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San Diego, California; Thursday, September 22, 2011 9:07 a.m. - 5:41 p.m.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Good morning. Here begins Media No. 1 of the deposition of Anthony S. Acampora, Ph.D., in the matter of Skyhook Wireless, Incorporated, versus Google, Incorporated.

This case is in the United States District Court, District of Massachusetts, and the civil action number is 1;10-CV-11571-RWZ.

Today's date September 22nd, 2011. The time is 9:08 a.m. This deposition is taking place at Sarnoff, 402 West Broadway, Suite 900, San Diego, California 92101. This deposition is taken on behalf of the plaintiffs. The videographer is Daniel Payan, appearing on behalf of Sarnoff Court Reporters \& Legal Technologies, located in San Diego, California.

All present, please take notice that as a part of videotaping of this deposition, very sensitive high-quality microphones are being used. If anyone present wishes to make a statement off the record, they should state that they are going off the record and gain concurrence from all parties. The videographer will then stop recording. All recorded comments made by anyone present during this deposition will be
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assumed to be on the record and will be transcribed.
Would counsel at this time please identify yourselves and state whom you represent.

MR. LU: Samuel Lu of Irell \& Manella for Skyhook Wireless.

MS. SOMAIT: Lina Somait, Irell \& Manella for Skyhook Wireless.

MR. BERTIN: Robert Bertin with Bingham McCutchen for Google.

MS. POLSE: Jennifer Polse of Google.
MR. ZAVISLAK: And Mark Zavislak of Google.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Thank you. At this time the court reporter may swear in the witness.

ANTHONY S. ACAMPORA, PH.D., having been administered an oath, was examined and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION
BY MR. LU:
Q. Good morning, Dr. Acampora.
A. Good morning.

MR. LU: Before we begin, I think I want to take care of a little bit of housekeeping. I have some exhibits that I'd like to mark.

Page 7
Exhibit 1 will be U.S. Patent No. 7414988.
(Exhibit 1 was marked.)
MR. LU: Exhibit No. 2 will be U.s. Patent No. 7433694.
(Exhibit 2 was marked.)
MR. LU: Exhibit No. 3 will be U.S. Patent No. 7305245.
(Exhibit 3 was marked.)
MR. LU: Exhibit No. 4 will be U.S. Patent No. 7474897.
(Exhibit 4 was marked.)
MR. LU: Exhibit No. 5 will be a document entitled, "Declaration of Anthony S. Acampora, Ph.D."
(Exhibit 5 was marked.)
MR. LU: And Exhibit 6 will be a document that is labeled Exhibit 1, which I will represent to you is an Exhibit 1 attached to the declaration of Anthony S. Acampora, Ph.D.
(Exhibit 6 was marked.)
BY MR. LU:
Q. So Dr. Acampora, could you please state your full name for the record?
A. Anthony Acampora.
Q. And what is your present business address?
A. I have two. I'm professor of electrical
computer engineering emeritus at UCSD, and my address there is Room 6606, 9500 Gillman Drive, Mail Stop 0407, La Jolla, California 92093.

I also operate out of my home -- my consulting business -- and my home address is 6473 Avenida Cresta, La Jolla, California 92037.
Q. What is your current occupation?
A. I do two things. As I mentioned, I'm a professor at UCSD emeritus. So what that means is three years ago, I resigned -- I retired from UCSD. I resigned my tenured faculty line. I remain on faculty emeritus. I teach electively. I supervise
Ph.D. students and conduct research electively.
I also provide outside consulting, separate and distinct from what I do at the university.
Q. And that is the consulting firm that you referred to previously?
A. That is correct.
Q. Are you the only employee of that consulting firm?
A. Myself and my wife.
Q. And what does your wife do in connection with that consulting firm?
A. She basically is the office manager.
Q. All right. So Dr. Acampora, have you ever
been deposed before?
A. I have.
Q. How many times?
A. Ballpark estimate, approximately 50 .
Q. And when was the -- and -- and were those 50
depositions in connection with your consulting business?
A. Essentially, all of them were, yes.
Q. Have you ever been deposed as a fact witness in any case?
A. I was.
Q. How many times?
A. Twice.
Q. What were the circumstances, generally, of those?
A. Well, one was a -- a -- a -- a personal matter. And second, I was engaged as a fact witness in a patent litigation matter.
Q. What was the patent at issue in the patent litigation matter, if you recollect?
A. It was so long ago, I'm not sure I can recall. My involvement was very brief. And as it turns out, I had access to records that were made while I was on the faculty at Columbia University that apparently were relevant in this matter. So I was called to testify.
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tutorials, have you testified in any other proceedings?
A. You mean in court?
Q. In court.
A. Not that I can recall.
Q. Have you ever testified in any summary
judgment proceedings?
A. No.
Q. Have you personally been involved in a lawsuit or other legal proceeding?
A. Separate and distinct from providing testimony as an expert?
Q. Correct. Personally involved.
A. I was.
Q. Okay. And generally what was the circumstance of that case?
A. It was a personal injury matter. My daughter and I were -- were injured as a result of an accident that took place in our home.
Q. Now, obviously, you've been involved in quite a few depositions. But just to make sure that there are no misunderstandings today, I want to review a few of the ground rules relating to depositions before we go any further, if that's okay with you?
A. It's fine.
Q. Okay. You understand that you're here today
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under oath?
A. I do.
Q. And you understand that the oath has the same effect as if you were testifying in a court of law?
A. I do.
Q. And you understand that you're obligated to tell the truth to the best of your ability?
A. I do.
Q. Now, you understand that the testimony you give today may be read or shown by videotape to a judge or a jury?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. Okay. Now, in this deposition I'm going to ask you a series of questions to find out more about the opinions that you provided in your expert declaration.

I'd like you to give you -- give us your best understanding and recollection of the matters that I've asked you about. Will you do that?
A. I will.
Q. Now, if there's a question that I ask at any time that you do not hear or do not understand, please ask me to restate the question. You've already done that a few times, but I just want to make sure that you'll do that again.
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Will you do that?
A. I will.
Q. And you understand that if you need a break at any time, you can ask for a break, and we'll take a break?
A. Sure.
Q. Is there any physical reason why you would not be able to give your full and truthful testimony today?
A. No.
Q. And did you bring any documents with you here today?
A. I brought my declaration.
Q. You brought your declaration.

Anything else other than the declaration?
A. Declaration and a bunch of attachments.
Q. Did you prepare any notes or markings in that declaration?
A. No.
Q. So Dr. Acampora, how were you contacted in connection with this case?
A. I believe that Mr. Bertin originally contacted me -- that's my recollection -- earlier on this year, as best I can recall.
Q. And have you worked with Mr. Bertin before?
A. No.
Q. Have you worked with Mr. Bertin's firm before?
A. No.
Q. Did Mr. Bertin contact you out of the blue?

Let me rephrase that.
How were you contacted by Mr. Bertin?
A. By phone.
Q. And Mr. Bertin contacted you directly?
A. That's my recollection, yes.
Q. When did you first meet with or speak with Mr. Bertin, just ballpark?
A. Well, again, this is going back probably to the January/February time frame. And I don't know if we first spoke by phone, then met face to face, or if I first spoke with Mr. Bertin -- I -- I believe we spoke by phone, then we met face to face.
Q. Okay. Have you met with anyone else from Mr. Bertin's firm?
A. No.
Q. Have you spoken with anyone else from

Mr. Bertin's firm?
A. I have.
Q. And with whom have you spoken?
A. Audry Lowe, I believe her name is. Audry Lowe.
Q. Okay. Anyone else?

Page 15
A. Susan Manning.
Q. And anyone else other than Audry Lowe,

Susan Manning, and Mr. Bertin?
A. At Mr. Bertin's firm? No.
Q. No. Have you spoken with anyone from Google in connection with this matter?
A. I have.
Q. And with whom have you spoken?
A. John Lebar, who, I believe, is an attorney employed by Google.
Q. Okay. Anyone other than John Lebar?
A. Well, the two people at the end of the table here, yesterday.
Q. Okay. And you -- have you met with any of those individuals other than from Google -- let me rephrase that.

