment, the typewritten document. You'll see a header there where it says document requests.
A Yes.
Q Have you seen these before?
A These document requests?
Q Yes.
A No.
Q No? Okay. Were you aware that Google had requested the production of certain documents in conjunction with your -- with the -- the Subpoena and your testimony today?
A No.
Q I take it you did not do anything to look for or obtain documents responsive to the Subpoena?
A That's correct.
Q Okay. Okay.
MR. LU: Susan, just so the record is clear, we did -- the Subpoena was served on Irell, and with Dr. Kotz's permission we did have a conversation with him regarding the

|  | P9:15:24-09:16:35) |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | documents that were requested to find out if |
| 2 | there were any documents that he relied upon |
| 3 | that were not either publicly available or |
| 4 | referenced in his expert report. Our |
| 5 | objections were referenced in Exhibit 1003, and |
| 6 | we made a production of additional documents |
| 7 | that were requested in the Subpoena that |
| 8 | Dr. Kotz did, in fact, identify; namely, the |
| 9 | retention agreement. |
| 10 | MS. MANNING: And I gather from the |
| 11 | witness's testimony that nothing has been done |
| 12 | about making any effort to obtain the other |
| 13 | documents requested in response to the |
| 14 | Subpoena? |
| 15 | MR. LU: Well, publications are, as -- on |
| 16 | the CV are publicly available. There are PDFs |
| 17 | there. And I think you took the -- we took the |
| 18 | same position that you folks took with respect |
| 19 | to Dr. Acampora in terms of what was to be |
| 20 | produced, what was not to be produced, though |
| 21 | we did produce the Retention Agreement. I know |
| 22 | the Retention Agreement of Dr. Acampora was |
| 23 | produced. |
| 24 | MS. MANNING: I don't believe it was |
| 25 | requested. |

Page 30(09:16:35-09:18:12)
declaration, I'm sorry, about the legal language from
Google and from Skyhook, two separate documents; and
declaration or whatever it's called from Dr. Acampora.
I think that's it.
Q Did you --
MR. LU: Did you want to reference your
expert report to confirm that?
MS. MANNING: I'll ask him about it, Sam.
A Yeah, I do list it, what I viewed, in the report.
MR. LU: Just wanted the record to be
clear, Susan.
BY MS. MANNING:
Q You looked at --
A Four patents.
Q Hang on. Hang on.

09:18:15-09:20:09)
1 Dr. Kotz, I'm going to hand you what's been
marked Google Exhibit 1004, the title of which is
Declaration of David Kotz, Ph.D., in Support Of
Plaintiff Skyhook Wireless, Inc.'s Opposition To
Summary Judgment. Can you take a look at that and tell me what it is.
A Well, it appears to be my -- my declaration as titled plus my CV.
Q And if you'll look at page 26 of the document.
Is that your signature, sir?
A Yes.
Q And did you in fact sign it on September 28th?
A Yes.
Q Sir, if you turn to paragraph 12 , which comes under the header materials studied.
A Right.
Q My -- I believe my question -- I'll just re-ask
it -- was other than the patents, briefs by Google and Skyhook, and Dr. Acampora's declaration, what, if anything, did you review in the process of preparing your declaration?
A The -- the one other thing is portions of the patent prosecution history of the 988 patent as stated here in paragraph 12.
Q Did you review the prosecution histories for the
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(09:20:11-09:21:36)
1 other patents in suit?
2 A Not that I recall.
3 Q You seem less than sure.
A Well, most of the portions that I reviewed were the parts that were quoted in the various other documents, so to the extent that they had been quoted in the -- in your or your client's declaration and your expert's declaration or Skyhook's declaration, I saw -- I may have seen some of those.
Q I see. When you say that you reviewed parts of the prosecution history of the 988 , did you have the actual prosecution history documents or are you referring to snippets that were quoted in other documents and you just read what was quoted in those documents?
A Yes, primarily the latter. I don't know if I
actually at the time had the full prosecution history.
Q How were the documents that you reviewed in the
course of preparing your declaration, how were those
made available to you?
A Download from counsel's server.
Q Okay. But counsel sent them to you?
A Yes.
Q Did -- who picked what documents you would look at?

## (09:21:38-09:23:14)

A They recommended the four patents and these three -- I guess three other documents.
Q And what was the time frame for when you reviewed these documents?
A Let's see. This was signed on September 28th, and so it would have been over the course of a week or, at most, two prior to that.
Q How much time did you spend reviewing the patents
prior to the time you signed your declaration?
A A few hours. I don't remember exactly.
Q Can you give me an estimate?
A It would be difficult to -- to be more precise than that.
Q When you say a few hours, do you mean less than ten?
A Yes.
Q Help me ballpark it here. More than five, less than five?
A Probably -- for all of the documents together, between five and ten.
Q And how much, if any, additional time did you spend on your declaration besides the five or ten hours spent reviewing documents?
A Let's see. After reading the documents I had conversation with counsel to discuss the legal
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:23:20-09:25:15)
background and to discuss the technical issues at -relevant to this suit and then later on editing and reviewing the declaration.
Q Who wrote the declaration?
A Well, it was a collaborative process. First
draft was prepared by counsel and the -- then I did some editing to make corrections, revisions, etc.
Q Do you recall what any of the changes you made were?
A I don't. There were, you know, many, small,
large, you know, here and there, so I don't remember the specifics.
Q I think I had asked how much time you had spent on the other aspects of preparing your declaration.
Do you have an estimate of how much time you spent besides the -- the document review time on these other aspects that you mentioned?
A It was probably another five or ten hours.
Q Your -- your declaration notes that you're being paid on an hourly basis?
A That's right.
Q Have you -- how have you recorded the time that you've devoted to the case so far?
A I use a software tool to help keep track of time.
25 Q So you actually have some record of the amount of
(09:25:17-09:27:39)
time that you have spent to date?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Have you billed either Skyhook or Irell for your time yet?
A Yes.
MS. MANNING: And, Sam, we'll ask that a copy of that be produced.
BY MS. MANNING:
Q I don't doubt that's an accurate recording of
your time devoted -- spent.
A To the best of my knowledge it's accurate, yes.
Q Sir, I'm going to hand you a two-page document
that's been marked Google Exhibit 1005. Would you
take a look at that, tell me what it is please.
A This appears to be a copy of my retention letter.
Q And is that your signature on the second page?
A Yes.
Q And you signed it on September 20th of this year?
A Right.
Q So that's the date on which you were retained?
A Yes.
Q When were you first contacted about this case?
A Perhaps a week before that.
Q And who contacted you?
25 A Lina.
(09:27:46-09:29:33)
1 Q And do you have any understanding of how it is they came to contact you?
A My understanding is that I was recommended by some of the Skyhook engineers.
Q Do you know who at Skyhook?
A No.
Q Do you know anyone who works at Skyhook?
A I met some of them several years ago. I don't
recall now who I met or whether they're still there.
Q What context was it? You say -- you recall
meeting someone from Skyhook. What was the context?
A At the time I was interested in wireless networks and wireless-based location or localization, and I don't remember whether I learned about them or they learned about me, but we discovered this -- a mutual interest and met for lunch in Boston. Had a nice conversation.
Q Can you give me a sense of time period?
A I would have to -- it would have been in the early 2000s to 2005, 6ish time frame. I don't remember.
Q Okay. Do you remember anything about the people you met with other than they were from Skyhook?
A Well, they were very nice people.
25 Q I'm sure they'll be glad to hear that.

| (09:29:37-09:31:30) |
| :--- |
| 1 |
| 2 | Yes. I don't remember anything else about them


|  |
| ---: |
| $(09: 31: 32-09: 3305)$ |

09:33:06-09:45:32)
A No. Sorry.
Q Correct me if I'm wrong, but I'm gathering that you guys didn't actually use Skyhook's software? A Well, we tried it. We used it in the sense that we obtained a copy and ran it on some computers, but we didn't end up using it in any other sort of productive way that I remember.
Q Okay. And I think I asked you this, but I'm going to ask you again. Do you recall why?
A I don't, unfortunately. I don't remember if it was because it didn't work well or because it didn't suit our needs or it didn't run on the platforms we cared about. I mean, there are many possible reasons why we ended up not using it, but I don't remember. Q Okay.

MS. MANNING: Let's take a break.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 9:38 and we're going off the record.
(Recess taken)
VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 9:49 and we're back on the record. BY MS. MANNING:
Q Hello, again.
25 A Hello.

09:45:34-09:47:00)
Page 40
1 Q Before we took our break you mentioned that you
had been first contacted by counsel for Skyhook roughly a week before the September 20th, 2011, retainer letter.

## A Right.

Q Do you know if that was before or after Skyhook
filed its opening claim construction paper?
A I don't know.
Q Did you have any role at all in the initial
formulation of Skyhook's claim construction positions?
A No.
Q When you -- you mentioned reading a paper by
Google and a paper by Skyhook as part of your -- your work in this case. Were those respectively Skyhook's opening claim construction brief and Google's Motion for Summary Judgment?
A They were Google Inc.'s Memorandum of Law in Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment of Indefiniteness and, in the Alternative, Opening Claim Construction Brief.
Q That's one.
A And the Declaration of Anthony S. Acampora and Skyhook Wireless Opening Claim Construction Brief. Q When you read Skyhook's brief, was there anything 5 in them that you disagreed with?

| (09:47:07-09:48:30) Page 41 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 A Not that I recall. |  |
| 2 Q I'm going to ask you a slightly different <br> 3 question as to Google. When you read Google's Summary |  |
|  |  |
| 4 Judgment of Indefiniteness paper and motion -- and |  |
| 5 Claim Construction Brief, did you agree with any of |  |
| 6 the claim construction positions Google took? |  |
| 7 MR.LU: Objection to the extent it goes |  |
|  |  |
| 9 A Yeah. I was focused on the particular aspects |  |
| 10 that I was asked to opine on which end up -- ended up |  |
| 11 in this declar -- my declaration and so I wasn't |  |
| 12 paying close attention to the other aspects of those |  |
| 13 briefs. |  |
| 14 Q Did you -- most of your declaration focuses on 15 invalidity, fair to say? |  |
|  |  |
| 16 A It focuses on questions of indefiniteness 17 primarily. |  |
|  |  |
| 18 Q And you understand that if a term in a claim is |  |
| 19 found to be indefinite, then that claim is deemed to 20 be invalid? |  |
|  |  |
| 21 A That's my understanding, although I'm not a 22 lawyer. |  |
|  |  |
| 23 Q It's not meant -- it's not meant to be a tricky |  |
| 24 question. |  |
| 25 A Right. |  |
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09:50:09-09:51:59)
1 Q And I'm not sure I got an answer to my original question so let me -- let me try asking it again. When you were reading Google's brief on indefiniteness and -- and the alternative for claim construction, did you agree with any of the positions that Google took on -- on how the claim should be construed?

MR. LU: Objection to the extent it goes beyond the scope of the witness's opinion.
A So I don't recall the specific -- your question is about the entire Google declaration, and there are many components in that. Even of those subset that applies to the topics covered in my opinion, I don't recall the specifics of the Google opinion at this time so I can't recall which ones I might have agreed with or disagreed with in reading it.
Q Other than perhaps the lunch in Boston with Skyhook employees whose names we can't recall right now, have you -- other than perhaps that lunch because we don't know who was there, have you ever spoken with any of the inventors of the patents in suit?
A Not that I know of.
Q You haven't done so in the context of your work on this case, I take it?
A No.

Page 44
(09:52:02-09:53:28)
Q We were discussing earlier the -- the documents
you reviewed and you advised that you hadn't looked
at -- you didn't recall having looked at the
prosecution histories of the patents in suit though you may have seen certain snippets quoted in the papers?
A Right.
Q Do you have an understanding of how the
prosecution history of a patent relates to claim construction?

## A Well, I understand that it is one of the sources

of information one should consider in determining a claim construction. It is part of the -- part of the intrinsic evidence.
Q Why didn't you look at them in this case?
A I'm sorry?
Q Why did you not look at them in this case?
MR.LU: Objection to the extent it mischaracterizes the witness's testimony.
A Well, I did not look at the entire patent
history -- prosecution history. I'm not sure I had them at the time I was preparing this report. I did look at the -- as I said, the pieces that were quoted in various other documents.
Q Did you -- I believe you mentioned earlier that

| Page 45 | Page 47 |
| :---: | :---: |
| (09:53 | (09 |
| 1 counsel for Skyhook had provided you with the | 1 Q They're declarations. |
| 2 documents that you reviewed. Did you ask for any | 2 A Declarations and exhibits before preparing this |
| 3 other documents besides -- | 3 September 28th declaration. |
| 4 A No. | 4 Q Okay. Do you recall whether you had them |
| 5 Q -- those you've identified as having been | 5 available to you? |
| 6 reviewed? | 6 A I did n |
| 7 A No. | 7 MR. LU: Can I take a short break? |
| 8 Q Why didn't you ask for the prosecution histories? | 8 MS. MANNING: Su |
| 9 A I -- it didn't occur to me. | 9 VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 10:01 and |
| 10 Q Have you reviewed any other documents from thi | 10 we're going off the record. |
| 11 case between the time you signed your declaration and | 11 (Recess taken) |
| 12 now? | 12 VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 10:05 and |
| 13 A No, I don't think so. | 13 we're back on the recor |
| 14 Q So to date do you have copies of the prosecution | 14 A So can I make a clarification? |
| 15 histories of the patents in suit? | 15 Q I have a question for you first -- |
| 16 A I do. | 16 A Okay. |
| 17 Q And you haven't read them yet? | 17 Q -- and then I'll -- then I'll invite any |
| 18 A I haven't had time. | 18 clarification you'd like. |
| 19 Q Okay. | 19 A All right. |
| 20 A Sorry. | 20 Q Did you just discuss the substance of your |
| 21 Q Are there any other documents that you have been | 21 testimony with counsel when you took a break? |
| 22 provided with? | 22 A Yes. |
| 23 A Are there any other? | 23 MR. LU: You can answer that yes or no. |
| 24 Q Yes. That relate to this case I should say. | 24 A Yes. |
| 25 A Yes. Yes, there are, many exhibits, dictionary | 25 Q Okay. What did you discuss with counsel? |
| (09:55:10-09:50.29) Page 46 | Page 48 |
| (09:55:18-09:56:29) | (10:01:11-10:02:35) |
| 1 definitions and the like. | 1 A What materials I had at what time. |
| 2 Q I did note that in your listing of the documents | 2 Q Okay. And can you elaborate? |
| 3 you had reviewed in preparing your declaration, you | 3 A Yes. So I had answered that I did not have |
| 4 didn't note anything about having reviewed the | 4 access to the full attorney's deposition declarations |
| 5 attorney declarations, I believe it's Sam's and mine, | 5 and all the exhibits when at the time I prepared this |
| 6 that were filed in support of the opening briefs, and | 6 declaration, and it turns out that I did in one form. |
| 7 those have attached to them a lot of exhibits, | 7 So as I said earlier, I downloaded all the materials |
| 8 including things like dictionary definitions and the | 8 via FTP, and there were many, many dozens of files and |
| 9 like. | 9 so I asked for clarification at that time as to what I |
| 10 A Right. | 10 should print and what I should read. And so I printed |
| 11 Q Did you -- did you, in fact, review any of the | 11 the documents that I mentioned earlier that I relied |
| 12 declarations or any of the attachments that were | 12 upon and not all of the others. |
| 13 submitted to the court prior to the time you signed | 13 Q Okay. |
| 14 your declaration on September 28th? | 14 A And so I had electronically, although I didn't |
| 15 A No. | 15 remember this, all of these other declarations and |
| 16 Q Did you have them? | 16 exhibits, but I did not have on paper, I did not read, |
| 17 A September 28th. For the record, I signed it on | 17 all of those declarations and exhibits. |
| 18 the 28th. You said -- | 18 Q Okay. And when you say you had them, you had |
| 19 Q I hope that -- I hope that's what I said. If I | 19 them in the sense that they were available to you on |
| 20 didn't say that, I apologize. | 20 an FTP site for download? |
| 21 A You said 20th, which is the retention letter. <br> 22 Q Okay | 21 A Yes, and then I did download them. They all came 22 as a big blob. When I .- |
| 23 A 28th is the declaration No, I did not | 23 Q To use the technical term |
| 24 all of those extensive, what did you call them, | 24 A To use the technical term, yes, and then to -- |
| 25 motions. | 25 once unpacked there were many, many files and I needed |

(10:02:37-10:04:32) Page 49
1 to ask which ones should be printed and read.
2 Q Okay. And counsel reminded you of this during
3 your conversation?
4 A Yes.
5 Q Okay. Counsel -- did you discuss anything else
6 with counsel while --
7 A No.
8 Q -- you were out in the hall?
9
A No.
10 Q Okay. What else was in the blob?