Have you met with individuals from Google face to face other than the two individuals at the end of the table?
A. I met with Mr. Lebar.
Q. Okay. Have you been -- have you done any previous work for Google?
A. No. The reason I'm hesitating is some of the litigation I've been involved in has involved multiple defendants, and I don't know if Google might have been
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one of the defendants in one of these
multiple-defendant matters. But I was not engaged by Google, as near as I can recall, in any of these matters.
Q. So in connection with this matter, how much are you being paid?
A. $\$ 600$ an hour, which is my customary rate.
Q. And to date how much have you billed?
A. Ballpark estimate, about $\$ 20,000$. That might
be a little bit on the high side, but that's -- that's probably a good estimate.
Q. Okay. Ballpark, what percentage of your total annual income comes from consulting as an expert witness?
A. Well, that's varied over the years. But if you're asking --
Q. Presently.
A. -- presently, 60 to 70 percent.
Q. And how much have you made over the past two years in terms of expert witness consulting -ballpark?
A. Well, I don't want to assume that you mean paid to my consulting company as opposed to paid to me in salary from my consulting company.
Q. Well, how is your consulting company

Page 17
structured, first of all?
A. It's a C corporation.
Q. Okay. And who's the owner of the consulting company?
A. My wife and I are co-owners.
Q. So let's break that question into two.

How much money has your corporation received in the past two years from expert consulting work that you have done?
A. Ballpark figure, it's probably been 1.5 to $\$ 1.6$ million.
Q. And that's for both --
A. That's over a two-year period.
Q. -- over a two-year period?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And how much have you been paid personally from your corporation for the work that you've done on behalf of that corporation relating to expert consulting work?
A. Okay. So I'm taking that question to mean, what was I paid in salary from my corporation over the past two years. And it's probably in the range of \$600,000.
Q. How much has your wife been paid from the corporation over the past two years?
A. Under \$100,000.
Q. So please describe what you've done since you've been retained by Mr. Bertin's firm in connection with this litigation?

MR. BERTIN: I'm just going to state on the record that Dr. Acampora is being offered as a witness on claim construction.

MR. LU: So noted.
THE WITNESS: I read the patents. I read the prosecution history. I had numerous telephone conversations with Mr. Bertin. I attended a face-to-face meeting with Mr. Bertin and Mr. Lebar, and I prepared my report -- my declaration.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Okay. Did you speak to any individuals other than the employees at Google and the employees at Bingham that you've identified today in connection with your work on this matter?
A. No.
Q. Did you do any prior art searches in connection with your work on this matter?
A. No.
Q. Did you look at any Google products or services in connection with your work on this matter?
A. No.

Page 19
Q. Did you look at any Skyhook products or services in connection with your work on this matter?
A. No.
Q. Have you heard of the patent in suit prior to your work on this matter?
A. No.
Q. Had you heard of Skyhook Wireless prior to your work on this matter?
A. No.
Q. Had you -- were you aware of Google location services prior to your work on this matter?
A. In passing, yes.
Q. And what do you mean by "in passing"?
A. Well, I know that they're -- as an example, on my iPhone I could -- or on my laptop -- I can certainly go to Google map. But my awareness of any location services that might be provided by Google are -- are -are -- are really not any deeper than that.
Q. Now, Dr. Acampora, I assume that you received a copy of a subpoena asking you to appear here today for the deposition, correct?
A. I was aware there was such a subpoena, and I actually saw that subpoena yesterday.
Q. And were you -- did you see a second subpoena -- or perhaps the same subpoena -- directed
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1 towards asking you to produce documents in connection with your expert declaration?
A. I did yesterday. But I was informed earlier -- I believe it was earlier this week -- that I was to produce all of the material I relied on, which I did.
Q. Okay. And what were the -- the materials that you relied on, those were produced to Mr. Bertin?
A. I believe so.

MR. LU: Okay. And Mr. Bertin, I just want a representation that all of materials that Dr. Acampora relied upon were, in fact, produced to us as part of, I guess, the declaration of Susan Baker Manning.

MR. BERTIN: Yes. That's -- that's correct. BY MR. LU:
Q. Okay. Have you seen the declaration of Susan Baker Manning?
A. I did.
Q. And were there any materials that you relied upon that were not in the declaration of Susan Baker Manning?
A. Oh, I would need to look at that declaration to answer that question.
Q. Sure. We'll pull that out.

Were there documents -- did you look at any of Page 21
the dictionary definitions that were provided by Skyhook as part of the claim construction process?
A. Not that I can recall.
Q. Okay. So I'd like to have marked as Exhibit No. 7 the declaration of Susan Baker Manning --
A. Can I back up for a second just to be sure that I answered that previous question correctly?

I'm assuming you mean as part of the
preparation of my declaration? Answer: No. Have I
seen -- have I subsequently seen dictionary definitions
that were produced by Skyhook? Probably, because I did
look at Skyhook's claim construction brief after it was filed.
Q. But prior to the filing of your declaration, you did not review any of the dictionary definitions provided or produced by Skyhook in this litigation?
A. That's correct.

MR. LU: Do we have the exhibit stickies?
There you go.
BY MR. LU:
Q. So Dr. Acampora, I've put before you Exhibit No. 7, which is the declaration of Susan Baker Manning.
(Exhibit 7 was marked.)
MR. LU: Take a few moments to review this,
and let me know if there are any documents that you relied upon in connection with your expert report -your expert declaration -- excuse me -- that are not listed in this declaration.
A. I believe that the answer to your question is no. But to totally confirm that, I would need to look at my own declaration to see if there's any -- and -and do some sort of a -- a cross check between what's in my declaration and what's in Ms. Manning's declaration.
Q. Okay. But sitting here right now, you not aware of anything that's listed in -- that's listed in your expert report? Well, let me strike that question.

So your expert report lists all of the materials that you relied upon in the preparation of that expert report?
A. I believe that's the case.
Q. Okay. And just to make things clear, since both of us have been referring to your expert declaration --
A. Declaration.
Q. -- as an expert report, for the purposes of this deposition, if we refer to your expert report, it will be understood that we're referring to your expert declaration, Exhibit No. 5.
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A. That's fine.
Q. Okay. Did you review any legal cases in connection with the preparation of your expert declaration?
A. Any legal cases?
Q. Any case law?
A. Did I -- did I personally review case law?
Q. Correct.
A. No. I was provided with instructions with regard to claim construction that reproduced in my declaration. And they may be referenced -- I -- I would need to double-check. There may be reference to case law there. There may not be, but I was provided with instructions. I did not personally review any case law --
Q. Okay.
A. -- with regard to the preparation of my declaration.
Q. So let's turn to your declaration for a moment. That's Exhibit No. 5. Whether you want to refer to the declaration you have in front of you or the actual exhibit --
A. This one appears to be less unwieldy.
Q. Fair enough.

So I'd like you to turn to page 26, which is
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1 section Roman numeral four, "Claim Construction

Principles."
A. I'm there.
Q. Okay. Other than paragraphs 60 and 61 of the section Roman numeral four, were these passages -these paragraphs regarding claim construction principles -- provided to you by the attorneys at Bingham?

MR. BERTIN: Which paragraphs are you referring to?
BY MR. LU:
Q. Well, just to be clear, please review paragraphs 58, 59, and 62 through 69, which I believe correspond to claim construction principles -- the law regarding claim construction.

Did you write those specific paragraphs?
MR. BERTIN: So you're referring -- just to be clear, you're referring to paragraphs 58 through 63?

MR. LU: No. No. I'm specific -- okay. So just to be clear, I'm excluding paragraph 60 and 61 because those are paragraphs where I believe Dr. Acampora expresses his opinion.

I am referring, Dr. Acampora, to paragraphs 58,59 , and 62 through 69.

BY MR. LU:
Q. And Dr. Acampora, my question is: These paragraphs regarding the claim construction principles, were those provided to you by the lawyers at Bingham?
A. Okay. Let me restate the question so I'm sure I'm providing an answer to what you asked -- what I think you asked.

The question, as I understood it, were paragraphs 58,59 , and 62 through 69 provided to me by attorneys at Bingham?
Q. Correct.
A. That's essentially correct. Although, as they were originally provided, there may have been some language that I didn't fully understand, and I asked for clarification. I did not prepare that clarification.

So I guess the answer to your guess is yes.
Ultimately, those paragraphs were provided to me.
Q. Okay. So let's talk about your declaration, generally.

Sitting here today, is there anything in your declaration that you believe is incomplete in any way?
A. Not that I can think of right now.
Q. And did you write this declaration?
A. Well, let me explain how my declaration was

1 prepared, and that may answer your question.
Q. Sure.
A. So I already mentioned that I attended a face-to-face meeting with Mr. Lebar and Mr. Bertin. I had numerous telephone conversations with Mr. Bertin and with his colleagues at -- at Bingham. And as a result of these meetings and telephone conversations, I let all my opinions be known with regard to the issues that I was asked to offer opinions on in my declaration.

And I actually, mechanically, prepared parts of this declaration. By "mechanically," I mean fingers to keyboard. Other parts of this declaration, mechanically, were prepared by someone else.

I did review everything that was prepared by somebody else. I heavily red-lined and edited. So ultimately, what you see in front of -- in front of us is -- is my report.

So content-wise, this was prepared by me.
Mechanically, parts of it might be typed -- might have been typed by somebody else.
Q. Now, you were careful in reviewing this declaration before you signed it, correct?
A. I was.
Q. Okay. And this declaration is accurate in
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every respect?
A. There's nothing that I'm aware of now that is not accurate.
Q. Okay. And you had the opportunity to review this declaration in preparation yesterday, correct?
A. Say again?
Q. You had the opportunity to review this declaration since you signed it, correct?
A. I did.
Q. And how many times have you reviewed this declaration since you signed it?
A. Let's say one and a half.
Q. Why half?
A. Once was a comprehensive read, and once was a skim.
Q. Okay. And so sitting here today, you're not aware of any inaccuracies in this declaration?
A. Not that I'm aware of.
Q. Okay. Is there anything in this declaration that you need to change?
A. Not that I'm aware of.
Q. So there are no mistakes in this declaration that you feel that you need to correct?
A. Not that I'm aware of.
Q. Okay. Is there anything that would make you
aware of mistakes or changes that you need to correct?
A. I'm not sure what you mean.

Well, if I discovered something as we're -- in the course of our conversation today that I felt needed some clarification, wasn't stated as pristinely as I think I intended it to be, if there's some confusion on it, then maybe the answer is yes.
Q. Okay. So let's turn to what's been marked as Exhibit 6.

MR. LU: Rob, do you have a copy of that?
MR. BERTIN: I probably do, but which --
MR. LU: Exhibit 6 is the CV, I believe, of --
MR. BERTIN: Okay.
MR. LU: -- Dr. Acampora.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Do you have that in front of you?
A. I believe it's somewhere in this stack.
Q. There it is.
A. Thank you.
Q. So Dr. Acampora, I'll represent to you that this is the -- a true and correct copy of the CV that was attached as the exhibit to your declaration.

So I had some questions regarding your CV, and I was hoping you might be able to answer that.

First question is: Could you describe briefly
your educational background?
A. Yes. I received my Bachelor of Science in electrical engineering from the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn in 1968; master of science in electrical engineering from the same university in 1970; and my Ph.D., also in electrical engineering, same university, 1973.
Q. And you've highlighted some of those qualifications in your expert report; is that right?
A. I'm not sure what you just asked.
Q. Let me rephrase that.

So you've also got a work history that's recited in your CV, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you've highlighted certain aspects of the work -- of those -- those -- those -- your work experience in your declaration, correct?
A. Well, there were two things. My CV has a summary of my professional experience.
Q. Uh-huh.
A. It also contained a lot of other material:
publications, patents -- things of this type --
funding, extramural funding. And my declaration also includes a section where I attempted to summarize my qualifications.
Q. Okay. So why don't we turn to that section of your declaration which would be on -- which I believe starts with Roman numeral one at paragraph 4.

So let me turn you first to paragraph 5 and the last sentence of that paragraph 5 which reads: "I have expensive experience with wireless communications systems, including the location and characterization of signal from wireless systems and use of such information to determine position."

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Could you describe your experience in the location and characterization of signals from wireless systems and use of such information to determine position?
A. Sure. First, I've been involved in wireless communications -- communication by means of radio or free-space optical means for 40 some-odd years. I was involved in the -- I was a member of the satellite systems research department at Bell Labs for a number of years. I was director of the center for telecommunications research at Columbia University for seven years. That center was funded jointly by the National Science Foundation and telecommunications industry for the express purpose of better coupling
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academic research into commercial practice to enhance -- to help to enhance the nation's economic competitiveness.

So in addition to the programs that we were pursuing in wireless communications, I was interacting continually with our industrial affiliates also working in that field.

I then founded the Center for Wireless Communications at UC San Diego, which I directed for five years, and I continued -- I remain a member of that center today. That center is also funded by the wireless communications industry.

I have interacted with and continue to interact with the industry extensively. I've consulted for industry. I've done a lot of work in wireless communications. And part of -- I teach courses in wireless communications. And a part and parcel of -part and parcel of all of that experience includes exposure to location and characterization of signals from wireless systems and the use of such information to determine position.

Moreover, in one of my -- one of the companies that I consulted for, Wireless Communications, Incorporated, and it's probably not listed here because it may not go back far enough in time, and what I
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should have been looking at is Exhibit 1, my CV. While I was at -- Wireless Communications, first of all, the company was involved in the deployment of cellular systems world-wide. In fact, it was heavily involved in the deployment of cellular systems worldwide.

Part of what we did there was determine the best locations to site cell towers for coverage and capacity regions. And one of the projects that we actually undertook while I was there -- and I was directly involved in this -- was a scheme to use the existing infrastructure of CDMA base stations in a position determination system.

So I've -- I've had lots of experience with wireless communications, including location and characterization of signals.
Q. Okay?
A. Propagation of signals, shadow-fading, multipath-fading, means to abate these. This what I do for a living.
Q. Okay. So -- let's break that up a little bit, and we'll come back to Wireless Communications, Inc., in a few moments.

Other than Wireless Communications, Inc., what experience do you have in the location of signals from wireless systems and use of such information to
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determine position?
A. Well, I'm not sure I understand your question.
Q. Okay. And perhaps it may be because you need both to do that; is that correct?
A. Say again?
Q. Is it because you need both the location and characterization of signals from wireless systems?
A. No. I just didn't understand your question.
Q. Okay. So I want to focus on what specific experience you have, other than the work for Wireless Communications, Inc., on the location and characterization of signals from wireless systems and use of such information to determine position.
A. Okay. Well, as I said, in my opinion, it would be impossible for somebody who has worked in wireless communications for as long as I have in the positions that I had, both as a direct contributor and as a manager, and not have extensive exposure to location and characterization of signals from wireless systems and the use of such information to determine position.

GPS, as an example, would fall into this category. I've got experience with that. I teach this material.
Q. Okay. Other than GPS and cell systems, what
other wireless systems that you have experience with would be used for the purpose of determining position?
A. Well, I'm not sure there are any systems beyond satellite systems and terrestrial cellular systems. And I would include in cellular -infrastructure of wireless, local area networks. They behave very similarly. They function very similar with access point replaced by base station.
Q. So it's your opinion that cellular systems are functionally very similar -- strike that.

So it's your opinion that cellular systems for location determination are functionally very similar to WIFI systems for location determination?
A. That's not what I said.
Q. Okay. What is it that you said? Please elaborate.
A. Well, what I said is -- you had asked specifically about GPS and cellular. And you asked, are there any other systems that I'm familiar with that as -- as I believe your question was phrased -- that had some involvement with location and characterization of signals.