## Page 50

## (10:04:35-10:06:03)

A Let's see. I met with Sam Lu for several hours to go over my declaration and to talk about each of the points there and to discuss the logistics and procedures of a deposition. Met again to review that last night.
Q I'm sorry, did you say you met again last night?
A Met again last night briefly to just review.
Q Am I correct to gather you had two meetings with Sam?
A Yes.
Q One was last night. When was the other one?
A Last Wednesday, I think? Last week.
Q Other than meeting with Mr. Lu and discussing issues with -- and the conversations in the course of those meetings, did you do anything else to prepare for your deposition?
A I reread my declaration and some parts of the patents and some of the other declarations mentioned in here.
Q When you say other declarations mentioned in here, do you mean Dr. Acampora's declaration or did you mean something else?
A I don't think I reread his. Again, I had limited time so I reread parts of Google's, parts of
25 Skyhook's, and all of mine, and some of the patents.
(10:06:10-10:09:00)
1 Q Did you focus in -- on particular parts of the briefing?
A During my reading?
Q Yes.
A Not in particular, no. I read through the whole
thing cover to cover.
Q Okay. How about the patents, did you focus on any parts in particular of those?
A The claims.
Q Did you read the specification?
A Not again, no.
Q Has Skyhook ever funded any of your research?
A No.
Q Do you know if Skyhook has ever funded any
research at Dartmouth?
A Not that I know.
Q Dr. Kotz, I'm going to hand you a document that has been marked as Google Exhibit 1006. On its face it is titled Risks of Using AP Locations Discovered Through War Driving. If you could take a look at that. Tell me what it is please.
A This is a -- this is a technical paper with that
title that I wrote with some co-authors some years ago.
Q Who are the co-authors?
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(10:09:01-10:11:41)
1 A Minkyong Kim and Jeffrey Fielding.
2 Q And were they students?
3 A Minkyong was a post doc and Jeff was an undergraduate student.
Q Do you know when this was published, Dr. Kotz?
A I think it was 2006, I think.
Q Sir, I'm going to hand you a copy of what's been
marked as Google Exhibit 1007. It is Bates numbered
GSHFED_0000021 through same prefix 40. And I hope you agree with me that that is a copy of the 988 patent?
A Appears to.
Q Okay. And you have reviewed this document before, sir?
A Yes.
Q If you would look on the second page of it. No, second -- second actual page.
A Oh, okay.
Q You'll see -- in the left-hand column you'll see
it says U.S. patent documents and then other
publications and maybe two-thirds of the way down there's a Kim M., et al?
A Yes.
Q Is this the -- is this the same article that is -- has been marked as Exhibit 1006? A Yes.

## (10:11:41-10:13:49)

Q Okay. And it says here that that's published in Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Volume 3968 in 2006.

A Right.
Q Okay. And that comports with your recollection?
A Yes.
Q When did -- well, withdrawn.
What's the paper about?
A Well, briefly it is about war driving, the collection of WiFi access point locations through driving -- literally driving around a neighborhood and listening for access point traffic and then using that for estimating the location of access points. And then this paper says, if I -- it's been years since I read it, but roughly it says the driving -- driving and collecting location of access point data like that leads one to misestimate the location of the access point to be closer to the street than it actually is. Q The paper was published in 2006. Do you recall when the actual study described in the paper was conducted?
A Not exactly, no. If we knew the month of the publication, it might give me a clue, but that might not -- it's not on the paper itself, so I'm looking to see if I might have it here. It is. It was in May of
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## (10:13:59-10:15:37)

2006, so the work certainly would have been done in 2005.

Q The -- just to be clear. It was published in May?
A Published in May of 2006, so we would have done the bulk of the research in 2005 . We would have submitted the paper late ' 05 or early ' 06 and then it actually appeared in May.
Q I think I -- I apologize. I think I missed part
of the testimony you just gave. You said you -- you
did -- for sure you did the bulk of the research in
2005 and you believe you submitted it when?
A It would have been toward the end of 2005 or
early 2006. The -- these publications have a lead time of, you know, several months. So I -- I don't recall exactly.
Q Okay. Does it -- I see you looking at your CV.
Does it -- is there any way we could more precisely figure out the time at which -- at which the underlying research was conducted?
A Well, with some effort one could, through public knowledge, look at when the submission deadline for that conference was. I mean, that would be publicly available information, either in the volume, literally in the volume cover materials, or on the web. And,

0:15:45-10:17:15)
you know, otherwise I'd have to look through my -- my records.
Q Do you think you might have pertinent records?
A Probably. E-mail, that sort of thing. Maybe
files from the -- the data files might have dates on them. It's been five, six years so --
Q I understand. I think you told me that -- is it Ms. Kim or Mr. Kim?
A Ms.
Q Ms. Kim was a -- was a post doc?
A Excuse me, Dr. Kim.
Q Dr. Kim, yes. And Jeffrey Fielding, he was an undergraduate?
A He was.
Q Okay. The -- the actual study, do you have any
way of determining whether that was done -- well, I
would assume it didn't happen over the summer, is that a fair assumption?
A You assume it didn't happen over the summer?
Q Didn't -- didn't happen over the summer.
A No, that's not a fair assumption, actually.
Q Okay.
A The summer would be the best time to do this work.
Q Okay.
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(10:17:16-10:18:46)
A This is -- this is New England, and outdoor
experiments are better done in the summer than in the winter.
Q Yes. Okay. And do you have any -- as we sit here today, do you have any way of figuring out whether this was -- what time of year this was done other than, you know, it must have been done by the end of 2000 -- must have been completed by the end of 2005. Do you have any way of more precisely gauging by quarter, season, month?

MR. LU: Objection. Asked and answered.
A Not today. Not without a lot of effort.
Q What was your role in this paper?
A I am the -- listed as the last author, which in my field tends to be a -- reflect the fact that I'm the senior member of the team but not the one doing the most of the -- most of the work. Minkyong led this work with Jeff helping and I advised basically and reviewed their progress and, you know, helped review drafts of the document and so forth. Q Do you have any sense of when the study was designed as opposed to when it was actually conducted? A No. It's the same issue really.
Q Do you know who designed the -- the study? 5 A It would have been a collaborative conversation


|  |
| :--- |
| $(10: 21: 00-10: 22: 31)$ |

(00-10:22:31)
Q Which -- which authors just to be clear?
A So Anthony LaMarca is the first author on reference 8 and the third author on reference 3 , and he's somebody that I see frequently. So I think I probably heard about it directly from him in conversation, excuse me, before -- you know, before we wrote this paper certainly.
Q You had said at conferences. What kind of conferences?
A Well so this paper and his paper we're referencing are presented at a conference called Pervasive for short, and that's an example of an academic conference on -- where such papers are presented, and many of us attend the same conferences over and over again so --
Q Do you know when Place Lab began its work? Do you know?
A I don't remember.
Q Why is Skyhook referenced in this paper?
A Why is Skyhook referenced?
Q Uh-huh.
A Well, as it's -- as it's written here, they
provide a similar commercial solution for locating WiFi users so it was, we felt, important to reference them as -- as an example. It's good academic practice

10:22:37-10:23:45)
to reference known work.
Q And when it says Skyhook Wireless provides a similar commercial solution for locating WiFi users, you mean similar to Place Lab's --
A Yes.
Q -- solution?
A Well, similar in its intent anyway.
Q What do you mean by that?
A Well, the technology may be different, but the -the goal is to provide software that can track users both indoors and outdoors is what I said about Place Lab, and Skyhook was providing a solution that attempted to do the same sort of thing.
Q Is Skyhook's technology different from Place Lab? MR. LU: Objection to the extent it calls for speculation.
A Yeah, I would have to look closely at their technology -- Skyhook's technology and it's also a question whether you're referring to the technology at the time versus what their technology might be today. I don't know what their technology is today. And I would have to refresh myself about Place Lab's technology, which was, you know, some time ago. Q My -- my question, which I'll just clarify, was -- was directed to at the time you and your team
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0:23:50-10:25:15)
wrote this, do you know whether Skyhook's technology was at the time you wrote this different from Place Lab's?

MR. LU: Same objection.
A I don't -- I don't -- so there's two ways to answer that question. One is do I know now whether they were the same at the time and the other is did I know then whether they were the same at the time, and I think the answer to both of those is -- is no. I don't know -- I didn't know enough about Skyhook's technology because most of it wasn't publish to be able to have a concrete opinion about whether they were the same or similar.
Q Does this reference to -- to Skyhook do anything to help refresh your recollection about when it is you might have met with the Skyhook folks and at least loaded up -- one of your students loaded up their software?
A Yeah. Let's see. The challenge here is that this citation indicates that we were aware of Skyhook as a company and as a product at the time we wrote the paper which would have been late ' 05 , early ' 06 , which makes it likely that that meeting with them was around that time of late ' 05 but not necessarily. It's possible, and I don't remember, we may have been aware
(10:25:17-10:27:05)
of them as a -- as an existing company and solution before I met them.
Q Okay. You just don't know one way or the other I take it?
A Yeah. Sorry. It's a long way of saying I don't know.
Q Going down on into the third paragraph also on
that first page of Exhibit 1006, second sentence says, thus, researchers, it cites to 3 and 1, recently started using the AP locations estimated through war driving. And recently just stuck out at me. Do you know when people started using WiFi access points for location?
A No, I don't know. WiFi as a technology was finalized in about 2000 or 2001 and it was -- there was a period probably a year or two after that that people started recording the locations, often manually, off access point locations. When that term war driving started into fashion or when that practice became more common, $I$ don't remember. The citation is to papers from August 2005 and June 2005, but the practice probably began, you know, before that. Q Okay. You mentioned that people manually recorded WiFi access locations. Sounds cumbersome, but can you describe what it is you're talking about?
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## (10:27:08-10:28:34)

A Well, in the most extreme example there was a practice called war chalking to play on the word war driving where they would write on the streets, this was in Manhattan, most -- most commonly with chalk, and they had a special code that they used different shapes and symbols to describe what kind of access point was available near there. So that people walking down the street could know, ah, there's a WiFi access point and it's open and it's secure and so forth. So -- so that's what I meant by manual. Q Okay. And -- and how -- how's -- what's the technology for finding this?
A Well, the most basic tech -- if you have any WiFi access point -- or, excuse me, WiFi laptop or device, it will, by design, search for WiFi access points. And the access points broadcast in their normal mode of operation beacons, small packets of information announcing their presence, and so any mobile device can capture those because it's an open spectrum and record the information in that beacon.
Q And what kind of information is typically in the beacon?
A Typically it's the -- a number that identifies the access point. It's called a MAC address, M-A-C, and usually the name of the network and some other

10:28:48-10:31:13)
data about whether the network is secured and what protocols it supports. I don't remember the details beyond that but --
Q What's an SSID?
A SSID is an acronym whose full spelling I don't remember, but it's the name, usually a human readable name for the network.
Q Okay. And so the war chalking, do you know when that began?
A Yeah, I don't remember exactly, but it was in that time of the early 2000s. I don't think it's a common practice anymore.
Q And how about war driving, when did that become a common practice?
A I think you asked that already, and it's -- the best I could estimate would be between 2001 and 2005, but exactly -- you know, it's one of these emergent behaviors. It's not clear.
Q War chalking, I'm -- this is a term that I wasn't previously familiar -- familiar with.
A It's not commonly used.
Q Yeah, okay. But the -- the manually recording of WiFi access points or -- or war chalking, as it may sometimes be called, was that used to create databases of -- of WiFi access point locations do you know?
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(10:31:16-10:32:50)
1 A War chalking was not used to create databases but another form of manual recording would be after collecting the locations of where beacons were observed, you might record those manually, meaning using great personal effort as opposed to automated software to put them into a database to share them with other people, for example.
Q Okay. And does war driving typically use some sort of more automated system for creating a database of access points?
A War driving initially did not, to my knowledge, create databases, but it would -- the software that first appeared was for the data collection part of it. So you would have some software that would be designed to, you know, rapidly poll for beacons and record beacons and record your location as you drove along the street, and then when you got home you would have a list of what you saw and where you went. And what you do with that is a different question.
Q Okay. Is that called stumbler software or is that something else?
A That was one -- that was the name of one piece of software designed to do that.
Q In -- one of the things that we -- you guys did in the course of this study was create a database of

| (10:32:54-10:34:55) Page 65 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | WiFi access point locations that you had collected |
| 2 | through war driving, and I think you call it war |
| 3 | walking, is that right? |
| 4 | A Yeah. We may have been the only ones to use that |
| 5 | term. Well, we created a database in a very loose |
| 6 | sense. I mean, we collected the data and we recorded |
| 7 | it in our computers in order to do the analysis and |
| 8 | this research. |
| 9 | Q So you would agree that you did create a database |
| 10 | of the WiFi access points? |
| 11 | A Yeah. |
| 12 | Q Can you recall why it is that you decided to --- |
| 13 | actually, your team decided to supplement the data |
| 14 | gathered through war driving with this it's called war |
| 15 | walking? |
| 16 | A Well, we were studying the Dartmouth College |
| 17 | campus and the campus has some streets through it but |
| 18 | it has many buildings, and many of the buildings are |
| 19 | in large areas with no intervening streets and so in |
| 20 | order to better observe the access points inside some |
| 21 | of the big buildings, we had to walk around them on |
| 22 | the pedestrian sidewalks. |
| 23 | Q Okay. Did you drive all the streets on the |
| 24 | Dartmouth campus? |
| 25 | A I can't recall. I'm not sure if we did. |

(10:35:14-10:36:37) Page 66
(14-10.36:37)
Q Just take a step back on -- on the equipment.
Who chose the equipment that you used for this study?
A Well, it was a collaborative discussion, but it
was Minkyong who would have made the -- you know, the
detailed selection, you know, to examine what we had or what we needed to buy and then we would discuss it.
I can't remember if -- you know, if we had -- of what
we used, whether it was stuff we had and so it was
convenient or whether we had to go buy some stuff.
Q Do you remember any conversation about -- about
the strength of the antenna and how that would affect the study?
A I don't recall, no.
Q Does -- does the strength of the antenna affect
the study?
A Well, the -- the strength of an antenna does
affect how well you can hear beacons and how many you might hear. Whether it would affect this study and its conclusions would require a lot more thought. Q But I take it you'd agree with me that the
strength of the antenna affects the -- your ability to see, or hear maybe is a better metaphor, WiFi access points around you, stronger antenna you can hear ones that are further away?
25 A Sure.

10:36:38-10:38:01
1 Q Okay. And so the stronger your antenna, the better -- well, is it true that the stronger the antenna you have, the at least more data you're going to get about access points?
A Yes. You'll get more data, that's right.
Q Will you get better data?
A Better for what?
Q That is a good question. The -- was one of the
goals here to -- in this study to find as many access points on campus as -- as you could?
A No, I don't think that was a specific goal.
Q Okay. Did it matter to the study whether you
found some or all?
A To some extent, yes.
Q How?
A Well, we were interested -- we -- we knew the locations of the Dartmouth managed access points because we had access to them through Dartmouth. And we wanted to estimate their locations using war driving methods and then compare how accurate those estimates are -- well, compare those estimates with the known location to determine accuracy. And obviously the more of our own access points we could discover, the more data points we would have for our study, so it affected the study in that sense.
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## 10:38:07-10:39:44)

Q And more -- is it true that the more accurate -access points you have, the better location you could ultimately get?