And what I was trying to do in my answer was explain that except for satellite systems and cellular systems, there aren't much else -- many other types of
systems that I could think off that are characterized as being wireless, including under the umbrella of cellular, infrastructured, wireless, local area networks.
Q. Why do you include infrastructure wireless local area networks under the umbrella of cellular systems?
A. From a 100,000 -foot perspective, a infrastructure cellular system involves base stations -- or access points and wireless clients. And from the same hundred-thousand-foot perspective, a cellular system involves base stations and wireless clients. The base stations and the access points both provide the point of entry into the worldwide telecom infrastructure. So I'm looking at this from a very high perspective. From that vantage point, they look very similar.
Q. Okay. What about --
A. That does not mean they perform in accordance the way they operate, in accordance with the same standards or use the same technologies. Once we get down below that hundred-thousand-foot, superficial-block diagrammatic description, there are a number of -- a number of differences.
Q. And what are some of those differences?
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A. Range might be one. Wireless local area networks or the range on an access point was not necessarily intended to be beyond -- much beyond a few hundred feet, or cellular systems might have ranges that -- well, they may be that small. Some base stations may have a range that extend to -- that may extend to several miles. That's one type of difference. They operate in accordance with different standards. They use different parts of electromagnetic spectrum. They use different modulation and coding techniques. They have different design objectives.
Q. What do you mean by "different design objectives"?
A. Availability, quality of service -- things of this type.
Q. What do you mean by "availability"?
A. One of the issues that we face in wireless communications is the fact that the signal strength is not constant. Signal strength can fluctuate for a variety of reasons. Line-of-sight blockage, multipath propagation, movement of client devices.

Cellular systems, for the most part, are designed with a higher availability requirement than a wireless, local area network might be. Cellular systems are designed so that there's a certain quality
of service guarantee. As an example, for basic cellular telephony, there are two things that we need to be concerned with. What is the likelihood that you try to place a cell call and the call doesn't go through because there wasn't a circuit available? And you need to be sure that the cellular system is designed so that that does not happen more than some specified fraction of the time. You need to be sure the call is not dropped because the user moves out of range of coverage and can't be picked up by a surrounding cell tower. Or the signal might be dropped -- blocked or dropped because the signal strength simply fades below some floor. You need to guarantee a certain call-blocking rate for wireless local area networks. These may or may not be design criteria.

Some wireless networks -- my at-home network -- I bought a wireless router, and I installed it. And it's giving me pretty good service. I'm the only one using it, but -- so I don't need to be worried about the air link becoming clogged because there's too much demand for a juice. I'm the only user. But in terms of -- of coverage, parts of my house have great coverage, and other parts of my house where I have no signal. In a cellular system, that would probably not
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1 be acceptable. I would need to do something to fix 2 that.
Q. Okay. Any other differences between cellular systems?
A. Well, we can spend all afternoon -- or all morning and all afternoon talking about that, if you want. So how much detail do you want to get down to?
Q. Well, what are the other major differences, in your view?
A. I already mentioned that they use different parts of the spectrum. They're deployed with different objectives in mind, different service quality objectives, different modulation and coding techniques, different capacities.

How much more detail do you want to get into? I can take any one of these topics and take you down to the next plateau.
Q. Well, let's ask about some -- let's ask about some differences that I had in mind.

Who controls the cell towers?
A. I'm not sure what you mean by "control."
Q. Well, when you -- when you install a cell tower, who does the installation there?
A. I'm still not quite sure what you mean.
Q. If I'm -- if I've got a Verizon -- Verizon
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phone, and I'm connecting to a Verizon -- a cell tower, who owns that cell tower?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Let me phrase --
A. I -- I --
Q. Let me phrase it to you a little differently.

So there's a cell tower infrastructure that a particular network provider creates, correct, or builds?
A. I -- I think I understand what you're asking. I think the answer is yes, but why don't I let you go on to see where it's -- where it's going.
Q. Okay.
A. And if I need to correct what you said, I will.
Q. All right. So a particular network provider -- let's use Verizon as an example -- would have a -- would have cell towers that it controls, correct?
A. I'm -- I'm -- I'm -- I -- I think the answer to the question as you're -- as I'm interpreting "control," I think the answer to the question is -- is yes, but --
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Q. Why don't you clarify.
A. But cell towers might be installed on buildings. Verizon certainly does not own the buildings upon which the cell towers are installed. Verizon may lease the space. Some towers are shared. More than one wireless carrier have equipment installed on that same tower. And they may even lease space on that tower. I'm not even sure about the equipment itself. It's probably owned by the individual carriers, but perhaps that's -- at least I -- so if you -- if by "control" you mean -- if I'm a Verizon customer, does my signal arrive at -- let's put it this way. If I'm a Verizon customer, the signal -- the point where my signal arrives at the network is probably controlled by Verizon. But even that may not be the case because I may be a roamer. I may actually -- Verizon may have a roaming agreement with another carrier, and I, in fact, may be served by that ultimate carrier.

So I -- I'm not sure. I -- I think, in general, the answer to your question is yes, but, once again, it was -- the question is so vague, I -- I really can't be --
Q. Sure.
A. -- any more specific than I just tried to be.
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Q. So location determination on a cell phone that is compatible with a particular carrier, how is that -is that determined using cell phone towers if it's a cellular model?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Can you ask that question again? BY MR. LU:
Q. Let me -- let me reask that question. That was not quite where we were going with it.

So we have a -- we have a network carrier such as a Verizon or an AT\&T, correct?
A. A cellular carrier.
Q. Cellular carrier?
A. Such as Verizon wireless or AT\&T.
Q. Right.
A. Okay.
Q. And they have certain cellular towers that they have access to and through which their network -network traffic travels, correct?
A. Again, roughly speaking, that's sort of correct. But it's not a totally accurate description of how things operate.

I try to be -- I tried to help in that regard just a few moments ago, but it's not as simple as your representing it to be.
Q. Okay. So let's -- let's focus on just the network provider-owned towers. They have particular towers that they own or otherwise control in the sense that their network traffic can pass through that particular cellular tower, correct?
A. Well, let me answer the following way. In the case of Verizon wireless, there are probably some cell sites that are equipped with equipment that was purchased by Verizon. That's probably the case. And traffic will flow through those base stations.
Q. Let me -- let me phrase this a little differently then.

Traffic flows through cellular base stations for a particular network provider, correct?

If you've got a cell phone -- if you have a cell phone --
A. Roughly speaking --
Q. And you're using --
(Reporter interruption.)
Q. Let me -- let me -- let me -- if -- if you have a cell phone, and you're placing -- you're accessing your cellular carrier's network, that signal has to pass through a cell tower, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. And --
A. Assuming that I successfully connected, the signal will flow through a cell tower. That's correct.
Q. And that cell tower is something that your network provider presumably has access to, correct?
A. In some cases, yes. In some case, perhaps not.
Q. So how does a network provider receive a signal through a cell tower that it does not have access to?
A. Well, as I explained before, it's not -- it's not necessarily the case that a particular carrier owns the equipment associated with its own -- it may lease that equipment.
Q. But it does have access to that equipment?
A. It -- it may outsource the maintenance of that system.

So I'm not sure what you mean when you say -when -- when you say has -- has access, the impression I have in mind is a Verizon employee can take a key and somehow walk up and open a box of equipment. If that's what you mean by "access," in many cases that's certainly true, and in some case, it may not be true.
Q. Okay. But the Verizon network would be able to receive signals transmitted to that cell tower, correct?
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A. What cell tower?
Q. All right. Let's -- let's -- let's -- let's try -- let's try this a little -- from a slightly different approach.

Network -- a -- a network provider would end up -- has -- a network provider generally has a network of cell towers through which it may receive signals from its subscribers, correct?
A. Again, generally speaking, that's true. So let's talk hundred-thousand-foot perspective, once again. That's true.
Q. Okay. And those cell towers are cell towers that, through whatever legal arrangement they have, are ones that signals from their subscribers are passed on to the network provider, correct?
A. Okay. I'm going to assume when you say "cell tower" you mean base station.
Q. Yes.
A. Yes. Because the tower itself doesn't receive a signal. The equipment installed on the tower receives a signal.
Q. Fair enough.
A. That's the base station.
Q. That's the base station, okay.
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. Now do the network providers know the locations of those base stations?
A. Yes.
Q. And how is it that the network providers know the locations of those base stations?
A. They, in most cases, supervise the installation of those base stations. The locations of the base stations are well known --
Q. In fact --
A. -- to the provider.
Q. In fact, the locations of those base stations are in many sit- -- in many cases actually selected by the network providers in order to maximize coverage, correct?
A. As part of the deployment of a cellular network, part of the design procedure includes siting the base stations. Where should the base stations be located? And that's -- that's dependent upon coverage, capacity, availability -- a footprint to simply install the equipment on, the cost of so doing. So a whole bunch of factors that go into the deployment of a cellular network.
Q. And in the vast majority of those cases, those base stations are meant to be permanently situated, correct?
A. Well, I don't know if that's true or not.
Q. Well, how -- how difficult is it to move a cell tower on which a base station is installed?
A. That depends on the installation.
Q. Is it -- do you -- do you have any notion of how often cell tow- -- cellular base stations are moved from one location to another for a typical carrier?
A. Now, you're asking about the base station or the towers upon --
Q. I'm asking about a base station.
A. I don't know how often they -- they might be moved. But I do know the deployment is an evolving process. It's not that the network is deployed and a snapshot is taken and it's frozen for all time. It's an evolving thing. It's a work in progress.
Q. Okay.
A. And carriers are continually upgrading the network by deploying additional base stations or providing base stations that have greater capability or may even conform to a different standard.
Q. Okay. But the cell providers, if they were to replace a base station or move a base station, would know the location of that either new base station or moved base station, correct?
A. That's probably the case.
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Q. Okay. Now is there a -- well, strike that.
A. Well, when I say "that's probably the case," eventually, that's probably the case. How they would learn that, that's a different matter.

But eventually, I would assume that the carriers know the locations of the base stations. Through some process they -- they -- they know where their base stations are.
Q. Okay. And all cellular base stations, at least in the United States, are controlled by network providers, correct? Or strike that.

All cellular base stations, at least in the United States, are connected to cellular providers, correct, or associated with cellular providers?
A. I don't know if that's the case.
Q. Do you know of instances where cellular base stations are not connected to or associated with cellular network providers?
A. Well, I can't tell you that I can -- I can't tell you a specific instance. But there has been discussion in the industry -- and it might have even happened -- where the radio license is not owned by what we regard as being a carrier. And the owner of the radio license deploys equipment and then sublets the airwaves to carriers.

Now, I can't give you a specific instance of where that happens, but it may.
Q. But in those instances, the base station location would still be known by the cellular providers who would be accessing it, correct?
A. Probably, but I'm not certain.
Q. Okay. How many WIFI access points, ballpark, are there in the United States?
A. Well, I -- I can't even give you ballpark estimate. I would -- but it's -- it -- it would be measured in millions, if that's what you're asking.
Q. Are there any national WIFI access-point providers -- WIFI access-point service providers?
A. Well --
Q. T-Mobile would be one?
A. As I'm interpreting your question, the first that comes to mind would be T-Mobile, right.
Q. Any others that come to mind?
A. I can't give you names, but there are others that are offering service. Who's offering service at airports, as an example? T-Mobile may be offering service at some airports. There are other providers of WIFI service at airports, and they do have -- as I interpreted your question -- national footprints.
Q. Okay. What percentage of WIFI access points
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do you believe are sort of controlled or accessible otherwise by these national wireless access-point service providers?
A. I don't know.
Q. More than 50 percent?
A. I don't know.
Q. 100 percent?
A. Not 100 percent.
Q. 50 percent?
A. Not 100 percent. I own by own base station that was never provided by T-Mobile, so certainly not 100 percent.
Q. 75 percent?
A. I don't know.
Q. You -- you just know it's not 100 percent because you have at least one?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: That's -- that -- that -- that sort of -- that in existence proof, I would assume that -- I -- I know of other people that own their own access points, so the number is not 100 percent. But you're asking me what fraction -- I think you're asking me what fraction of base stations are owned by these, quote, "national carriers," unquote, and I don't know the answer to that question.

In fact, I'm not sure that Verizon and AT\&T, themselves, don't own and operate networks of WIFI access points in an attempt to offload traffic from their cellular networks or that they have leasing arrangements with owners of access points for the same purpose. It's a lot going on in this industry.

MR. LU: Okay. So we've been going for about an hour. Why don't we take a short break?

MR. BERTIN: Sure.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going off the record. The time is 10:07 a.m.
(A brief recess was taken.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going back on the record. The time is 10:17 a.m.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Okay. Dr. Acampora, let's turn back to your declaration, specifically paragraph 2 of your declaration.

Now, it states that you've been engaged as an expert to review issues relating to patents owned by Skyhook Wireless, Incorporated, and you identify that as including the asserted patents in this case.

Do you see that?
A. That's a part of what I was asked to do.
Q. Okay. Were you -- did you review issues
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relating to patents other than the asserted patents in this case?
A. I -- I don't understand the question.
Q. So you indicate that you have -- were engaged as an expert to review issues relating to patents owned by plaintiffs Skyhook Wireless?

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And you say that that includes the asserted patents in this case -- the 988, 694, 897, and 245.

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Did you review issues relating to patents owned by Skyhook other than the asserted patents in this case?

MR. BERTIN: I'm just going to -- to note for the record that Dr. Acampora is an expert for Google, and he's being offered in this instance to testify about his opinions on claim construction. And I would ask that his answers be on claim construction.

MR. LU: I -- I note your objection, but I also note that his expert declaration indicates that he was asked to review issues relating to patents owned by Plaintiff Skyhook Wireless, including the asserted patents, but apparently not limited to the asserted
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1 patents. So I'd like to find out what issues he's
reviewed relating to patents owned by Skyhook, other than the asserted patents.
BY MR. LU:
Q. And if you could please answer that question? MR. BERTIN: And my -- my instruction is that's fine in connection with claim construction.

THE WITNESS: The issues that I'm referring to in paragraph 2 are claim-construction issues. And I have not reviewed claim-construction issues with regard to any Skyhook patents other than the four mentioned in paragraph 2.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Did you review any Skyhook patents, other than the four mentioned in paragraph 2 , for the purposes of claim construction?
A. Well, for the purpose of claim construction -for the purposes of my assignment that resulted in this declaration, I believe the answer is no.
Q. Did you review any of those patents for the purpose of preparing the background and description of the claimed inventions?
A. What patent are you referring to?
Q. Let me rephrase that.

Did you review any patents -- any Skyhook
patents other than the asserted patents in suit for the purposes of preparing the background and description of the claimed invention?
A. What's included in my declaration -- all of the views and opinions expressed in this declaration are based only on these four patents.
Q. Okay. So --
A. And their prosecution histories.
(Reporter interruption.)
THE WITNESS: And their prosecution histories. BY MR. LU:
Q. Did you review any of the provisional patents for the asserted patents in suit? Let me rephrase that.

Did you review any of the provisional patent applications for the purpose of -- for the asserted patents in suit for the purposes of preparing your declaration?
A. Not that I can recall. But I would need to review my declaration to see if, in fact, I indicated any of those provisional applications as being material that I relied upon.

Now, I'm sure those provisional applications are referenced in my report. But did I rely upon them for forming my opinions? Yeah. On para -- on page 11,
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section C, the asserted patents familial relationship to each other. And here I reference the provisional application. It's a 108 provisional application.
There may have been some other provisional applications mentioned as well.
Q. Does that indicate that you reviewed those provisional applications for the purposes of preparing your declaration?
A. Well, see, that's what I'm having difficulty in -- in responding to.

In general, the answer to that question is probably not, except that I am noting here the relationship among all of these patents. So to that extent, yes. To the extent that I'm noting the relationship here, the answer is yes.

Now, if you're asking did I rely upon something that was stated in the provisional application to support an opinion -- a claim construction opinion -- that I have, there, the answer is perhaps not. But did I consider the provisional applications with regard to the preparation of the report? Well, clearly, I did. They're mentioned right here.
Q. Did you read the provisional applications that are referenced on page 11 ?
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A. Not that I can recall. Unless they were referenced in the prosecution history, in which case I probably did.
Q. And what do you mean by "referenced in the prosecution history"?
A. If there was discussion concerning those provisional applications in any of the office actions or response to the office action, if they were referenced there, then I probably did read them or at least sections of them.
Q. And did you -- so it's your view that if you relied upon -- strike that.