MR. LU: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. Foundation.
A I think it would help me if you restated that question. It had a couple of different parts.
Q Sure. Is it -- is it -- is it true that the more
WiFi access point locations you have that you've determined through estimation, the better you're able to later determine the location of the mobile device in that same area?
A Generally, yes. The more access points -- the more data points you have that you can use for localizing later on, the better the result.
Q You said you didn't -- didn't know if you had driven all of the -- all of the streets. I mean, is there a reason you wouldn't drive all of the streets? A I don't think so. I mean, I'm looking at the map, which is a little hard to read in this printout but -- and it looks like we got most of them, at least close to the campus area. Of course, there are other streets in town. And I think it would make sense for us to drive all of the streets that are drivable in order to get more data points, but I can't say with

| (10:39:46-10:41:01) Page 69 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | certainty today that we did drive all the streets. |
| 2 | Q Okay. Well, would you agree with me that it's |
| 3 | sort of -- I guess it's -- the obvious way to maximize |
| 4 | the number of -- of data points is to drive all the |
| 5 | streets you can? |
| 6 | MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous. |
| 7 | Calls for legal conclusion. Foundation. |
| 8 | A Well, is it obvious? Well, I think that -- let |
| 9 | me think about your question carefully. So it does |
| 10 | seem clear to me that if you want more data points, |
| 11 | then you would drive more streets. |
| 12 | Q Was that clear at the time you wrote this paper, |
| 13 | designed the study? |
| 14 | MR. LU: Same objection. |
| 15 | A That's -- that's -- that's hard to say. I mean, |
| 16 | that's six years ago. In retrospect it seems clear, |
| 17 | but then I can't say -- I don't recall whether we |
| 18 | thought it was obvious at the time that was -- that |
| 19 | requires me to either speculate about my condition at |
| 20 | the time or remember something I don't remember, so I |
| 21 | can't answer. |
| 22 | Q Neither -- neither of which we are asking you to |
| 23 | do, sir. |
| 24 | A Right. |
| 25 | Q Did you walk all over campus? |

(10:41:01-10:42.12) Page 70
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A That would be a lot of walking.
Q I take it the answer is no?
A No. All over is a very broad term.
Q Well, one of the things that is described here,
it's in the third paragraph under war driving --
A On which page?
Q On -- it's the third page of the document.
A Unfortunately, not numbered.
Q I have realized that I have inadvertently handed
you a copy of the document that is not Bates numbered.
MR. LU: And my copy is not Bates numbered
either.
BY MS. MANNING:
Q For everyone's ease of reference I'm going to ask
to trade.
A Okay.
MS. MANNING: If that's okay with you,
Sam?
MR. LU: Sure.
MS. MANNING: Any objection?
MR. LU: And just to make the record
clear, all we're doing is trading a copy of the
Kim article Risks of Using AP Locations
Discovered Through War Driving that does not
have Bates numbers to one that does have Bates

10:42:15-10:44:00)A Page 3 you say.

Q Is the third page which is Bates numbered, GSHFED_0011327. And under the header for Section 3.2 war driving, the third paragraph down you'll see I guess it's the third sentence there. It says, to get signals from as many APs as possible and also not bias the AP location estimates towards one direction, we walked around each building and tried to stay close to it as long as we had GPS signal reception.

## A Okay.

Q How is it that walking around each building
affected the number of access points you were able to record?
A Some of the Dartmouth buildings are very large and have many, many access points and so the signal from the access points is not visible in all
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directions, from all sides of the building.
Q Okay. And how did walking around the building affect whether the AP location estimates were biased toward one direction?
A Well, as -- as the paper eventually concludes, I think, collecting data from one side of the building tends to -- you end up with data points, observations of an access point that are location stamped on that side of the building and so your estimate of that access point is biased toward that side of the building where you've taken the observations. If you take readings of an access point from all sides of a building, then you have a -- a location for each observation and those locations are on all sides of the building or as many as you can get the access point, and you're more likely to have a better estimate of the access point's location. Q And your team knew that that was -- that was one way to solve that problem as of the time you designed that study, right?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous.
A Well, we -- I think to say we knew that was one way to solve the problem is not quite correct. I mean, we -- we felt that that was a -- a way that would help us solve the problem. Whether we learned
(10:45:31-10:46:52)
that from someone else or thought of it ourselves, I don't know.
Q Okay. Is that the same thing as arterial bias
that's described in the 988 and 694 patents, the same
problem you just described?
A Not exactly, no.
Q How is it different?
A This form of bias -- so assuming that, for
example, you drove every street and you were able to
hear some of the access points inside of a building on the street, then what we were showing $I$ think, if I remember the results correctly, is that the access point location estimates are biased toward the street rather than in the center of the building or wherever they were. Arterial bias, as I understand it in the 988 patent, reflects a bias toward arteries as opposed to other streets. So they're related concepts, but they're not the same.
Q Help me understand that. What -- what -- what's the distinction you're -- you're drawing?
A Well, so as I understood the -- the use of the phrase arterial bias in the 988 patent, they were concerned that data points would be collected only on so-called arteries, which are the heavily trafficked roads in the -- in a city and as opposed to other
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roads, and so you would -- the locations of APs would be -- more likely to be placed close to the artery rather than close to their actual location. And in this case we were concerned with them being placed closer to a street, not necessarily an artery. Might be an alley that you drove on. And so I was distinguishing based on the word artery as they used it.
Q Well, both issues, to the extent they're --
they're different, are concerned with the biasing of
the -- of the calculated location of the access point toward the place where the reading was taken --
A Yes.
Q -- correct?
A Yes.
Q And the actual results you got in the study --
the number of -- very often you see that the access
point is actually calculated as being on the path
where the reading was taken?
A Correct.
Q Okay. And that is the same thing we see depicted
in Figure 3 of the 988 patent that's Exhibit 1007?
MR. LU: Objection. Mischaracterizes the witness's testimony.
A Well, that's a statement. Are you asking a
(10:48:26-11:05:11)
question?
Q I -- I am asking, is it true that that is the
same thing that we see depicted on Figure 3 of the 988 patent?
A So help me remember what you mean by that. You said that is the same thing so --
Q Sure. Figure -- do you agree with me that Figure 3 depicts calculated locations as being actually on the path that the scanning vehicle took?
A Yes.
Q And that's the same basic issue that you --
you -- you found when you were driving Dartmouth
campus, your access point locations would be
calculated as being actually on the same path that the scanning vehicle or the walker actually took?
A In some cases, yes.
MS. MANNING: Let's change tape.
VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 10:53 and we're going off the record.
(Recess taken)
VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 11:09 and we're on the record.
BY MS. MANNING:
Q Dr. Kotz, I want to ask you another question about that same paragraph on the third page of Exhibit
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1006 where it describes walking around each building to take readings. Were you trying to get multiple scans of each access point?
A Yes.
Q Why?
A In order to estimate the location as something other than the location where you were standing, you need multiple scans in order to triangulate.
Q And you need them from different locations around the access point, is that right?
A Right.
MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous.
A You need them from different locations, and if you can get around the access point, then hopefully you can get a better -- more accurate position estimate.
Q You emphasized around, which isn't going to show up on the transcript, so could you just explain what you mean by -- you emphasized around. Why did you emphasize that?
A Because if you have -- you can't do triangulation without readings from multiple locations, that is, three, and if the three location -- or more locations are on one side of the access point, then your estimate is necessarily going to be closer to the

| readings than the actual location. If you can get readings from -- that are on -- on points around the access point at -- in other words, not all on one side of the access point, then your estimate will be better. <br> Q And I have to ask you because you're testifying <br> here in 2011. That's something that your team <br> understood at the time you were designing the study <br> and doing this work? <br> A Yeah. <br> MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous. <br> A We understood that having readings from around the access point would be -- lead to better -- more accurate estimates at the time. <br> Q Okay. And you understood that you needed multiple scans in order to calculate the location? <br> A Yes. <br> Q Okay. How is it that -- that you knew that the <br> biasing of the access point locations was -- was a <br> potential problem? Do you recall? <br> MR. LU: Could you re -- could you read back that question please? <br> (Pending question read back) <br> MR. LU: Objection. Foundation. Vague and ambiguous. <br> A I don't recall how we knew that. I could <br> speculate about how, you know, but that -- I don't see <br> any point in that. <br> Q I'll ask you for your best recollection if you <br> have one -- have one, but I won't ask you to <br> speculate. <br> A Yeah, I can't -- I don't have a good <br> recollection. I'm sorry. <br> Q Do you recall how it is that -- that your team understood that -- the method by which the area was traversed affected location calculation and accuracy? <br> MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous. <br> A So can you characterize method by which the terrain was traversed? <br> Q Well, what you've been describing for me is you walked around the buildings -- <br> A Uh-huh. <br> Q -- so as to get multiple readings from around the building and, therefore, around the access points inside of it. <br> 21 A Right. <br> 22 Q And that's -- that's a different method of -- of <br> 23 walking through the area or driving through the area <br> 24 as opposed to just straight line right on by it for <br> 25 example. |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

11:09:15-11:10:39)
A Uh-huh. Uh-huh.
Q How is it that your team knew that how you
traversed the area will make a difference in the accuracy of the location calculations --

MR. LU: Same --
BY MS. MANNING:
Q -- and the access points?
MR. LU: Same objection.
A Well, quite literally, I don't know how we knew this. The -- you know, looking -- thinking about the mathematics of the calculations one -- and coming back to my previous answer about how having readings from around the access point will lead to a better accuracy estimate, it seems likely that we were hypothesizing and then going to do the study that one would get better results if one traversed the terrain in that way, but I don't remember how we came up with that at the time. So, I mean -- because that's -- that's your question, right?
Q Yes.
A How would we know? I don't know how we knew.
Q But you did know that. You did know that, for example, walking around the building --
A Apparently, yeah. It's -- obviously, eventually we figured it out one way or another.
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(11:10:41-11:12:14)
Q And you -- and you just don't recall whether that was something you knew at the time you were designing the study or it's a conclusion drawn during the course of the study?
A Well -- right. Right.
Q Do you -- well, withdrawn.
There are some figures in the -- in the paper
that show the actual path of walking, and I believe
there's one in here for the actual path of driving as well. Did you guys plan out the routes in advance, do you know?
A I don't know.
Q Do you have any recollection of how you decided where to drive or where to walk?
A See, the problem is that Minkyong was the lead on the details of the study and so I -- I -- I know we discussed it sometimes. I'm sure they did some test walks and test drives to get some test data to see how
things were going, but I don't remember how we made specific choices.
Q There's some references to obstacles like trees
and vehicles and structures. I take it you were not necessarily walking on paths?
A Right.
5 Q Is that --

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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Q There are -- if you look, for example, at Section 4.2, which is the sixth page of the document.

A All right.
Q I believe it's Bates number GSHFED_001330. Got
it? There are references to simple centroid and
weighted centroid algorithms and -- do you see those?
A Yes.
Q And there's reference in the next -- after the
semicolon to particle filter?
A Right.
Q Is that also location determination algorithm?
A I think so.
Q I should ask. Are simple centroid and weighted
centroid algorithms, are those location determination algorithms?
A Yes, I think so.
Q Other than what's written in the paper here, do
you have any recollection of how the number of
available access points affected the choice of which algorithm to use?

MR. LU: Objection. Foundation.
A I don't think -- you know, in this context we
were experimenting with all three algorithms, so we weren't choosing an algorithm. We were experi -- we would plug the data into all three algorithms and see

11:15:54-11:18:24)
how they did. At least that's -- from looking at Figure 3, that's what I'm seeing, we're -- we're presenting the accuracy, the error in each -- of each algorithm with each data set.
Q So is it fair to say that one of the purposes of the study is to determine which algorithms do a better job of -- of determining location of a mobile device?
A Yes. I mean, that's not a primary goal of the study, but that was part of it.
Q Okay. In other words, it's something you didn't know in advance?
A Correct.
Q You had to do the study?
A Correct.
Q Were there other location determination
algorithms available to you that you could have used in the study?
A Probably. I mean, at the time there had been
many, many published, but I can't remember which ones
were available to us at the time. So probably there were others at the time.
Q Okay. The paper discusses at some length the errors in the estimated locations of the access point as compared to the known actual locations of -- of each individual access point. What -- what could have
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been done differently in the study to improve access point locations -- estimated access point locations, I should say?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous. Also to the extent it calls for speculation.
A Yeah, that's a broad question. What could have been done differently in the study. Lots of things. Q Like what?
A Well, some of which we've partly discussed.
There are other algorithms one might have used to better compute an estimate from the data we collected. We could have collected more data points. We could have used a stronger antenna or different antenna anyway. These are the things that come to mind, but given a few weeks, we could probably think of some other things too.
Q Okay. Anything else you can think of as you sit here?
A No.
Q Okay. You said you could have used other algorithms besides the three that are mentioned in the -- in the paper?
A Right.
Q I think you mentioned a moment ago that you thought there were others?

## (11:19:44-11:20:52)

A Yeah. There were likely others available. The goal of this study wasn't to think up a new algorithm or to find the very best algorithm for locating access points.
Q Okay. And you said you could have used a
stronger or different antenna?
A Yeah.
Q Which would just be a way of collecting more
access points, correct?
A Yeah.
Q Would it -- would it have any other effect
besides just more access points?
A Well, you might -- I mean, I suppose you might get more accurate signal strength estimates, and signal strength is a -- a weak proxy for distance, which is why one uses it as a weighting factor. And so it's possible that different antenna technology might have given better -- better signal strength estimates and therefore better distance estimates and, therefore, better weighting factors and, therefore, better estimation for example, but I don't know for sure what antenna we used and, you know, what alternatives were available at the time.
Q Right. You said it was a weak proxy for distance. Why -- why a weak proxy for distance?

(11
would have water in between, which is a significant attenuating factor, so it would be very difficult to account for that.
Q And do these -- you know, the -- your paper talks about a number of -- of pre-existing location systems placed on it, for example I think you used Place Lab software. Do you know, do these pre-existing location determination systems, do they account for variations in signal strength or do they also treat it as a -- as a proxy for distance?

MR. LU: Objection. Compound. Also object to the extent it calls for speculation. A Well, I don't -- Place Lab is one example, one that we did cite. I don't recall that it used anything more complex than essentially a proxy for distance-type approach. I would be surprised if it did.
Q Why would you be surprised?
A Because it's very difficult, especially if you don't know anything about the environment.
Q Okay. The other thing that you mentioned when you were describing things you could have done to improve location, you could have collected more data points.
A Yeah.
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23:27-11:24:44)
Q How would -- how would one have done that? How could you have accomplished that?
A Well, I noticed in my quick review of the paper just now that we drove at ten miles per hour, for example, and we walked -- I don't know if it said how fast we walked, but that was in order to collect data points sufficiently frequently as you drove. If you drove through quickly, obviously there's less time. The beacons are sent typically ten times a second and so if you drive through quickly, you're not going to pick up very many beacons and so if you drive through slowly, you can pick up more beacons in the amount of time that you're nearby and that gives you more data points. So if we had tried different techniques to pick up more data points, we might have had -- we might have been able to compute more accurate locations, and one way we could have done that was to be to change the software or the driving patterns, walking patterns, etc.
Q When you say change the driving or walking patterns, do you mean literally the route?
A Yes. You could change the route. We could have changed -- we could have walked more slowly. We could have changed the software to collect more frequent data points. I'd have to think. Those are some

## (11:24:50-11:26:18)

examples of how we might have collected more data points.
Q How would changing the route have affected the number of data points?
A Well, if we hadn't driven every road, then we could have driven more roads. If we hadn't walked every path or every -- between every pair of buildings, we could have covered those spaces we missed. And so, obviously, if there are places we missed we would have collected more data points if we hadn't missed those. You might -- there might have been some benefit from driving or walking segments again, you know, repeating a segment. Although that seems wasteful, it could give you more data points. Q These -- these solutions for how to get more -more data points and, therefore, more accurate location, you know, for example driving more slowly or changing the route or just being more comprehensive in your route, those were all things known to your team at the time the study was being conducted?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous.
Calls for speculation.
A I don't know if they were known. I mean, I -I'm -- I'm listing these examples today because they are apparent as things we could have done. Whether we
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thought of them at the time or could have thought of them at the time, I don't know.
Q Has the technology changed in any way that would make something, you know, apparent today that -withdrawn.
Is there anything -- is there anything about the technology that's changed that would make the solution of driving more slowly or driving more
comprehensively, you know, apparent to you today in
ways that it wasn't when this study was actually designed and conducted?

MR. LU: Objection, vague, and foundation.
A I don't think so. The technology has actually
changed quite a bit in many ways, but whether it would have changed the apparentness of those things is really hard to know because sometimes ideas that seem obvious in retrospect are not obvious at the time. That's just the nature of things.
$Q$ If you could go over to Section 4.6 of your paper please. Begins on the page Bates numbered GSHFED_0011336. Got it?
A Yeah.
Q There is a discussion that begins here of access point interference. Just for the record, could you just briefly describe what -- what -- what the problem

11:28:51-11:30:13)
of interference is?
A Well, WiFi technology uses unlicensed spectrum, and the set of frequencies available for WiFi is fairly narrow and so each access point has to pick a subrange of those frequencies for its use and there are only -- at least at the time there were only 11 such ranges, and they overlapped. So you have access points that are next to each other, near each other, using the same frequency or overlapping frequencies, then they interfere with each other and the communication doesn't work well. So that's what I mean by wireless interference.
Q And how does that affect -- affect the location technology, that interference?
A Well, I think that that wasn't what we were trying to do in this section, but $I$-- it does -- it would affect it in the sense that if there are APs transmitting beacons on the same channel, they could collide with each other, and the beacons, meaning the transmissions, interfere and then no one receives the beacons successfully and so those beacons are lost. And, therefore, if you were trying to collect data for war driving or if you were trying to use beacons later for localization, you might miss some beacons because of the interference.
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Q Is the -- the interference means that you
literally don't receive the data from the access points that interfere with one another?
A Yes, in -- in the most simplest sense, right. If they collide. If they transmit at the same time, then their signals interfere and the receiver can't decode either one of them.
Q Okay. So is it that you have no information
about those -- those access points or just that some
of the -- some of the beacon packets get filtered out and your data is of less quality?
A Some of those beacons -- the beacons that collide with another beacon or another data packet would be lost, but beacons are retransmitted usually about ten times a second, so if you are there long enough, you would hear the next beacon. If you're driving by pretty fast, you might miss it.
Q Was there any reason to -- to filter out some of the observed access points when you were actually doing location calculations?
A Yes, I think so. Again, this paper -- it's been a while, but we -- I believe we observed non-Dartmouth access points set up and run by private citizens in the neighborhood, and we didn't know the location of those access points and so for the purposes of our

| (11:31:37-11:43:35) Page 93 | (11:45:17-11:46:58) Page 95 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 study, we weren't able to estimate or compute the | 1 discussed this -- this aspect of it. |
| 2 error of our estimates for those AP | 2 Q I'm going to hand you what's been marked as |
| 3 Q Okay. Okay. So you -- you filtered those out | 3 Google Exhibit 1008, document entitled on its face |
| 4 entirely for the location calculations, is that right? | 4 Declaration of Anthony S. Acampora, Ph.D. |
| 5 A Whether we filtered them out for the loca | 5 A Okay. |
| 6 calc | 6 Q Is that the document you've previously reviewed |
| 7 MS. MANNING: Can we take just a very | 7 sir? |
| 8 short break? | 8 A Yes, it looks like it |
| 9 MR. LU: Sur | 9 Q It's not a small document. The good news is I |
| 10 VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 11:37 and | 10 have a specific question for you. If you turn to |
| 11 we're g | 11 paragraph 60, which is on page 26 |
| 12 (Recess taken) | 12 A All right. |
| 13 VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 11:47 and we're | 13 Q On page 26 you'll see a section also titled Level |
| 14 back on the record | 14 of Ordinary Skill in the Art, and in paragraph 60 |
| 15 BY MS. MANNING | 15 Dr. Acampora states in this case, it's my opinion that |
| 16 Q Dr. Kotz, could you please turn to Exhibit 1004, | 16 one of ordinary skill in the art would be one with a |
| 17 which is your declaration. | 17 bachelor's degree in electrical engineering or |
| 18 A Okay. | 18 computer science and three to five years' experience |
| 19 Q And, in particular, if you could turn to page 6 | 19 working in wireless communications hardware and |
| 20 of it please. And in the middle of the page there it | 20 software design. |
| 21 says level of ordinary skill in the art, and you in | 21 A Yes, I see that. |
| 22 paragraph 32 -- you offer an opinion about the | 22 Q So they're pretty similar but not identical? |
| 23 personal skill in the art? | 23 A Yes. |
| 24 A Yes. | 24 Q And I wanted to ask you some questions about the |
| 25 Q And it says here, in my opinion, a person of | 25 reason for the -- the differences between them. |
| Page 94 | (11.47.05-11:48.20) Page 96 |
| 1 ordinary skill in the art would have a bachelor's | 1 Dr. Acampora includes in his description of person of |
| 2 degree in electrical engineering or computer science, | 2 ordinary skill in the art three to five years of |
| 3 comma, three to five years of experience working in | 3 experience working in wireless communications hardware |
| 4 wireless communications software design, comma, and | 4 and software design, and I note that you omitted |
| 5 would be able to read and write computer source code. | 5 hardware and -- hardware and. Is there a reason for |
| 6 Is that, in fact, your opinion of the skill and | 6 that? Is that a difference in text or is it a |
| 7 education level of a person of ordinary skill in the | 7 difference in kind? |
| 8 art relevant to these patents in suit? | 8 A I hadn't noticed that difference before. I don't |
| 9 A Yes. | 9 know that it would be -- I'm not sure that it would be |
| 10 Q What's the basis for your opinion? | 10 necessary for someone to have hardware experience for |
| 11 A Well, these patents are about compute | 11 designing wireless communications hardware in order to |
| 12 technology, WiFi networks, WiFi position estimation | 12 understand this patent. So I think it would be -- I |
| 13 and software to do so and so it seemed on reflection | 13 think it -- it's an unnecessary addition. So I'm |
| 14 that someone with this kind of experience would be | 14 comfortable with my -- |
| 15 needed to -- would be appropriate to be considered | 15 Q Okay. |
| 16 someone of ordinary skill in that art. | 16 A -- statement. |
| 17 Q Do you recall whether you reviewed Dr. Acampora's | 17 Q Okay. If someone had three to five years of |
| 18 declaration before formulating your opinion on this | 18 experience in wireless communications hardware as |
| 19 point? | 19 opposed to software, is it -- do you have a view on |
| 20 A Yes. | 20 whether that person would be appropriately viewed as |
| 21 Q I asked you if you recall so now I'll ask you, | 21 one of skill in the art? |
| 22 did you -- did you review it before formulating your | 22 MR. LU: And to clarify, you're asking |
| 23 opinion? | 23 just hardware design? |
| 24 A Yes, I think so. I mean, I read his declaration | 24 MS. MANNING: Yes. |
| 25 before we prepared this declaration and before we | 25 A Well, I think that would be less ideal. I think |
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degree and three to five years of experience in the relevant field?

## A Right.

Q Okay. And then you add to your definition a clause that's not in his, and would be able to read and write computer source code. Why'd you add that?
A Well, these patents are in many parts about the application of algorithms to solve the problem, and that requires someone to write code to implement those algorithms and so reading and writing computer source code would be a necessary condition.
Q Do you think the ability to -- to read and write
computer source code is implicit in the definition -in the description of someone as having a degree in computer science, for example?
A One would hope so, yes. Yeah, but I think it's
sometimes helpful to pull it out as -- to be clear
that that's something that's relevant in this case.
Q Okay. Well, one of the things I'm trying to
understand is if we have an actual disagreement here
or if these are perhaps phrased differently but
essentially overlapping definitions.
A Okay. I understand that's what you're trying --
Q Do you have -- do you have -- do you have a view on that?
(11:51:30-11:52:51)
1 A Well, unfortunately, I don't know what his -what's behind his statement, whether he, for example, thinks it isn't necessary to be able to read and write computer source code and so I can't know whether this is a difference in text or a difference in opinion. Q Okay. Well then I'll -- let's just ask about your -- your views. I think we seem to -- seem to agree that we firmly hope that a computer science graduate can read and write source code and we would, of course, expect that of computer science graduates. Would you expect the person with the electrical engineering degree would be likely to have some ability to read and write code?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous as to likely.
A I would expect someone with an electrical engineering degree of these days certainly, I mean recent years, to be able to read and write source code.
Q How about in 2005, would you have had similar
expectations?
A Yes. Yes.
Q Okay.
A Can I clarify that?
Q Sure.
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A Meaning someone with a degree in 2005 as opposed to someone who got their degree in 1965 in electrical engineering not -- not referring to anyone in this case, but in general there was no -- there was very little computer source code then. It wouldn't be part of an EE program then.
Q Understood. As of 2005?
A A fresh EE graduate would have that skill.
Q Right. Right. Okay. Do you have experience working with persons who would fit this description, your description, of skill and education level of person of ordinary skill?
A Yes.
Q Can you describe that experience for me please?
A Well, so many of the colleagues that I work with at Dartmouth and in my scientific community would fit this description.
Q By colleagues do you mean fellow faculty members?
A Yes, or graduate students or post docs or faculty and post docs at other universities.
Q Okay. Do you have any experience outside the academic setting working with persons who would fit this description?
A Yes, some. I've had some collaborations with other industry colleagues. For example, the location

## (11:54:24-11:56:05)

prediction work we spoke about earlier was a collaboration with engineers at NTT DOCOMO Labs, and they were of this sort, not in academics.
Q Okay. You'll have to remind me, what -- what time frame was that work?
A That would have been overlapping this work, this paper we discussed earlier. Between about 2003 and 2006 or 7, something like that.
Q Okay. And you suggested that some of the
graduate students and maybe faculty would fit the
description of a person of ordinary skill in the art.
And I'm curious where such a person would have acquired three to five years' experience working in wireless communication software design.
A Well, so for example the -- my most recently graduated PH.D. student graduated in -- this summer, spent five or six years at Dartmouth as a graduate student, and he worked most of his time at Dartmouth on wireless software and coding software that would run inside the access points, for example. And so by the time he finished certainly he had more than met this standard.
Q Okay. Are you a person of skill in the art?
A Yes.
Q Are you a person of extraordinary skill in the
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## :56:07-11:57:33)

art?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Do you -- how do you distinguish in your own mind between your own insights as a person of extraordinary skill in the art and those of a person of simply ordinary skill in the art? How do you make that distinction in your own head?
A Yeah, that's an interesting question. I have -for example, based on this definition, I have many more than three to five years of experience working with wireless networks, closer to $\mathbf{1 1}$ or 12 . On the other hand, my experience, it tends to be at a higher level as a researcher and research leader; whereas, an engineer or maybe some of my graduate students would work at a much lower level and have much more detailed knowledge of the technology than I'm able to have. So I have a greater skill in the broader scope of wireless networking, but if you ask me to, you know, spend the afternoon writing device driver for some new wireless card, I would have some difficulty. So -so, you know, there's different degrees of skill in different aspects of the technology.
Q Why is it you would have trouble spending the afternoon writing the driver?
25 A Because I haven't had the luxury of the time to
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(11:58:59-12:00:18)
I'll just represent to you my understanding is that it has some differences in the specification.

## A Okay.

Q Would you agree with me that the 988 , 694, and
245 specifications, other than perhaps their summary and abstract, are essentially identical?
A I recall them being very similar. I didn't do a line-by-line analysis to make sure they were identical.
Q We can -- I think we'll probably end up talking at some length about the specification of the patents in suit. For convenience I think we tend to talk about the specification of the 988 and -- and I'll continue to do that if you are -- if you are comfortable with the idea that it is similar to the 694 and 245. If you're not, we can go through all of them but --
A No, that's fine. It's a suitable representation.
Q Okay. And I'll also, you know, represent to you that the 245 references the disclosure of the other patents in suit and incorporates it by reference, so unless you're uncomfortable with -- with doing so, I'll also assume that our discussions of -- of the specification of the 988 , to the extent that's referenced or incorporated into the others, that --
:00:21-12:02:12)
that that testimony would be relevant to those patents. Is that fair?
A Seems fair.
Q Okay. So the question I had started to ask you
was about war driving and whether it was the same
thing as the random model discussed in the
specification of the 988 patent?
A Yeah, I'm trying to remember what the random model specifically meant.
Q Well, if it assists you, take a look, column 7, line 52 -- or really 55 . There's a reference to the random model.
A Okay.
Q Is that the same thing as war driving?
A No.
Q How is it different?
A Well, as described here, the random model is a use of war driving techniques by putting them into -putting a war driving device, they call it a scanning device, in vehicles as they are used for business or personal use going about their normal business. And many people who use the word war driving imagine someone going out purposefully to collect war driving data, meaning that they would drive around specifically trying to collect AP location data. And
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this is random, meaning -- in the sense that it's just happenstance. Wherever these cars go they collect data.
Q Okay. Could you look back on column 2, last
paragraph in column 2. It starts with Microsoft.
A Okay.
Q Do you see that? And in the fourth line down, line 61 there's a reference to war drivers.
A Right.
Q Would you agree with me that the -- the inventors used the term random model to describe war driving? A No. I don't think they equate them. They refer to war drivers here as amateur scanners who submit their WiFi scan data to public community web sites, and they don't talk here, at least not in a quick review of this, about how these amateurs collect the data, whether it's done in a random model or some other model. It's really in this definition about the collection and sharing with the community.
Q Okay. Did war driving include collecting data
through nonrandom models?
MR. LU: Objection to the extent it calls
for speculation. Foundation.
A I think this description of war driving certainly leaves that open, and I think a lot of war drivers do
(12:03:50-12:05:00)
use nonrandom models by this definition of random model.
Q So help me understand that. What's -- when you say this definition of random model, what exactly do you mean?
A The page -- you know, column whatever it was.
Q Column 7?
A Column 7.
Q Okay. And you think ran -- the war drivers used
nonrandom models in contrast to the specific
description of random model here. What model -- what models are they using?

MR. LU: Objection. Calls for speculation.
A Well, you know, my main point was war drivers
could use any number of models. Some use this
so-called random model and some would go out and
survey their neighborhood in some pattern. It could
be anything.
Q You said war drivers would survey their
neighborhoods using some --
A That would be an example.
Q -- pattern. By pattern you mean a driving route?
They would follow a particular driving route?
A Yeah.
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Q Do you mean something else?
A Yeah, that's what I meant.
Q Okay.
A And that was an example.
Q Uh-huh. And can you think of specific examples
of war drivers doing that?
A No.
Q But it's your belief that the war drivers
discussed in column 2 , at least some of them, were doing that?
A Yes. I'm -- I'm confident that some of them did
that. I don't know of any specific examples.
Q Okay. Would you agree with me that the inventors
were trying to -- well, withdrawn.
Would you agree with me that the inventors
criticized the random model as a method of collection?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Was there a particular problem that the
inventors described themselves as attempting to solve in the disclosure of the patent?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague.
A Yeah. That's too broad. I'm sorry. What do you mean by in the disclosure of the patent --
Q Oh, well --
25 A -- problem to solve?
(12:06:45-12:07:42)
1
Q Problem to solve is not a term of art. When I
2 say disclosure of the patent, I mean the
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## (12:07:43-12:08:53)

1 the -- I am referring to the specification of 2 the 988 which is, as we've discussed, extremely 3 similar to that of the 694 and 245 and 4 incorporated by reference in the 897 so, yes. 5 MR. LU: Just -- just -- I'm not trying to 6 be difficult here. I want to figure out if 7 there are different problems that are discussed