So it's your view that you would have relied upon the provisional applications for the purpose of preparing your declaration if such provisional applications were referenced in the -- back and forth -- between the patent office and the applicant; is that correct?
A. That's not quite what I said.

You asked me if I read them, and I told you, "not that I can recall," unless they were specifically called out in an office action or response to an office action, in which case I probably read the portions that were called out. That does not mean that I relied upon that for my opinions.
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I'm simply -- your question was addressed to whether I read them or not.
Q. Did you provided copies of everything you read in connection with the asserted patents to your attorneys at Bingham?
A. Can you ask that question again?
Q. Did you provide copies of everything you read in connection with the asserted patents in the preparation of this declaration to your attorneys at Bingham?
A. I provided a list of everything that I read with regard to my assignment to attorneys at Bingham.
Q. Okay. And were -- did you rely upon -- if you had relied upon the provisional applications for the purpose of preparing your declaration, you would have provided those provisional applications and copies thereof to the attorneys at Bingham, correct?
A. Not necessarily.

What I might have indicated is -- what I did read and what I did rely on were prosecution histories. And as I testified earlier, if any of the provision applications were specifically called out as part of an office action or response to an office action, then I certainly read passages from those provisional applications.
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But would I have called that out separately from the prosecution history? Probably not.
Q. Those passages would have been the one -- the passages quoted in the prosecution history?
A. If there were any, and I'm not saying that there were. But that would have been it, yes.
Q. If there were no passages from provisional applications quoted in the prosecution history, would it be the case that you would not have read the provisional application?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: That's probably the case. But again, there may have -- and I just don't recall. So we're actually dealing in the realm of the speculative right now. There may have been sections in the prosecution history that referenced provisional applications and may have been discussion concerning those provisional applications, and that material I certainly did read as part of my assignment in this matter.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Okay. But you provided everything that you relied upon for the purposes of your declaration to the attorneys at Bingham for purposes of production to the attorneys at Skyhook, correct?

MR. BERTIN: Well, objection. Asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: Again, I believe the answer to that question -- I believe the question you asked me earlier was whether I provided to attorneys at Bingham all the material I read with regard to my assignment. Yes.

And let me clarify that. What I said was I provided a list of -- not necessarily the documents themselves -- but a list of what I relied on.

MR. LU: Okay.
THE WITNESS: A list of what I read.
BY MR. LU:
Q. All right. I'd like you to turn to paragraph 3 of your declaration and specifically the sentence beginning: "In forming my opinions as expressed below, I've relied primarily upon the text of the claims and specifications of the asserted patents, their prosecution histories, certain related patents, and patent applications assigned to Skyhook, including their prosecution histories, and exhibits to the declaration of Susan Baker Manning, dot, dot, dot, as well as my background knowledge and experience in the field."

Do you see that?
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A. I do.
Q. What are the "certain related patents and patent applications assigned to Skyhook, including their prosecution histories" that you refer to in this paragraph 3 that you relied upon for the purpose of preparing your declaration?
A. Well, to answer that question, I'm going to need to go to my report -- through my declaration page by page.

Visual application 108.
Q. Which page is that?
A. Page 11.
Q. So it's your position --
A. You didn't --

MR. BERTIN: Hang on. Let him finish.
THE WITNESS: Can I finish my answer?
BY MR. LU:
Q. Sure.
A. 762 patent, 811 provisional, 481 provisional, the application that issued as the 762 , the application that issued as the 127, and the pending application, No. 154.

I believe that's it.
Q. So other than the asserted patents, their prosecution histories, the patents, and applications
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that you've identified in the prior answer, as well as their prosecution histories, and the exhibits to the Susan Baker Manning declaration, you did not rely on any other documents for the purpose of preparing this declaration?
A. That's my recollection.
Q. Let's talk a little bit about your work background.

Where did you start your employment after getting your Ph.D.?
A. I was working at AT\&T Bell Laboratories when I got my Ph.D. and continued to work at Bell Laboratories after receiving my Ph.D.
Q. And what were your duties and responsibilities when you started at AT\&T Bell Labs?
A. My first assignment was as a member of technical staff in a -- in an organization that was responsible for exploratory development -- design and development of -- of advanced radar systems for a ballistic missile defense.
Q. And then you went on to go work in the radio research laboratory; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Turning to paragraph 9 of your declaration, you indicate in that paragraph that one of the things
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you did was to work on strategies to acquire and maintain synchronization of radio signals sent to and from satellite.

Could you explain, generally, what that work related to?
A. Can you --
Q. Page 2 of your declaration.

MR. BERTIN: Paragraph 9.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Paragraph 9, second to last line from the bottom.
A. Okay. And your question once again is?
Q. Explain, generally, what you mean by strategies to acquire and maintain synchronization of radio signals sent to and from a satellite?
A. Well, these satellites -- actually, these techniques could have been used for -- for any satellite. But the satellites that I was concerned with at the time were geosynchronous satellites.
(Reporter interruption.)
THE WITNESS: Geosynchronous satellites.
These were in orbit 26,000 miles above the surface of the earth. And there's a need for the base stations to effectively determine their range from the satellite for the purpose of ensuring that anything

1 they sent to the satellite arrives when it's supposed to and doesn't collide with some other transmission.

And similarly, each base station -- although it's not as critical -- would also need to know when the receiver must listen for a signal that's targeted at itself.

So this work was associated with strategies for effectively obtaining the requisite range information by means of synchronization signals sent from the satellite -- or sent through the satellite -not necessarily sent from the satellite, but sent through the satellite.
Q. Now, at your time at Bell Labs, did you do any work on determination of location using access points or GPS or base stations?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Okay. Those are three different things.
BY MR. BERTIN:
Q. Well, we can --
A. So --
Q. Did you do any -- while at Bell Labs, did you do any work on determination of location using GPS?
A. Probably.
Q. And how familiar are you with GPS
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technologies?
A. Quite.
Q. Quite familiar?

Have you ever heard the phrase "triangulation
used in connection with determining location in GPS"?
A. I have.
Q. And what is your understanding of the triangulation in connection with the determination of location in GPS?
A. It's a method of using -- in fact, I think I have an opinion on that in -- in my declaration.
Q. Is that on page 62 of your declaration?
A. It is.
Q. And is triangulation in GPS --
A. I'm not sure the question I'm answering now. I thought there was a pending question, which was what I was trying to answer.
Q. Well, to make -- to make the record clear, I was going to reask the question for -- you know, because the last question I asked is, "Is that on page 62 of your declaration?" And you answered, "It is." So --

MR. BERTIN: Do you want to reask or --
MR. LU: I plan on reasking.

BY MR. LU:
Q. What is your understanding of triangulation as that word is used in the determination of location using GPS?
A. Okay. In general, triangulation technique is calculating the physical location of a user device by using the strength of signals received from two or more -- well, you're asking me in the sense -- in the case of GPS. Two -- two or more GPS satellites whose locations have been calculated by the formation of triangles having to use a device in each such GPS satellite as a vertices.
Q. So in your view, GPS --
A. Except with regard to GPS, this might -- we might have needed three satellites because of the three-dimensional nature of GPS positioning.
Q. So in your view, GPS location determination uses a triangulation technique in which triangles are formed having the GPS device and each of the satellites as the vertices?
A. In GPS the location technique is generally known as triangulation. And at the end of the day, one can draw a triangle -- well, on a planet surface, one would be able to draw a triangle with the two known locations and the location to be determined as
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vertices.
Q. That wasn't the question I asked.

The question I asked is: In determining location in GPS, is that location calculated by the formation of triangles having the GPS device and each of the GPS satellites as the vertices?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Again, I tried to distinguish in my earlier testimony the difference between triangulation in -- on a plane from triangulation in three-dimensional space.