15 A So in general the problem they're trying to solve 16 is building a system that allows one to determine the
17 location of mobile devices using WiFi location 18 positioning methods.
19 Q And as they discuss, you know, systems for
20 determining the location of -- of mobile devices,
21 those were -- those were known in the art?
22 A Right.
23 Q Those aren't new, right?
24 A Correct. So more specifically what they were
25 trying to do was develop systems that could do that
(12:08:58-12:11:50)
more accurately by, for example, driving all of the streets to collect more observations of the access points and avoid therein arterial bias and obtain better both reference symmetry and other features. Q Are those -- you just mentioned three things if I heard you correctly, that they were trying to drive all of the streets to collect more access points, that they were trying to avoid arterial bias, and they were trying to create reference symmetry. And we can have a discussion about what all those terms mean, but we'll get to that. The -- are those three different problems that they're trying to address?
A Well, they're all related.
Q They're all related problems?
A Yeah.
Q Okay. How are they related?
A Well, one of the reasons to drive all the streets is to -- I think I put it this way in fact, is to reduce arterial bias, and one of the other benefits of doing that is you increase reference symmetry. Q The -- how did the inventors' criticisms of the random model in the specification inform the opinions you expressed in your declaration?
A Let's see. So their criticism of the random model primarily is about the fact that the vehicles
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you've chosen to collect the data are not making any systematic attempt to collect the data and so they tend to travel on arteries and they tend to -- they will be unlikely to cover very many streets or certainly not all of the streets, and so that helped me to understand what they meant by arterial bias. In fact, that's where they seem to introduce the term arterial bias, at least they put it in quotes. And I don't know if it -- if -- if this is -- you know, has a strong relationship to some of the other parts of the opinion such as reference symmetry but, again, they're related concepts.
Q Just so I'm clear, what exactly are the related concepts?
A Arterial bias and reference symmetry. So, you know, we've just gone through how all these things are related, and then you asked me how the random model affected my formation of my opinion, and I explained how reading about their criticisms of the random model helped me to understand what they meant by arterial bias, and I'm not as clear about how well that helped me understand reference symmetry but, again, they're related concepts so understanding one helps one understand the other.
Q The -- one of the things you said is that the --
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your view that the random model wasn't likely to cover all of the streets. Can you tell me what exactly that's based on?
A Well, the random model, as they've defined it, is to put -- put a scanning device in, you know, everyday vehicles, taxis or personal cars, delivery vans, etc., and then let them collect data as they go around doing their normal business. And I think it's pretty clear that even though a taxi or delivery van might visit a lot of parts of the city, they're not going to visit every street, at least not in any finite period of time.
Q You agree with me, we're not talking about one vehicle, right? It's many vehicles?
A Correct.
Q Okay. Why wouldn't -- you know, if you outfitted every taxi in New York with a scanning -- with a scanner, why couldn't you get a comprehensive map of Manhattan in that way?
A You could get a lot, and people have done this, actually in San Francisco, but -- and I've seen the maps and they don't cover every street because there are some streets that just taxis don't happen to visit. They're -- they're small residential streets, and if they didn't have any customers there during the
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Q Do you have any understanding what the scan
period was for the examples you're talking about?
A I don't remember.
MS. MANNING: You have to change the tape.
VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 12:19 and
we're going off the record.
(Recess taken)
VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 1:01 and
we're on the record.
BY MS. MANNING:
Q Dr. Kotz, we were discussing -- before the break
we were talking a little bit about the random method
of data collection as it's discussed in the patent.
If -- and you gave an example of how you didn't think
that in the examples you were familiar with random
methods or war driving had resulted in a comprehensive
scan of a -- of a city, I think San Francisco was the
example you gave. Is there any reason why you
couldn't achieve a complete scan of a target area?
And by complete scan of a target area, I mean scan all
of the access points in the target area using the
random method if you had, you know, enough vehicles
MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous.
(12:58:00-12:59:25)
Also to the extent that it calls for a legal conclusion as to target areas a disputed claim term. Do you want to rephrase that?
MS. MANNING: Yeah. Fair enough. BY MS. MANNING:
Q Let me just clarify. In my question I'm not using target area in the sense of the claims. Let's just say a city. Make it a little easier. So is
there any reason why using the random method you could scan every access point in the city if you had enough cars with scan -- set up with scanning equipment and enough time?
A Yes.
Q Why?
A I think there is a reason. There are -- there are a couple of components to that. First of all, you would want to cover every street, and so set aside for the minute scanning every access point. If your goal was to cover every street with one of the vehicles at some time, if you had a lot of vehicles and you had a lot of time, eventually one thinks every street would be driven by some one of your vehicles, but you might require a very large number of vehicles or a very long amount of time before every street was visited by one of your vehicles. Now if -- since your question was
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(12:59:29-13:01:13)
about scanning every access point, that implies that every access point is visible in the WiFi sense from some street, and I would think in some places, very dense -- densely constructed areas or very large blocks there would be some access points that simply can't be heard. And then finally there are some access points that don't transmit beacons because they've been configured that way so they can't be discovered, so I think that's why I answered initially yes there is a reason why one cannot scan all access points.
Q And let me make sure I understood your -- your -your reasons. Is it -- is it primarily because not every access point is visible?
A Primarily, yes.
Q If we leave aside the access points that don't broadcast, as you just mentioned, is there reason why given enough -- enough scanning vehicles and enough time you could record an access point location for every access point that does in fact broadcast?
A There are some access points you would nonetheless miss because as I -- the other reason I gave in prior -- previously was there would be some access points that can't be heard because their signal isn't strong enough to reach a street.

| (13:01:24-13:02:43)112 P Isn't that a function of the strength of the 117 of the scanning vehicle as well as the |
| :---: |
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your scanning vehicle, I realize strong is not terribly specific, but let's assume --
A Right.
Q -- a strong antenna on the scanning vehicle, do you have a sense of how many access points you would expect would nevertheless not be scannable?

MR. LU: Objection. Foundation. Vague and ambiguous.
A I don't have a strong sense of what fraction of access points would not be scannable, and it would depend a lot on the nature of the access points, their antennas, and their placement and the environment and the scanning antenna. So I don't know.
Q Okay. And it sounds like we've spotted an issue here. There is a -- a scenario under which it is possible to miss access points?
A Sure.
Q Even though they exist and they're broadcasting in the clear. And do you have -- do you have any, you know, factual information that would allow you to -to make an assessment about a percentage of access points in a given city that would fall into that category? Any -- any facts to base it on other than recognizing it's a potential issue, but any facts by which to judge the severity of the issue?

13:04:17-13:06:40)
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1 A Certainly not at hand. I mean, earlier we were talking about my paper, Exhibit 1006, and in that paper there were several of our own access points that we knew existed and we knew were broadcasting that we didn't discover through war driving in our -- using our methods. And so that gives me confidence that -that it is easy to miss some of the access points. Q And was that a -- that failure to detect all those access points, was that attributable in some significant measure to the strength of the -- of the antenna on your scanning device?

## A I don't know. I mean, I'm sure that was a

 factor.Q My recollection -- according to the third page of Exhibit 1006 it says, we used a Linux laptop and a Cisco Aironet, A-I-R-O-N-E-T, Aironet 350 wireless card which supports 802.11 B . So you're using a card in -- a wireless card in a laptop?
A Uh-huh.
Q Not a -- not a strong antenna?
A No, nothing special.
Q Right. And Figure 2 of the 988 patent shows
directional antennas on the scanning vehicle, right?
A That's what it shows.
Q Okay. And directional antenna being a much, much
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stronger antenna than what's in a laptop?
MR. LU: Objection. Foundation. Vague and ambiguous.

## BY MS. MANNING:

Q Is that your understanding, sir, or do you have a different understanding?
A It's different. That term normally means something different than stronger. Directional means that it is aimed in a particular direction and it receives signals coming from that direction. Q Right. And it -- and it is able to receive signals from much further away in the -- in the direction that it's pointed than something like a card on the laptop you were using in your study?

MR. LU: Objection. Foundation. Vague and ambiguous.
A Generally speaking, directional antennas are designed for that purpose but not necessarily, but that -- they're generally designed for that. The word directional is more about the fact that they're -they're focused in a direction as opposed to omni directional which is what you would see in a laptop.
Q Right. And that affects the ability to -- to receive weaker signals from -- from further -withdrawn.

| (13:07:52-13:09:32) Page 121 |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| 1 | And that affects the ability to receive weaker |
| 2 | signals, correct? |
| 3 | MR. LU: Objection. Foundation. Vague |
| 4 | and ambiguous. |
| 5 | A One would use a directional antenna in order -- |
| 6 | one would use a specialized antenna for scanning |
| 7 | purposes so that you can receive weaker signals or |
| 8 | signals from farther away, and one approach would be |
| 9 | to use a directional antenna. And you would usually |
| 10 | choose a directional antenna that is designed with |
| 11 | that extra gain, meaning the ability to receive weak |
| 12 | signals. The other reason to use directional antennas |
| 13 | is so you can have multiple antennas listening in |
| 14 | different directions. The other reason is that |
| 15 | because they are directional, you know that this |
| 16 | signal came from that side of the street versus that |
| 17 | side of the street. So there are a lot of reasons why |
| 18 | one might use directional antennas, that's why it's |
| 19 | difficult to answer your question concisely. |
| 20 | Q Okay. Well, I appreciate your clarifying. |
| 21 | Sir, can you take a look at Figure 11 in the 988 |
| 22 | patent please. Are you familiar with this figure? |
| 23 | A Yes. I've seen it before. |
| 24 | Q Just generally, what's your understanding of what |
| 25 | it shows? |
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## :09:33-13:11:11)

A Well, it's comparing the random scanning model with the Chinese postman scanning model.
Q And the -- it's divided in half and the X's we see are locations where the readings were taken around the access point, is that your understanding?
A That's my understanding.
Q In the random scanning model does it show taking
multiple readings of the WiFi access point at
different locations around the access point?
A No.
Q What does it show?
A It shows -- it shows the locations of multiple
lo -- multiple readings of that access point location
and the calculation -- calculated estimated location of that access point, but all of the readings are on one side of the access point.
Q Well, there -- I -- I -- I will certainly agree
with you that they are all on -- perspective here is on the left side of the access point, but it's certainly taking readings from multiple locations? A Yes.
Q Okay. And those locations, I don't have a
protractor with me but, you know, probably something on the order of, you know, 140 or so degrees? I don't mean to be precise with that but --
(13:11:13-13:12:40)
1 A Right.
2 Q -- a big arc --
3 A Yes.
Q -- around it? Why isn't that taking readings
from multiple readings from locations around the access point?
A Well, I guess an intuitive understanding of around, at least in my mind, would include readings that were from not just the left side but the right side. What we have here is from -- some from the top side and some from the bottom side, again, using this perspective but only from the left side and not from the right side, and so it doesn't -- by contrast to the right side of the figure, the Chinese postman scanning model where you see $X$ 's all around the access point and many locations above and below, left and right. So I think it's more in contrast that one sees the lack of the -- the lack of the locations being around the access point.
Q Okay. So it sounds like you think the Chinese
postman scanning model clearly shows taking multiple readings from around the access point?
A That figure does, yes.
Q Yes. Okay. And if you had even one reading from the right side of the access point in the random
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(13:12:42-13:14:33)
scanning model, would that be taking multiple readings from around the access point in your view?
A That's -- that's hard. It's -- I think it would be difficult to clearly define what would be sufficient to -- to say that it is collected around the access point. I'm not sure how precise one needs to be given the nature of the material in this packet, but one is not -- I mean, it would be nice to see a few more than one on the other side.
Q Well --
A So -- so -- but I see what you're doing. You're trying to look for a line. At what point does it become around?
Q Yeah.
A I don't know.
Q Okay. Let me ask you a question about Figure 3.
And I trust you're familiar with this figure?
A Yes.
Q And, generally speaking, what's your
understanding of what it shows?
A This is a scenario showing arterial bias.
Q And it is so -- so entitled. The path of the scan -- scan vehicle is what we show in the heavy black line with arrows, right?
A Right.

## (13:14:34-13:15:58)

Q Okay. And the figure shows calculated locations of access points, and in most cases those are actually on top of the path of the scan vehicle, right?
A Right.
Q I am interested in one of the access points in
the middle box, and there is an access point that is
sort of nearer the bottom left-hand corner there, and
there is a calculated access point that is right on
the bottom left-hand corner. Do you see that?
A Yes.
Q Would you agree that -- that those correspond,
the -- the calculated access point is the calculated
access point for that nearest access point?
A Not necessarily. It's likely, but there's
nothing in the figure that helps us know that for sure.
Q Okay. But you'd agree that's the most likely reading of this?
A Yes.
Q Okay. The access point itself, not the
location -- calculated location, but the access point itself, has that been scanned from multiple sides around the WiFi access point?
A This figure doesn't show the locations of the scans, but it shows the path where the scans were
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## (13:16:03-13:17:35)

taken, and if one assumes that a lot of the scans were taken along that path, then -- well, it's somewhat around. I mean, aroundness, if you will, is maybe a matter of degree but, you know, if -- all the scans are going to be on the left or lower side of that access point, not on the right or upper side of that access point.
Q It's -- again, perhaps we would benefit from a protractor that we don't have here.
A Yeah.
Q But it's, you know, going to be significantly more than 180 degrees --
A True.
Q -- around it, wouldn't you agree?
A True.
Q And the calculated location for that access
point, the one that we think is most likely for that access point, that's the only calculated location shown in this figure that isn't actually on the scan path, right?
A Right.
Q And would a person of ordinary skill in the art understand that the reason it's not on the -- on the scan path be because it has been scanned -- because the access point has been scanned from multiple
(13:1
11
1 locations around the access point.
A I think so. I mean, I think they -- if you studied this carefully, you would recognize that the -- the scans occurred in multiple locations that were up this north-south Street 304 and this east-west Street 305 and that they were on -- sufficiently on -on sides -- on two sides of the access point so that you could get that estimate.
Q Okay.
A But to say -- to go to say that -- you know, you used precise language about multiple locations around the access point and whether one understood it to be around in this case, I'm not sure. I think there -one could -- some might say that but most probably would not, especially when you compare it with Figure 4 which more clearly shows scans that are around the access points. And I think that's the kind of contrast that the patent's about, and they're trying to make that point.
Q Well, I -- what I'm trying to understand is -- is your opinion about what a -- a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand from the teachings of the -- of the specification. And if I'm -- if I'm understanding you correctly, it might be a person of ordinary skill in the art might be of two minds.

Page 128
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A Well, there are two people of ordinary skill would be each of different minds, but I think -- I mean, I think the -- the -- the figure has to be examined in the context of the other figures, and the patent specification is trying to teach by showing this contrast, this is what it looks like when you have arterial bias, meaning that because you're only driving arteries, your estimated locations are skewed towards the arteries because there aren't enough observations around the access points; whereas, if you have this other model derived, for example, from using the Chinese postman routing algorithm, then you'll get many more observations that are more around the access point and you'll get better estimations.
Q Figure 3, the access points that's in the bottom left-hand corner of the middle -- middle box, would you describe that as having more or less arterial bias than the other access points that are right on the scan path?
A Less. It would have -- it has less arterial bias than the ones that are on the scanning path. Q Okay. And so -- so the amount of -- the amount of arterial bias can vary even in the -- the random model, is that a --
A True.

| (13:20:41-13:22:39)1 Q Okay. And in Figure 4, which is the next figure,2 that's the one you were contrasting Figure 3 with,3 this figure shows the calculated locations of the ${ }^{4}$ access point and the actual access points. So like -- |
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|  |
| ---: |
| Page 130 |

What's your understanding, sir, of what the Chinese postman model is?
A I actually was not familiar with that algorithm before reading this patent. I understand it's a variation of the Eulerian tour problem and it's an algorithm that -- that maps out a route that covers every segment in a graph, in this case the graph being a city map, with the goal of visiting every -- every street segment.
Q And have you ever read the article actually
referenced, I believe it's Kwan article, actually referenced in the patent at column 8, line 40 -- I'm sorry, 39? Graphic programming using odd or even points in Chinese map?
A No.
Q You've never -- never read it?
A No. That was before I was born.
Q Before most of us were born.
A Yes.
Q The -- withdrawn.
Do you have any understanding of what Chinese
postman is other than just what the patents themselves say on this?
A No.
25 Q Would you agree with me that the goal of the

24:19-13:26:41)
Chinese postman routing model is to cover every street and minimize the number of streets that are visited twice?
A That's my understanding, yes.
Q Do the patents teach any way of achieving
reference symmetry other than by using Chinese postman routing model?
A Well, my recollection is that they -- they use
the Chinese postman routing algorithm as one example
of a -- or maybe the word is preferred embodiment, as
one way of achieving -- of achieving reference
symmetry by driving all the roads, but I think there -- I think they leave open the possibility, it certainly is a reasonable possibility, that one could use other algorithms that cover all the roads.
Q Do they give any examples of other approaches to achieving reference symmetry?
A I don't recall them giving other specific examples, but I do recall them using -- I'm looking for it, but I do recall them using language to the effect that this would be one approach, the Chinese postman algorithm.
Q Are you relying on column 8 , line 28 or so?
A That's where I'm looking. So at line 41, for example, it says preferred embodyence -- embodiments
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of the invention include a methodology for identifying a target region for coverage and then using the Chinese postman routing algorithm for planning the vehicle route. So I take that to mean that they after having introduced the Chinese postman algorithm say this is one way you could do it, but you could also do it other ways.
Q Okay. But if I understood your testimony a moment ago, you don't -- you would agree, they don't actually reference any other ways of doing it?
A Not that I recall, but I also understand they don't need to.
Q Well, that's a -- is that -- that's a legal --
A That would be a legal thing.
Q -- understanding?
A And I'm -- you know, but then I'm -- you know, I'm not a lawyer, I don't know for sure, but that's my understanding.
Q Leaving Mr. Lu and I to debate the legal requirement --
A Yes.
Q -- you agree, there is no -- there's nothing else besides Chinese postman taught in terms of a way to traverse every street in the target area, correct?

MR. LU: Objection. In terms of -- oh, of
(13:27:44-13:29:56)

1
2

17 Q Got it?
18 A That's lines 23 or so down to 30.
19 Q Right. Is there any way to -- to meet those
20 requirements other than driving a route through the
21 target area that covers every street in the target
22 area?
23 A I don't think one has to cover every street to
24 meet those requirements. You have to record multiple 25 readings. You have to record them at different
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(3:29:58-13:31:26)
locations. Those readings have to have reference symmetry relative to other access points in the area, which would mean you'd want to have a large number of the streets driven so that you'd have a lot of, you know, distrib -- good distribution of readings, and you want to avoid arterial bias in the calculations, which would mean that you would want to avoid collecting all your data on a few arteries. So you would want to collect data from many streets, but I don't think you would have to -- according to this claim language and my opinion, you wouldn't have to collect it on every street.
Q Okay. How could you achieve reference symmetry if you didn't collect data from every street?
A Well, we haven't talked about what reference symmetry is yet.
Q There is a debate about what that is, I realize that.
A And I have, you know, expressed some opinions about that. In order to get reference symmetry you need to have a good distribution of readings around the -- the access -- around the relevant access points or at places where you're trying to localize the users, and I think one could do that if you didn't cover every street, but if you were missing any

## (13:31:28-13:33:17)

1 significant streets or, you know, if there were some
2 regions that weren't well covered because you were
3 skipping a street or two, then you probably wouldn't have sufficient reference symmetry in that region. Q Okay. Do the patents teach that you have to plan the route by which you drive the target area?
A Any of the four patents or are you thinking -asking about a specific one?
Q Well, let's start with the 988.
MR. LU: Just to clarify, you're simply talking about the disclosure or what the claims require?
MS. MANNING: I asked about the teachings and so I meant to ask about the disclosure.
A Oh, okay. Well, I was focusing on the claims at the moment.
Q We can come back to that.
A Yeah. Right. I don't see any requirement in the claims that cover that you plan your routes. The disclosure, that is the specification, you know, uses the Chinese postman algorithm as an example of how one would plan a route that would cover all the streets and that would not -- and it would do so efficiently and criticizes the random model, which means -- which is sort of the opposite of planning, completely
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(13:33:19-13:34:32)
unplanned data collection, but I can't recall if they -- if the specifications specifically requires a plan.
Q Well, the -- the same line that we were looking at earlier, column 8 , line 28 ?
A Yeah.
Q Another approach is devel -- is develop a --
routing algorithms that include every single street in the target area so as to avoid arterial bias in the resulting collection of data, thus, producing a more reliable positioning system for end users?
A Sure.
Q You'd agree with me that is talking -- that is teaching that one is to plan the route through the target area, correct?
A Right.
Q Okay. And then immediately thereafter it -- it discusses the Chinese postman as an optimized routing algorithm?
A Right.
Q And, again, Chinese postman is described as covering every single street in the target area?
A That's the goal of that classic problem, yes. Q It's not just the goal of Chinese postman, it is the goal the inventors describe as -- it is the goal

| (13:34:38-13:46:29) <br> of -- you were to achieve through planning your route? <br> A Yes. <br> Q The line before that. The goal is to drive every street? <br> A Yes. <br> MR. LU: Now would be a good time for a <br> short break? <br> MS. MANNING: I was just going to say, sure. <br> VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 1:39 and we're going off the record. <br> (Recess taken) <br> VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 1:49 and <br> we're on the record. <br> BY MS. MANNING: <br> Q Okay. Let's take a look at the prosecution <br> history of the 988 patent. And we will mark this as Google Exhibit 1009. The Bates numbers are GSHFED_0000154 through 273. <br> Dr. Kotz, I think you've told me that you have <br> not seen -- you may have in your possession somewhere <br> on a hard drive, but you have not actually looked at <br> 23 the prosecution history, right? <br> 24 A Right. I have not looked at all of it. <br> 25 Q Okay. If you turn to the page Bates numbered |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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## (3:46:35-13:48:47)

183. That page is page 3 of an amendment to the claims that was made during prosecution, and on the page that I've directed you to, GSHFED_183, you'll see a listing of the claims, and it shows how they have been modified through amendment?
A Uh-huh. Yes.
Q I believe this is quoted in our claim
construction brief. So is this familiar to you? Have you seen this before?
A Yeah, it does look familiar. I've seen it.
Q Okay. So this is the part you've seen?
A Yes.
Q Good. I wanted to discuss with you the
modifications we see here in the claim language, and
I'm hoping we can catalog together the differences between the claims as they were filed and as they actually issued. And would you agree with me that after the underlying language is inserted, it is the -- there is a new requirement that the multiple readings are recorded at different locations around the WiFi access point that wasn't there prior to the amendment?
A Well, the new language at the very least makes it more explicit. Before it was that the multiple readings are there to provide reference symmetry, and

13:48:52-13:50:13)

1
now they're saying that they are collected at different locations so that you get reference symmetry. I think that makes it more explicit that you need different locations. So, yes, it is -- the short answer was yes.
Q Okay. And I think you just paraphrased the language a moment ago. As a -- as amended, not as filed, but as amended Claim 1 requires that the multiple readings have reference symmetry relative to other WiFi access points in the target area, right?
A Right.
Q Okay. So it's -- it's the -- it's the multiple
readings that have reference symmetry, whatever that is, and we can talk about what that is, but whatever it is, it is something that the multiple readings have, would you agree with that?

## A Right.

Q And this requirement that the multiple readings
have reference symmetry relative to other WiFi access points in the target area, that's new too, right?
A Right. And, again, it's clarifying. It's making it more explicit what the reference symmetry means in this context.
Q When you say that it's clarifying, that -- am I to understand that -- that you think that the -- that
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50:18-13:51:29)
the change is actually just a clarification of something that was already required before?
A I think so, yes, because before in the earlier version it said readings of the WiFi access point to provide reference symmetry and now it's saying reference symmetry relative to other WiFi access points, so I think it's -- that helps to -- to me anyway, that helps me understand what reference symmetry is about in this context.
Q Okay. But is it -- is it a substantive change in the scope of the claim or is it clarification of something that was already there?

MR. LU: Objection to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion.
A Yeah. I mean, I can't comment in the legal context, but from my reading as an expert, I think it's a clarification because the reference symmetry is a word that is defined in the context of this patent and it helps one who's reading this to understand what reference symmetry means in the context of this claim. Because reference symmetry in these patents has two meanings. It -- it occurs in two different contexts, right. One is reference symmetry in the context of location determination of a mobile client and the other one is, in this case, reference symmetry

## (13:51:33-13:53:25)

relative to other WiFi access points. So this helps disambiguate that.
Q You said that of the two -- in your view there are two contexts, one of which is reference symmetry in the context of a mobile client?
A Well, yeah.
Q What do you mean by that?
A If you look back at my declaration, we talk about
these two different cases.
Q And is it your view that claim -- Claim 1 of the 988 sort of specifies one of those two cases? You think there are two kinds of reference symmetry discussed in the -- in the patents?
A There are two.
Q And is it your testimony that -- that Claim 1
pertains only to one of those two kinds, specifically
to reference symmetry relative to other access points in the target area?
A Yeah, I think so. I mean, the -- the other -- I mean, the other use of the -- of that term shows up in a different -- different part of the claim language and perhaps in one of the other patents and this is one that's about reference symmetry relative to WiFi access points and that one was reference symmetry relative -- I forget the exact wording.
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(13:53:35-13:55:31)
1 Q
2 Here's the 694 patent. Let's mark it. Let's 142 the 694 patent.
(13:55:35-13:57:25)
that term. One of them is with respect to certain language in the 694 patent and one of them is with respect to language in the $\mathbf{9 8 8}$ patent, this particular section that we were just discussing. And that's what I was thinking of when I said there are two different contexts in which that term is used, reference symmetry. And so in this -- when I was coming back to this particular language, I felt that this addition of this phrase relative to other WiFi access points, you know, to me was -- was helping to clarify which of those contexts we were talking about.
Q Okay.
A Sorry that was a bit muddled. I'll try to be clear.
Q Looking at the prosecution history we received, the -- the as filed and as amended versions of Claim 1 , do you have a view on whether the claims as amended are narrower or broader than the claims as they were filed?

MR. LU: Objection to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion.
BY MS. MANNING:
Q I should say or are they the same?
A Yeah, I don't -- I mean, again, from a nonlegal perspective, just from reading this as a person of
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(13:57:29-13:59:48)
ordinary skill in the art, my impression is that they're the same and that they are clarifying rather than narrowing.
Q If we look at the prosecution history of the 694. You can put that large document away for now. We may come back to it, but let's look at a different one for a moment. I'm going to mark as Google Exhibit 1011 the prosecution history of the 694 patent, which is Bates numbered GSHFED_0000274 through 372. And, again, I understand from your earlier testimony that you have not reviewed this document.
A Not in whole, no.
Q But if you would turn to the page Bates number ending 297. You will see something similar to what we were just looking at. You will see an amendment to the claims of the 694 patent. And I believe this was also quoted in our opening papers which you have read. A Right.
Q Is this familiar to you?
A Yes, it looks familiar.
Q And in 694 we again see certain amendments to the same limitations that discuss the taking -- taking of readings, arterial bias and reference symmetry. I'm obviously paraphrasing. And in the 694 we see that the applicants inserted the language at different
(13:59:53-14:01:20) Page 145
1
2
2
locations around the WiFi access point and that refers
3 A Right.
Page 146

## (26-14:03:21)

inserted new language down to the bottom where it talks about the database records for substantially all WiFi access points in the target area provide reference symmetry within the target area?

## A Right.

Q Same question, is that a substantive change in the scope of the claim as you understand it or is it clarification of requirements that were already there?
A I think it's a clarification. I mean, they've
got the -- they're essentially rewording the reference symmetry aspect of the claim in this bottom phrase.
Q So is it -- is it your understanding that the --
the scope of the -- of Claim 1 of the 694 patent as
filed is substantively the same as the scope of it as
it actually issued?
A Yeah.
Q You can also put away that large document.
A You guys use a lot of paper.
Q Again, so stipulated.
A Excuse me.
MR. LU: Is that noise being picked up?
THE WITNESS: I wondered.
BY MS. MANNING:
Q Let's look at figure --
MR. LU: Let me go -- let's take a quick

14:03:23-14:09:24)
1 break. I'm going to check to see if the door
is open in the laundry room. It was earlier and I asked --
MS. MANNING: Sure.
VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 2:07 and we're going off the record.
(Recess taken)
VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 2:12 and we're on the record.
BY MS. MANNING:
Q Dr. Kotz, would you take a look at the 988
patent, Figure 5 please. Okay. What does this figure show us in your understanding?
A This figure is an example of the lack of reference symmetry with respect to user -- labeled user 501.
Q And the figure shows radio range of the user
device. Does it matter that most of the calculated
locations -- does it matter in terms of judging whether there's reference symmetry or lack of reference symmetry that most of the access points are out of range of the user device?

## A No, not to that user.

Q If we had -- withdrawn.
This figure -- unlike Figures 3 and 4 that talked
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09:29-14:11:30)
about arterial bias, this figure doesn't show us where the actual location of any of the access points are, right?

## A Right.

Q Does this figure still show us a lack of
reference symmetry even if the calculated locations are dead on over the top of where the access points actually are?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague and ambiguous. Foundation.
A Well, so if these estimated locations as drawn in the figure were the actual locations of access points and these are the set that are available for use in localizing the user, it would still show lack of reference symmetry.
Q We were talking a little bit before we changed the tape about different kinds of reference symmetry that you see in the -- the two different database claims, the 988 and the 694, and is this the -- the reference symmetry that we see here and also in Figure 6 , which also has the user, is that the kind of reference symmetry in the 694 patent -- the claims of the 694 patent I should say?
A Well, I need to go look at that. So in the 694
it says, and wherein the database records for
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## 4:13:20-14:15:09)

position of the user using the prerecorded locations and so it is close to this figure. I apologize.
Q Okay. Just -- just so I'm -- just so I'm
understanding your testimony --
A Right.
Q -- we've got a number of documents in front of us and you're kind of gesturing. If I'm understanding you correctly, you're telling me this: That the reference symmetry in the 694 is calculated with reference to a user, and that's the same thing as what we see in Figures 5 and 6 --
A Right.
Q -- is that right?
A Right. Sorry I got lost there.
Q In Figure 5, if we assume that the calculated locations of the user locations -- I'm sorry, calculated locations of the access points -- let me start over.
In Figure 5, if we assume that the calculated location of the access points are exactly right and they show precisely where the actual access points are, and if we also assume that this is -- this shows all of the access points that are actually in this area, does that make any difference, the fact that it shows all of them inaccurately? Does that make any
(14:15:15-14:16:57)
difference for the reference symmetry issue in determining whether there's reference symmetry or not?
A Well, it would be the best you can do, but I can't -- yeah. I -- would it make any difference? I think -- I think not. I mean, you would still have -you would still not have reference symmetry and -and -- you wouldn't have the desired degree of distribution of access points to get an accurate localization.
Q Okay. And that would just be a function of how the -- how the access points are actually distributed in the area?
A Right. Right.
Q I think of this as -- Figure 5 as the easy case?
A Yeah.
Q It obviously doesn't have reference symmetry.
Would you -- would you agree that it's obvious this doesn't have reference symmetry?
A Right. Yes.
Q Okay. And I think of Figure 6 as another kind of easy one. It obviously does have reference symmetry if you think reference symmetry is the distribution of the calculated locations around the access -- around the user rather?
A Yes.
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## (14:17:06-14:18:58)

MR. LU: Can we stipulate to both of those statements?

## BY MS. MANNING:

Q What's the -- what would happen if in Figure 6 we took away all three of the calculated locations in the top right-hand box? Would you still have reference symmetry?
A Well, it's -- it's much like the case we were discussing earlier, that $L$-shaped driving route. And I think it would be -- it would be less reference symmetry, if you can say that, if you allow me that, and it would be less desirable, but if that was the situation, that is to say there were no access points in that block, the best you can do, if you missed access points in that block because you didn't collect data well in that region, then you haven't collected data with full reference symmetry that's available or potentially available and so you haven't achieved the kind of symmetry that they're seeking in this method. Q Okay. So if I understand you, it depends on whether the access points are actually there or not. If we -- if we --
A I think so.
Q If we -- if there are in fact three access points 5 in that top right-hand box but we don't have

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
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|  |  |
|  |  |
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|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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## :20:07-14:22:05)

like that.
Q On Figure 6, if we took away all of the
calculated access points that are outside of the circle that shows radio range of the user device, let's assume that those access points exist but we don't have any information for them, would Figure 6 in that -- as modified still show reference symmetry or would it not show reference symmetry?
A Well, with respect to this user it would still show reference symmetry.
Q Okay. And once the user moves from the intersection that we see shown in Figure 6 to, say, the intersection across -- if you move from the -A West one block and south one block, is that where you're going?
Q Sure. Better way to put it. Thank you. And your user is now located west a block and south a block but you -- but you have the same access points present --
A And, again, the ones we agreed were not present.
Q The ones we agreed are not present are still not
present.
A Yeah.
24 Q Then do you have reference symmetry with respect 25 to that user?
(14:22:07-14:23:11)
Page 155

MR. LU: Objection. Foundation. What are the assumptions for why they're not present? MS. MANNING: The assumption for why they're not present is that they exist but you haven't scanned them.