The construction that I read on page 62 of my declaration applies to a plane. The question you're asking now is with regard to GPS. So a generalization of this two- or three-dimensional situation, we would need to generalize on what one would understand a triangle to be. But that technique, nonetheless, is known as triangulation.
BY MR. LU:
Q. And that technique would involve the formation of triangles in which the device and the satellites would act as vertices?
A. Well, again, I'd -- as I tried to explain, these would be a generalization of -- of what would be -- the -- it would be a generalization of a
triangle. The reason being, to fix location in three dimensions, you would need three satellites, and there'd be four vertices involved, location of the three satellites, and the location to be determined. So there'd be four vertices. Obviously, a triangle is only three.

That's why I did say that in that case, we would need to -- and one would -- one of skill in the art would understand what's meant by triangulation. It's a phrase that's commonly used in GPS, but there are four points, not three points involved.
Q. Okay. What about cell tower location? Is that a two-dimensional location determination technique?
A. It could be.
Q. Okay. And what is your understanding -- is triangulation used to determine location using cell towers?
A. Well, there are many ways that are used -well, I shouldn't say many. There are several ways that one can use cell towers in conjunction with a location determination. One of those is certainly triangulation.
Q. And how would you define "triangulation" in terms of determining location using cell towers?
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A. Same as I would define it in paragraph 155 in my report --
Q. So --
A. -- except I would replace "WIFI access point" by "cellular base station."
Q. Now, are you aware that Google has adopted Skyhook's claim construction in connection with triangulation technique?
A. You would need to show me what you're referring to. I am aware of what I propose the construction to be.
Q. But no one has informed you that Google has adopted -- or the agreed-upon claim construction for triangulation technique proposed by Skyhook?
A. Not that I can recall.
Q. Have you heard the term "triangulation" used to describe -- well, strike that.

You've seen the dictionary definitions for triangulation provided by Skyhook, have you not?
A. Well, at what point in time?
Q. After you've prepared your declaration in connection with preparation for the deposition today.
A. I believe so.
Q. And do you recollect what those definitions were?
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A. No.
Q. Quick question, Dr. Acampora. Can you read source code?
A. No.
Q. Can you write source code?
A. No.
Q. Do you have any computer programming experience?
A. Well, that's not a simple yes or no.

I certainly programmed in the past. My students all program, and I supervise their work. So I guess the answer is, yes, I have had experience in writing programs in my past.
Q. When you say in your past writing programs --
A. I -- I think that was your question.
Q. That was my question.
A. Yes.
Q. My -- my question is, when you say that you have experience writing programs in the past, are you talking about putting hands -- fingers to keys on keyboard, as you used that terminology previously today?
A. I've done that.
Q. Okay. And how long ago was that?
A. Long time ago.
Q. When you say long time ago, are we talking '80s? '90s? '70s? Punch cards?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: All of the above.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Okay. So when was the last time you had -where you wrote source code for a computer program?
A. I don't know if I've ever written source code. That wasn't the question you asked.
Q. What was -- what was the programming experience that you had? What did you write?
A. Mostly computer simulations and, in some cases, actual formulas that were needed to produce numerical results at the end of a fairly extensive theoretical analyses.
Q. So we're talking about something like math lab -- MATLAB?
A. I've used MATLAB.
Q. When you said "putting together formulas," are you referring to the use of MATLAB?
A. Well, no. I actually wrote my own programs specifically to compute what needed to be computed.

I've also used MATLAB, but less often.
Q. And when you refer to simulations, that also referred to writing programs?
A. Yes.
Q. And how -- that was not source code because it was in Basic or some other --
A. Yes. I was it was in programming language, not source code, correct.
Q. Okay. Do you have any database programming experience?
A. I'm not sure what you mean by that. I've got experience with databases.

Are you asking whether I've written source code to create database or to operate a database? The answer is no.
Q. Do you have any experience in programming servers?
A. Well, I'm going to ask you to clarify that question. I'm not sure what you mean by "programming servers." I gave you my programming experience before.

If the computers upon which my programs execute are servers, then the answer to the question is yes.
Q. Okay. But you have no experience writing source code that is used to operate a server?
A. That is correct.
Q. I'm going to put before you what I'm going to mark as Exhibit 8, which, to confuse things, is
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Q. Okay. But the dictionary definition states that "triangulation often involves the use of trigonometry."

Does it not say that?
A. It says that.

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I'm not sure I would agree with that when it's use -- it's characterization of "often." BY MR. LU:
Q. Okay. So your view is that triangulation must always involve the use of trigonometry; is that correct?
A. Can I see the patent, please?
Q. Yes. Copies of the patents are in front of you as Exhibits 1 through 4.
A. Okay. The calculation that I'm referring to in my proposal instruction for triangulation technique would involve trigonometry.
Q. And what is the basis for that view? Let me strike that.

So I -- right. Okay.
But at least according to the American Heritage Science Dictionary, one can perform triangulation without trigonometry; is that correct?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.

THE WITNESS: Well, I think that what the confusion here may be is what's meant by
"trigonometry."
In my opinion, the calculations that I'm referring to in my construction would involve trigonometry. If you don't know trigonometry, you can't triangulate.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Is it possible to triangulate the position of a cell phone using only two -- the locations of two cell towers?
A. Ask that again, please.
Q. Is it possible to tri-- use triangulation to determine the location of a cell phone using the known locations of two cell towers within range of that cell phone?
A. Yes.
Q. Does that involve the use of trigonometry?
A. Yes.
Q. And how does it involve the use of trigonometry?
A. Well, I can give by way of example.

I can first determine my distance from the first cell tower. I can then determine a distance from a second cell tower. And if I were to draw a circle

1 around the known location of the first cell tower -- so here's where trigonometry is coming in -- I would need to know the circle around the location of the first cell tower of radius equal to the distance that I just measured between myself and the first cell tower. Then I would draw a circle around the second cell tower of radius equal to the distance that I measured between myself and that second cell tower. I would note the intersection of those two circles. Those two circles would intersect in two points. And then I may be able to eliminate one of those two points as being physically impossible because it's in the ocean, as an example, and I know I'm on land. And I would therefore know my location.
Q. And your location would be at the other intersection?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. But if you're --
A. And that would form the triangle, by the way.
Q. But only in that circumstance where you can eliminate the second access point would that -- second intersection point would that constitute triangulation in your mind.
A. Well, no. I didn't say that.
Q. So you have -- okay. So triangulation could
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include a scenario where you have two known -- two intersections in the scenario that you described where your location might be one of either of those two intersections?
A. There may be instances where I actually don't care as to the ambiguity. But in many cases, that ambiguity is easily eliminated for a variety of reasons.
Q. Okay. But those instances where you don't care about the ambiguity, that would -- that would still included triangulation, correct?
A. Can you ask that question again.
Q. In the instances where you don't care about the ambiguity, that would still, in your mind, constitute triangulation, correct?
A. Well, the reason I'm hesitating is, if I'm trying to determine my location and we've -- this discussion has been by way of example. If we trace back through the questions you've asked, you'll see that I offered up my explanation as -- as an example.

If the purpose of triangulation is to fix a location, the technique that I just described may involve an ambiguity which sometimes can be eliminated on the basis of impossibility of one of the two locations, and, in some cases, would need to be
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eliminated by means of some additional measurement.
But the triangulation technique that I just described is part of the process of fixing the location. It's -- it's calculating the physical location of the device using the strength of signals received from two or more -- in the question you asked me -- cell towers, I believe you were asking about -whose locations have been calculated by forming triangles having to use the device in each such WIFI access point as vertices.
Q. Where's the triangle that's being formed in that example?
A. The intersection would be one vertices-- one vertex. And the two locations, one for each cell tower, would be the other two. And you can then draw a triangle between those three locations.
Q. Now, why would being on the water being an -an impossibility? I've got a boat, and I've got a cell phone.
A. Well, in that case, I would use the -- the intersection that's in the water and eliminate the one on land since I know I'm on a boat.
Q. All right. I'd like you to turn to page 60 of your expert declaration. And that is the section titled "Simple Signal Strength Weighted Average Model." 25
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Do you see that?
A. No. I haven't quite gotten there yet. Can you ask one more time, please?
Q. Sure. Turn to page 60 of your expert declaration. And that is the section titled "Simple Signal Strength Weighted Average Model."