## A Right. Okay. So --

Q I should say you don't have any data for their calculated location. Whether or not you've scanned them, you don't have any data for calculated location. A Okay. And assuming the same radio range? Q Yes.
A Okay. So in that case I think you would not have reference symmetry because you would only be -- you'd only have data for access points northeast of the user and you wouldn't have any data for the access points, although they are present, to the south and west and southwest of the user and so you wouldn't have reference symmetry.
Q Okay. Now let's change the assumption. If the assumption for the reason that we no longer have any information about those access points, it's not that we have failed to -- to scan them or put the information in the database, it's that they don't exist and your user still has moved south a block and west a block from where the user's actually shown in
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## 23:13-14:25:50)

Figure 6, in that situation is there reference symmetry with regard to the user?
A Well, it's difficult to say. I mean, it's -it's -- it's more like this case we discussed earlier, Figure 5, and so because the -- there is no way to get reference symmetry in that case, it's very difficult to say whether there is or isn't reference symmetry. I think we decided earlier that there wasn't, but that's because it wasn't possible.
Q Okay. So let me give you a different
hypothetical. It's not with regard to the figures. Say I'm a competitor and I know Skyhook has their patents and I want to design around Skyhook's patents, specifically just for sake of a discussion I want to design around Claim 1 of the 694 patent and I want to have my database of WiFi access points, I want to have a computer readable medium, I want to have records about calculated location information, I want to meet all of the limitations of Claim 1 of the 694 patent except I would like to not be sued for patent infringement. So in order to not be sued for patent infringement I have decided that it is my goal to design around this claim and do everything that the claim requires except I want to make sure that the database records for substantially all WiFi access

| (14:25:51-14:30:18) Page 157 |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | points in the target area do not provide reference |
| 2 | symmetry within the target area. So it would |
| 3 | necessarily mean that I have substantially all WiFi |
| 4 | access points in the target area because that's a |
| 5 | different part of the claim. I just want to avoid |
| 6 | having reference symmetry. How do I do that? |
| 7 | MR. LU: Actually, can you read that |
| 8 | question back? |
| 9 | (Pending question read back) |
| 10 | MR. LU: Objection, vague, ambiguous, and |
| 11 | it's not clear what you're carving out. Are |
| 12 | you carving out reference symmetry or are you |
| 13 | carving out substantially --- |
| 14 | MS. MANNING: I'm carving out reference |
| 15 | symmetry. |
| 16 | MR. LU: Simply. So you want to collect |
| 17 | substantially all WiFi access points but not |
| 18 | have reference symmetry? |
| 19 | MS. MANNING: Uh-huh. |
| 20 | A Well, to be frank, I'm finding it difficult to |
| 21 | think of a way to do that given the other aspects of |
| 22 | the claim. |
| 23 | Q Okay. Let me ask you a different question. Is |
| 24 | there any way to gather substantially all -- I'm |
| 25 | sorry. Is there any way to have database records for |
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## (14:30:23-14:32:09)

substantially all WiFi access points in the target area and also obtain the calculated position information from recording multiple readings of the WiFi access point in different locations around the WiFi access point other than to drive every street?
A Please repeat the question.
Q Sure. Sure. I'm looking at two different aspects of Claim 1 of the 694 patent. I'm looking at the requirement the database records -- the database have records for substantially all WiFi access points in the target area and also at the requirement that the said calculated position information is obtained from recording multiple readings of the WiFi access point at different locations around the WiFi access point. So there's two aspects of -- of Claim 1 of 694 patent. Is there any way to meet both of those limitations other than driving every street in the target area?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague and ambiguous. A Well, I mean, there's -- the claims -- the claim goes on to avoid arterial bias, but you left that out in this example --
Q Uh-huh.
A -- and so one could get substantially all but probably not all WiFi access points as we've discussed

14:32:13-14:34:05)
by not driving all of the streets and you would get multiple readings of the WiFi access points at different locations around the access point, but the fewer streets you drive, the less close you are to substantially all WiFi access points. I mean, you wouldn't -- you wouldn't get -- you would need to drive most streets if not -- in order to get substantially all WiFi access points is my feeling. Q Okay. In your answer you -- you noted that my original question hadn't included the avoid arterial bias in the calculated position information requirement. Is there any way to avoid arterial bias other than by driving every street and also meet the recording multiple readings and the requirement that the database have records for substantially all WiFi access points? Can you do all three of those things except by driving every street?
A All three getting substantially all points, obtaining multiple readings of each point and avoid arterial bias?
Q Right.
A I think so. And -- and by the way, this claim doesn't require that you do drive every street, but you would want to choose your streets very carefully so that you would not miss -- so you not end up
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(14:34:09-14:35:51)
biasing towards arteries because that was one of the three things and so that you would have a strong likelihood of covering substantially all WiFi access points even though you skipped some streets. Q Uh-huh. Okay. What -- what's your understanding of the relationship between the teachings of the specification and the meaning of the claim language? A On the 694 patent?
Q As a general matter.
A Oh. Well, the claim language tells you what the patent is covering, if you will, and the specification helps you to understand the context of the claims, but the claims coverage isn't limited exclusively to what's described in the specification. In particular, when there are preferred embodiments or other expressions of -- of, you know, for example.
Q Do you have an understanding of whether the specification can implicitly redefine claim language? MR.LU: Objection. Vague.
A You know, I -- I see that primarily as a legal question and not as a technical question so I would want to be very careful.
Q Well, and -- and -- and -- I'm -- I'm not trying to ask you a legal question, but I am -- I'm trying to understand your opinions and I'm trying to understand
(14:35:55-14:37:38)
1 how it is in your opinion the person of ordinary skill
2 in the art would view these claim terms. So in
3
forming your opinions did you consider whether the
4
specification might have implicitly redefined or
5
6
further limited some of the claim language?
7
8
helps provide the context in which you can understand
9
the claims, but the specification, as I understand it,
10
what they are and of course sometimes particular terms
11
in the claims need definition and that's when you go
12
back to the specification to try to understand the
13 context of the definition.
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## :37:43-14:38:51)

that the patent examiner believes that it is suitable for issuing.
Q Now when you say adjusted and redefined, are you -- are you talking about express amendments of the claims like --
A Like the ones we looked at.
Q Like we saw before?
A Yes.
Q That's assuredly true that you can have express amendments of the claim language. My question, I was going to get at something -- something a little different.
A Okay.
Q Do you have an understanding of whether you can implicitly limit your claims not through an express amendment of the actual language but through your explanation of what that language means, either by saying so in plain words or through implication?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague.
A Well, my understanding, and this is, you know, about the legal process, and my understanding is that that -- the patent specification and the patent prosecution history is part of the evidence one considers in deciding what the claim terms mean but that the patent prosecution history is less relevant

4:38:55-14:40:59)
or less reliable than the specification itself for example.
Q Did that inform your views in any way?
A Not directly.
Q When you say not directly?
A Well, I -- remember that I didn't read all the -the prosecution history and I only read those pieces that were pulled out by one side or the other and that was -- they were part of the mix, but I think the specification and the claims themselves were where -where -- where most of the information that was useful came from.
Q Why is it that you judge the specification to be, in your sort of -- have information that was more useful than -- than the prosecution history?
A Well, there's -- there was a lot more detail, a lot more information there that I saw, and it explained the technology and the related technologies and related terms in ways that $I$ thought was helpful. Q Okay.

MR. LU: Should we take a short break?<br>THE WITNESS: Sure.<br>MS. MANNING: Do you want to?<br>MR. LU: Sure.<br>VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 2:45 and
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(14:41:01-14:49:43)
1 we're going off the record.
2 (Recess taken)

VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 2:52 and we're back on the record.

## BY MS. MANNING:

Q Sorry about that. I have my exhibit we're going to mark as exhibit -- Google Exhibit 1012, a document that we created. And you will note that it bears some resemblance to the figures of the patent that we've been discussing. And it is -- you will see that there's a legend on it that we have, some red markings that show calculated position of access points, and we have a user identified here on the page and we have a radio range similar to what we've seen before, and my question for you is does this show reference symmetry within the meaning of the claims?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous. Foundation as to the assumptions.
A So you're talking about the reference symmetry in the context of the 694 patent as we were before? Q I'll limit -- I'll ask you a different question for the 988. Let's just focus on the 694.

## A Right.

Q Does Exhibit 1012 show reference symmetry within the meaning of the 694 patent in your view?

## (14:49:50-14:51:30)

1 MR. LU: Same objections.
A So it's difficult. I mean, considering the way
that we've been discussing reference symmetry and the way that reference symmetry has been defined in my opinion, one of the characteristics is that the calculated positions of the observed WiFi access points in range of user, so I'm looking at the set that are in range of this user, tend to be distributed around the user with reduced levels of arterial bias, which is an aspect we weren't discussing very strongly before. And it's impossible to tell from the way -from this figure how these -- these points were collected and whether there are reduced levels of arterial bias, but I'm guessing that there is some arterial bias here only because some of these access points appear to be in the middle of the street. And so by that definition then there is not reference symmetry here.
Q Okay. So is that the only reason why in your view this would not have reference symmetry?
A So the other characteristic was this tended to be distributed around the user part, and as we discussed before, it's a little difficult to define, you know, strictly what is around the user and what is not around the user. There are some easy cases, as you
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## (14:51:34-14:53:09)

said. This is one that's a little harder, right, because there are many access points to the, if you will, southwest, west, south areas but not so much up in block -- there are none in Block 3 and Block 6 to the east of the user and so they're not well distributed all around the user. We also talked about earlier whether there existed access points in those areas, and we don't know from this figure whether they do or don't exist or whether one would expect them to exist even.
Q Okay. So we can -- we can address in a moment -a moment the issue of whether the access points -whether there are access points that exist that are not represented by calculated location information in this figure, but before we get there, just based on what you know now, is it possible to give a yes/no answer to whether or not this has reference symmetry within the meaning of the 694 patent?

MR. LU: Same objections.
A Is it possible?
MR. LU: Actually, also asked and answered.
A I mean, in effect what I said before was no, it's not. Q It's not possible?

14:53:11-14:54:53)
1 A Not possible because I don't have enough

## information.

Q What -- what additional information would you need?
A Well, were these calculated positions collected in a way that reduced arterial bias, that's one thing. And I think it would be helpful to know, although we've set aside, as you said, the question of whether there are access points or -- or expected to be access points in Blocks 3 and 6.
Q Is it essential? I mean, understanding just that it would be helpful. Is that -- is that critical to the analysis?
A No, I guess not.
Q So the -- the -- the main thing you need to know is -- is the method by which the area was traversed to scan for the access points?
A Well, I guess, you know, I'm trying to -- I'm trying to -- to apply the definitions that are worked out in this opinion to this new example and -- which is a great technique for testing a definition, and one of the characteristics of that definition is that the observed access points tend to be distributed around the user with reduced levels of arterial bias, and that begs the question how does one know whether there
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are reduced levels of arterial bias. And one way to do that would be to know whether the method used would reduce or tend to reduce arterial bias, and another would be to find some way of judging whether there is arterial bias just from looking at the positions. And it appears in this figure, since that's all I have to work with, that there is some -- possibly some arterial bias. And so your question was do I need to know the method, and I'm -- I'm not sure to be honest. I think it would be -- I'm trying to think if there's a way one could do this without knowing the method of data collection and I -- and I think one could devise a method, but I'm trying to do that on the fly and that's a little tricky.
Q Okay. Well, and I appreciate your -- your effort to give a thorough answer -- answer to the question. As you are thinking about it you've identified that you might need to know the method by which the -- the scan data was collected that underlies the calculated positions, and I think we decided you didn't need -didn't necessarily need to know whether or not there were more access points that existed in the target area --
A Uh-huh.
Q -- than what are represented by the calculated
:56:38-14:58:34)
locations. So if I'm right, the only thing on the table is do we need to know the method or not?
A Yeah. I'm not sure.
4 MR.LU: Objection to the extent it 5 mischaracterizes the witness's testimony.

15 A So in this one the -- some of the access
BY MS. MANNING:
Q Let me mark another figure. This one is Google
Exhibit 1013. It's a figure similar in some ways to
the last one that we were looking at, and my question
for you is can you tell from this figure whether --
whether this shows reference symmetry within the
meaning of the 694 patent?
MR.LU: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous.
Foundation.
points --
MR. LU: Just for clarification, you have
this labeled as first, second, third, fourth,
and I think Street A, B, C, and D. Is this the
same sort of snapshot of a hypothetical grid of
streets as shown in Exhibit 1012?
THE WITNESS: The previous diagram.
MS. MANNING: Yes, it is.
MR. LU: So we're talking about the same
streets with different scanning techniques
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(14:58:36-15:00:01)
$1 \quad$ or -- or -- I'm trying to figure out what the
2 hypothetical is here.
3 MS. MANNING: We are talking about --11 there may be a few more access points. The access
have -- it may have less arterial bias than the
previous version, 1012, because the access points
don't appear to be on the streets. Those are the
differences I notice. And the question is whether
there is -- this exhibits reference symmetry.
Q So it shows that there's reference symmetry
(15:
1
$0: 02-15: 01: 43)$
within the meaning of the 694 patent?
A Right. Yeah, it seems to. I mean, there are --
the access points are distributed around the user more
or less and they are perhaps having reduced level of
arterial bias, you know, with the caveat of the
previous conversation that it's not immediately clear how one determines that for sure.
Q And my question again about Exhibit 1013 was
specific to the 694 patent. If the -- if we change
the question as about the 988 patent, what then? Does
this Exhibit 1013 show reference symmetry within the
meaning of the 988 patent?
A Well, the 988 patent has a different -- let's
see. So in the 988 patent there's no user involved.
It's about the multiple readings have reference symmetry relative to other WiFi access points in the target area. And so if we -- so in this 1013 we ignore the user and the user's radio range and look at the rest of the picture. Is that what you're asking me to do?
Q I am -- I am asking you to give me the answer to my -- my question.
A Okay.
Q Which is just simply does this have reference
symmetry within the meaning of the 988 patent. If you
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think that we disregard the -- the user in order to come up with the answer to that question, you know, please -- please explain.

MR.LU: Objection. Foundation. Vague and ambiguous.
A So I think the answer would be yes, it does.
Q Okay. Why?
A Well, the 988 patent requires that one record multiple readings of the WiFi access point at different locations around the WiFi access point so that multiple readings have reference symmetry relative to other WiFi access points in the target area, and so that calculation of the position of WiFi access point avoids arterial bias in the calculated position information, and Skyhook has construed that to mean, and I believe this is a much more clear definition, multiple scans are recorded. That's something that's not part of staring at a map, of course. The scans are taken at different locations. We -- that's not something we can see from the map. But this results in the following, that multiple readings produce a calculated position of the WiFi access point having reference symmetry relative to other WiFi access points in the target area, and the calculated position of the access point reduces the

## (15:03:29-15:05:11)

effects of arterial bias. So I'm looking at the calculated positions of the access points you've plotted, the red dots, and to me they appear to have reference symmetry in the sense that there are many access points around each one, and they seem to have reduced levels of arterial bias because they aren't close to the streets generally. They're certainly not on the streets.
Q Okay. And I think you were referencing Skyhook's
definition -- proposed definition of the reference symmetry limitation in the 988 as -- as recited in I guess it's paragraph 100 of your --
A Yes.
Q -- report? Okay. So the claim language of the 988 says so that the multiple readings have reference symmetry relative to other WiFi access points in the target area. So it's the -- it's -- according to the claim language, it's the multiple readings have reference symmetry. And Skyhook would define that, as you noted when you were reading from the definition, that the multiple readings produce a calculated position of the WiFi access point having reference symmetry, but let's assume the court doesn't agree with that. If the court takes the view that it is the multiple readings that is the scan data, the multiple
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readings are the thing that have to have reference symmetry, and they have to have it relative to other WiFi access points in the target area, first off, what would that look like?

MR. LU: Objection. Foundation. Vague and ambiguous.
A What would that look like?
MR.LU: It goes beyond the scope of the witness's opinion.
A Well, so you're talking about the multiple
readings having reference symmetry with respect to
other WiFi access points --
Q Uh-huh.
A -- and the -- I'm thinking of the figures in the patent that dem -- that plot the access points' actual locations and the readings around them or the calculated -- actually --
Q Figure 11 you mean?
A Yeah. Showing the multiple readings around the calculated positions. I think 11 is about arterial bias, I think.
Q You tell me. If you weren't thinking of 11, I
just want to --
A I'm checking. I think -- I think I recall that. This is one of the few diagrams that I recall that has
(15:06:34-15:07:52)
the raw readings and the access point location and that's what you're asking about.
Q Right. I'm -- I'm -- yeah. I'm -- I'm asking you if -- if the court takes the view that it is the multiple readings themselves that have reference symmetry and they have to have it relative to other WiFi access points in the target area --

## A Right.

Q -- I'm asking you, do you know what that would look like?

MR. LU: Same objections.
A I think it would -- in some ways it would be similar to the kinds of things we've been discussing except you'd be plotting the raw readings of the access points instead of the calculated positions of the access points and you'd be looking at the distribution of those readings around the actual access points instead of the distribution of the calculated positions among themselves. So you'd be looking to see -- much like we have with these 1013 example where we're looking at the symmetry around a user, you'd be looking at the symmetry of readings around an actual access point, and if they're well distributed around that, that's what -- that's what that could mean if the court were to look at it that
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way.
Q Well, the claim -- the claim language is that -talks about taking -- recording multiple readings of the WiFi access point at different locations around the access point so that the multiple readings have reference symmetry relative to other WiFi access points in the target area.
A Right.
Q If I understood you to be -- if I understood you correctly, I understood you to be describing the readings having reference symmetry with respect to the access point that they're actually reading?
A Yes.
Q Okay. So -- okay. So my question was -- was different.
A Yes.
Q Assume the court believes that the multiple readings have to have reference symmetry relative to other WiFi access points in the target area, the claim language, what would that look like?

MR. LU: Same objections.
BY MS. MANNING:
Q Do you know?
24 A No, that's -- yeah, that's -- that's a little
25 harder to see. You know, I can imagine a couple of
must have it relative to other WiFi access points in
the target area, in that situation do we have
reference symmetry -- symmetry demonstrated on Exhibit
1012?
MR. LU: Objection. Incomplete
hypothetical. Foundation.
A We don't have any readings on this figure so
can't answer that.
Q Okay. So you would need to -- you would need to
see the readings themselves? Okay. Assuming that you
had -- would it -- would it implicate the same issue
we were just discussing, you would have to have --
multiple readings would have to be taken from around a
given access point and those readings would also have
to be distributed around other WiFi access points in
the target area, is that right?
A Right. That's the way we were discussing it
before. In that respect this figure's no different
than the previous one because we're both imagining a
different figure. One with readings, right?
Q Well, I think my question was, you know, what --
(15:

1
2 A
3 Q
4

## 15:24:43-15:26:33)

1 whether it addresses that point exactly so let's see. Well, so in this -- in this section, column 9, line 50 , and following where they introduce reference symmetry, they're talking about the distribution of reference points around the end user in terms of calculating the user's position.
Q Right.
A And the reference points are calculated AP locations, I think.
Q Right. And I understand -- understood that to be different from what we were talking about?
A Right. I agree.
Q Okay.
A And so I'm -- you were asking whether it teaches anything about that, and it's not in this section anyway.
Q Okay. And if you look at your report, the first sentence in paragraph 102.
A Okay.
Q It says, the specification refers to multiple readings, quote, providing reference symmetry among the reference points. And then it cites to the 988 patent at columns 2 , lines 55 and 56 ?
A Right. The ones we were just looking at, I think.

| (15:26:33-15:27:48) Page 181 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Q I think -- I think we were -- I think we were a |
| 2 | little further in the patent. I think they were |
| 3 | columns 9 and 10. |
| 4 | A |
| 5 | Sorry. |
| 6 | If you look at that citation, column 2, lines 55 and |
| 7 | 56, I just want to double check this one because I |
| 8 | don't see that as referring to multiple readings |
| 9 | providing reference symmetry among reference points. |
| 10 | A Well, this sentence is in a bit of a different |
| 11 | context, but it says there's no way to provide |
| 12 | reference symmetry among the reference points. You're |
| 13 | right, it doesn't refer to the readings because there |
| 14 | are no readings in this context. It's about TV |
| 15 | towers. |
| 16 | Q Okay. So -- okay. So -- so upon further look |
| 17 | you would agree with me that at least this particular |
| 18 | citation doesn't support the idea that the multiple |
| 19 | readings themselves provide reference symmetry? |
| 20 | A |
| 21 | Qrue. Okay. And further on down in that same |
| 22 | paragraph, 102 of your declaration, it says, the |
| 23 | specification also explains that in one aspect of the |
| 24 | disclosed invention, quote, more access points, |
| 25 | bracket, are gathered closed, bracket, uniformly |
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across a target area confirming that the multiple readings produce reference symmetry relative to other WiFi access points. And looking at -- if you look at column 8 , lines 56 and 59 , my question for you again, is there anything in 56 through 59 that actually talks about the scan data, the multiple readings having reference symmetry relative to other WiFi access points?
A No.
Q And it's a little bit longer citation, but column
9 , lines 4 through 21 is the other citation there, and if you could take a look at that and tell me whether that talks about -- upon further review whether you think that talks about multiple readings themselves having reference symmetry.
A Well, this citation doesn't, unless I missed it, use the phrase reference symmetry, but it does refer to the scanning vehicles detect a particular access point from as many sides as possible of the building housing the access point. And so that's referring to the readings. And this additional data greatly improves the results of the reverse triangulation formula. So though it doesn't use the phrase, in a way it has the spirit of that phrase. Q Well --

15:30:00-15:31:56)
1 A It's talking about the distribution of the access point readings.
Q Right. And is it -- is it indicating that those readings have reference symmetry relative to some other access point?
A No, that's true, it does not.
Q In your -- in your declaration at paragraph 106 you have a reference to what you believe to be the purpose of the database, and my question is just what -- what role does the purpose of the database, as you put it, have in the claim construction analysis?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Also object as to it calls for a legal conclusion.
A Okay. I'm sorry, your question was what role does the purpose of the database play?
Q Uh-huh.
A In?
Q In the -- in the analysis of the actual claim language.
A Well, let's see. Go back to the claim language. This is about Claim 1, and Claim 1 is about a database of WiFi access points. So I think that the purpose of the database is relevant. The purpose, as I opined, is to calculate the location of mobile devices. And so the claim is a long claim, and we are talking about
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the reference symmetry aspect of it. And this point, paragraph 106 -- in this point I say the database should contain AP locations distributed throughout the target area so there will tend to be access points distributed around the user. And so it seems -- I don't know, it seems reasonable to talk about the purpose of the database being for calculating the location. I don't -- sorry, I don't see the point of why there is an issue.
Q Well, I'm trying -- I'm trying -- I'm trying to understand your -- your views as to what's sort of appropriate -- appropriate questions to ask in order to figure out how to issue the claims, and I take it you think what your perceived purpose of the database is is a relevant -- is relevant to how the words themselves should actually be construed in they should be construed consistent with their perceived purpose, right?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous. Also to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion.
A Right. Well, from -- from the point of view -from the point of view of my expert opinion as opposed to a legal opinion, I think that the purpose is -is -- is relevant because it -- it's another piece of

| (15:33:30-15:36:14) Page 185 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | context in which one reads the terms. |
| 2 | Q I'm going to mark as Google Exhibit 1014 a copy |
| 3 | of U.S. Patent Number 7305245. This is Bates number |
| 4 | GSHFED_0000001 through 20. And you've reviewed this |
| 5 | before, sir? |
| 6 | A |
| 7 | Qeah. |
| 8 | the claim language if you want or any other part of it |
| 9 | you feel appropriate, but in the -- Claim 1, one of |
| 10 | the limitations is based on the number of WiFi access |
| 11 | points identified by -- via receive messages choosing |
| 12 | a corresponding location determination algorithm from |
| 13 | a plurality of location determination algorithms said |
| 14 | chosen algorithm being suited for the number of |
| 15 | identified WiFi access points? |
| 16 | A Yeah. |
| 17 | Q As you know, the meaning of that limitation shows |
| 18 | an algorithm being suited for the number of identified |
| 19 | WiFi access points is one of the terms in dispute |
| 20 | here. My question for you, sir, is going back to my |
| 21 | earlier hypothetical about a competitor. I'm a |
| 22 | competitor. I would like to design around the 245 |
| 23 | patent and not get sued by Skyhook for infringing, and |
| 24 | in designing around, I have determined that I wanted |
| 25 | to do everything in the claim -- Claim 1 of the 245 |
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## (15:36:20-15:37:44)

patent except I want to avoid infringement because I want to avoid this limitation, said chosen algorithm being suited for the number of identified WiFi access points. And my question is how do I do that?
A Let's see. So -- I've just got to look back at what I was saying earlier about that language and -so one easy way, I think, to do -- to avoid that would be to use a single algorithm and not to choose an algorithm at all.
Q Agree that would do it, but that's different from my hypothetical.
A Oh, I'm sorry.
Q What I'm -- what I'm -- what I want to do is I
want to do everything in Claim 1, including based on the number of WiFi access points identified via receive messages, choosing a corresponding location determination algorithm from a plurality of location determination algorithms.
A Oh, okay.
20 Q So I've got -- I've got --
21 A I see.
22 Q -- multiple algorithms.
23 A Okay.
24 Q I want to choose between them. I just don't want
25 to -- I just want to not infringe by not meeting that

15:37:47-15:40:06

1

Q When you say -- when you use the word suited,

## 40:13-15:41:53)

what's the -- what's the criteria for suitability the patent teaches, if any?
A Well, let's see. I'm trying to remember. MR. LU: Could you read back that last question and answer? I just wanted to -- the last portion.
A It was a long answer. (Previous question and answer read back) MR. LU: And could you read back the previous question and answer? Just previous question.
(The following question was read back:
Q: I want to choose between them. I just don't want to -- I just want to not infringe by not meeting that said chosen algorithm being suited for the number of identified WiFi access points requirement.)
MR. LU: Was that the question?
THE REPORTER: And you objected.
A So the question on the table is whether the patent teaches --
Q What it means to be suited.
A -- what it means to be suited. And I, in my opinion, didn't reference any section of the patent in regards to that language, and I'm not quickly finding

## (15:41:59-15:43:54)

a place where it does. I'm trying to find that. Q Can I ask you to look at column 7, line 9.
A The decision of which algorithm to use is driven
by the number of access points observed and the user
case application using it.
Q Would you agree with me that that doesn't teach
you -- that doesn't give you any criteria for what it
8 would mean to be suited or not suited to the number of
9 WiFi access points?
MR. LU: Objection. Foundation. Vague and ambiguous.

## A Not directly, no.

Q How about column 5, lines 45 through 48, for example, the location determination algorithm?
A That's saying something very similar to the sentence we just read.
Q Right. Would you agree with me that that, too, doesn't actually give you any criteria for what constitutes suitability or lack of suitability?
A Well, it says that it -- no, I guess you're right. I agree.
Q To my knowledge those are the only two passages of the specification in play, and my question for you is are you aware of anyplace else in the patents that there's any criteria for what constitutes suitability
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or lack of suitability of algorithm vis-a-vis the
number of access points?
A No, not that I recall.
Q In your declaration, I'm looking at paragraph 87 --
A Okay.
Q -- you state in the middle of that paragraph 87,
certain algorithms are, comma, and are known to be,
comma, more appropriate to use in certain instances
than other algorithms. I have a couple questions
about that. First, is this something within the
knowledge of a person of ordinary skill in the art in your view?
A Yeah.
Q And would it be something a person of ordinary skill in the art knew as of October 2005 when the application for patents -- several of the patents in suit was filed?
A Yeah.
Q Okay. And the language is not a hundred percent
clear so let me see if I understand you. When you say that the certain algorithms are and are known to be more appropriate to use in certain instances than other algorithms, is the certain instances there differing number of WiFi access points?

15:45:51-15:47:15)
A Yes.
Q Can you give me some examples of algorithms that were known to be appropriate to use for varying numbers of access points as of October 2005?
A Well, so this is choosing -- this is in the
context of the language that says choosing a
corresponding location determination algorithm so -Q Yes.
A -- we're talking about location determination algorithms.
Q Yes.
A I have to think about that. I mean, the -- I don't recall all the algorithms that were known at that time. I don't -- and I certainly don't know all the algorithms by -- by heart anyway. There were three that we discussed earlier, the centroid -- the simple centroid, the weighted centroid, and the particle filter in my paper for example -Q Yes.
A -- and I think the centroid ones are -- require a minimum number of access point -- data points to be useful, say three or more, if I recall correctly, and the particle filter I can't recall whether it had any constraints. There are probably other algorithms, but I can't think of them at the moment.
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Q Okay. But, nevertheless, it's your -- it's your
view that as of 2005 , late 2005, a person of ordinary skill in the art would -- would have -- would have known what algorithms would be appropriate to use with any given number of access points?
A Right. Well, you wouldn't -- I mean, the chosen algorithm has to be suited for the number of access points so you might base your choice on other factors as well but you might eliminate certain ones because they're not suitable for that number of access points. Q Understood, but --
A Yeah.
Q -- to the extent we're talking about just this requirement of the claim --

## A Right. Right.

Q -- people would know that you could choose access points based on their suitability for a number -- I'm sorry. People would know that -- that you could choose an algorithm based on its suitability to the number of observed access points --
A Right.
Q -- correct? I said people but I meant persons of skill in the art.
A Understood.
Q All right. And would they know that there was

## (15:48:27-15:49:45)
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value in -- in making that determination, actually choosing between the algorithms on that basis?

MR.LU: Objection. Vague.
A Yes. I mean, there are certain algorithms that
wouldn't be suitable and so you wouldn't -- you couldn't choose them because they wouldn't work or they wouldn't work well.
Q Okay. So one reason that something wouldn't be
suited would be that it just wouldn't work to
calculate location based on the number of access points?
A Right.
Q And then you said wouldn't work well. How do I -- how do I judge the bounds of that?
A Well, it's difficult without coming up with a specific example. Wouldn't work well could mean that it -- it gave poor accuracy, poor -- not inaccurate results. Another would be my example here that with a large number of access points it might run very slowly and -- and depending on your context of your application that may be -- not meet your needs. It would be too slow and so you would choose a different algorithm that was faster when you had a larger number of access points. It might be less accurate. You
might be willing to trade lower accuracy for higher
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speed, for example.
Q But you'd agree with me that -- that if accuracy
is the -- is the criteria, certainly the patent
doesn't teach that? We -- we looked at a couple
different passages. That's not what the patent
teaches?
A True.
Q I think earlier we were talking about some
situations where if you had two persons of ordinary
skill in the art, they might have differing views on
an issue before them, and in this context my question
is could persons of skill in the art ever be uncertain
about what constitutes an algorithm that's suitable to the number of WiFi access points?
A So I -- I don't think so. I mean, given an
algorithm and if you -- if you were asked -- one of ordinary skill in the art were asked is this suitable for, say, ten access points or a hundred access points, I think you could decide either by examination or with some experimentation whether that algorithm was suitable for that number of access points. Q Just so I understand, when you're talking about examination experimentation, what are you -- what are you thinking of?
25 A By examination I mean by studying the algorithm

15:51:46-15:53:26)
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on paper, reading it and thinking about it. By experimentation, it might not be sufficiently obvious from just examining it so you might code it up, give it some test data, run some experiments and determine, you know what, this one is just too slow when we get up to a hundred access points so I'm not going to use it for my application. It's not suitable.
Q So is -- is -- is suitability, you know, is it
sort of a digital on/off concept or is it an issue of degree?

MR. LU: Objection. Vague. Compound. A Well, I think the -- as we discussed earlier, the patent specification doesn't give a lot of guidance about what suitability means, but it was discussed in the context of choosing an algorithm with the needs of the application and the number of access points in mind and so I think -- I think that in -- in -- in -it would have some degree -- in some contexts it would be a matter of degree. So this one would be more suitable, less suitable in this context, but in other contexts it might just be binary. This algorithm is not suitable for an odd number of access points because it requires an even number of access points. So my answer, unfortunately, is it's both. Q Okay.
53:26-15:57:42) Page 196

A In some algorithms, in some contexts it's binary, digital. In other contexts it's a matter of degree.

MS. MANNING: Why don't we go off the record.
MR. LU: Pardon?
MS. MANNING: Why don't we go off the record.
MR. LU: Okay.
VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 3:58 and we're going off the record.
(Discussion off the record)
(Off the video record at 3:58 p.m.)
MS. MANNING: I would like a rough copy please, and do you need an e-mail address for that?
THE REPORTER: I'll get it after. MS. MANNING: And the original can be mailed to me at my office, I believe you have my business card, 2020 K Street, Washington, DC, 20006, I believe.
MR. LU: Same order, and you have I think both my contact information for the e-mail address.
(WHEREUPON, the deposition was closed at approximately 3:57 p.m.)
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