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Now, I'd like you to turn to paragraph 152.

And you mention that "there's a mathematical formula in the specification for taking the average of a location weighted by signal strength."

Do you see that?
A. I do see that.
Q. How does one determine in this example the average of a location weighted by signal strength?
A. In what example?
Q. In the example described in 152 -- paragraph 152.
A. Okay. The question, once again, is?
Q. How does one determine in this example the average of a location weighted by signal strength?

MR. BERTIN: Which example?
MR. LU: The example that's described in paragraph 152.

THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm -- I'm not quite sure what you're asking.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Well, it's your declaration, and you say that there's a mathematical formula in the specification for taking the average of a location weighted by signal strength.

Do you see that?
MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: But I didn't characterize that as being an example of anything. It's simply a statement of what's in the patent. If you're asking me -- if you're asking me to explain this mathematical formula --
BY MR. LU:
Q. Yes, I am asking you.
A. -- formula and how it involves an average weighted-by-signal strength, that I can explain.
Q. Sure. Why don't you explain that.
A. Sure.

MR. LU: Why don't we just take a quick thirty-second break to change the tapes.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This marks the end of Media No. 1 of the deposition of Dr. Anthony Acampora. We're going off the record. The time is
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## 11:11 a.m.

(A brief recess was taken.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're back on the record.
The time is $11: 15$ a.m.
And this marks the beginning of Media No. 22 of the deposition of Dr. Anthony Acampora.

MR. LU: Let me just ask the question again so that the record is clear. We were referring -- we were discussing paragraph 152 of Dr. Acampora's declaration. And specifically the phrase: "There is one mathematical formula specification for taking the average of a location weighted by signal strength." BY MR. LU:
Q. And Dr. Acampora, I asked you to describe at a high level how that average of a location weighted by a signal strength is calculated.
A. Sure.

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: If we look at column 12 of the 245 patent, beginning at, let's say, line 41 . By the way, there's some confusion in the language of the specification. One of skill in the art would have no difficulty cleaning this up.

What's being discussed here is a process whereby some sort of a weighted average of the measured

1 GPS location of access points is being performed. Some 2 sort of a weighted average of GPS measurements for
access point location is being performed.
So as -- in the set of equations, there are little N such measurements. And the methodology whereby these measurements are recorded -- is recorded into specification -- involves running a van equipped to make these measurements specifically deployed to make these measurements up and down every street in the area, trying to cover each street a minimum number of times. But having done that and having recorded by means of this van driving Chinese postman algorithm route, let's suppose N measurements were made.

Let's label those "1 through N." That's what the subscript "I" means in line 42.

The paragraph then goes on: "The calculated access point location is located by" -- it looks to me like it's also using Lat I and Long I. That's clearly a mistake. Because we look at the formula, the calculated location is noted by Lat $U$ and Long $U$.

So how do we get to the weighted average? Consistent with how I believe one of ordinary skill in the art would understand a weighted average. In this case, each measured location -- let's consider the latitude first. Let's consider averaging over the N
latitude measurements. Take each measurement, weight the measurement by a factor that's dependent upon the signal strength associated with that measurement. And that factor is, in fact, the fourth root of 10 , raise to the power of that signal strength measurement, divided by 10 .

So that fourth root of 10 raised to the power of the signal strength measurement divided by 10 is the power weighting factor associated with Latitude I.

Sum up all N latitude measurements, each weighted by the appropriate factor, then divide or normalize by the sum of the weighting factors. Repeat the exact same process to calculate the location -- or the longitudinal location -- of the access point. BY MR. LU:
Q. I'd like to direct your attention to column 6, line 65 of the same patent, the 245 patent.

It reads: "The location calculations are produced using as a series of positioning algorithms intended to turn noisy data flows into reliable and steady location readings. The client software compares the list of observed access points along with their calculated signal strengths to weight a location of a user to, determine precise location of the device user."

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And it goes on to say: "A variety of techniques are employed, including simple signal-strength, average-weighted models."

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Is that the same technique a simple
signal-strength, weighted average model, as you've just described, corresponding to that lat/long equation on column 12?
A. Well, let's put it this way. In this patent, the equations appearing in column 12, while they're being described in the context in which they're presented as being used to calculate the location of an access point by performing a weighted average of the measurements of signal strength observed from that access point, could also be used to compute a weighted average location of a WIFI-enabled user device, but we have to make some changes. And, in fact, the changes are not all that great.

In this case the weighting would be performed by the user observing in the case of these examples, N distinct access points, noting the signal strength received from each of those access points and then
using the calculated -- let's work with latitude first -- using the calculated latitude for each of the access points, weight that latitude by the signal strength that the user observes from that access point -- the weighting factor again being the fourth root of 10 raised to the power of the signal strength divided by 10 -- normalized by -- by summing over the N weighting factors.

And by the way, the Lat U/Long U result for -obtained by repeating the same process for the longitudinal calculation, that "U" might suggest user. Remember I -- I explained earlier there's a little bit of confusion in the text that one of skill in the art could read through, at least as after as the correct replacement needed to calculate the location of an access point. Perhaps one would also see, based upon the language that you just called my attention to beginning at the bottom of column six and going to the top of column 7, that these equations might be used to compute a weighted average of -- of WIFI locations to determine a user's location -- or at least to compute a user's location.

How accurate that computation would be is anyone's guess. But again, the process starts by first determining -- first measuring latitude and longitude

1 of -- of access points. Each access point some
2 multiplicity of times, N, by driving this Chinese postman route to build up some sort of a -- a database of computed locations for access points, then applying the -- those computations to further compute the location of a particular WIFI-enabled user.
Q. Okay. So in other words --
A. So that's how weighting would be performed. And that's a long answer. But then again, there's a considerably amount of math involved.
Q. Okay. But to summarize what we're talking about here in the simple, signal-strength, weighted average model is you calculate an average of latitude and longitude locations of access points by taking a multiplication of each signal strength measurement, putting on some weighting factor to weight stronger signal strength readings more than weaker signal strength readings, and that's used to determine the location of a user device, correct?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Well, I -- I -- I -- I -- a few things were thrown in there.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Okay.
A. And I'm not sure we're not doing apples to
apples.
Q. So let me break that up.

So what we're talking about here is calculating an average, correct?
A. When you say "we're talking about here" --
Q. So when we're -- what we're talking about in column 6 , line 65 through column 7 , line 3 , which is, as you described, a weighted average technique, correct?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form. Mischaracterizes earlier testimony.

THE WITNESS: Well, so far, we haven't got into weighted average. All it says here is "the client software compares a list of observed access points along with their calculated signal strengths to weight the location of the user to determine the precise location of the device user."

That language in itself is really -- it -- it
it -- it's not the clearest language. I think I know
what it means, but it's not clear. But so far we haven't gotten to -- I -- I don't see average up here. BY MR. LU:
Q. Okay. So the average appears in the exact -the next sentence. "A variety of techniques are employed, including signal -- simple, signal-strength,
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weighted average model."
Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Okay.
A. But again, this is -- the language is really --
Q. Understand.
A. -- not the clearest.

But I think one would understand from what's being discussed here is that a user could measure signal strength received from some number of base -- of access points and weight the location of each access point in some fashion in a way dependent upon the signal strength we see from that access point to compute its own location.
Q. And so that would be a simple, signal-strength weighted average model, correct --

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
BY MR. LU:
Q. -- what you just described?
A. That -- that might be one example, which I think would be consistent with the construction that I've suggested for the phrase "simple, signal-strength, weighted average model."
Q. Okay. Is it possible to calculate a location
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using a simple strength -- strike that.
To determine location, is there -- with -- if you have multiple WIFI access points, each having different -- strike that.

If you have multiple WIFI access point locations, each having different signal strengths, does it make any sense to take an average of the signal strengths for the purpose of calculating location?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: With all due respect, I have no idea what you just asked.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Well, quite frankly, I have no idea what I asked there either. Okay. Let's move on.

I'd like you to turn to paragraph -- page 6 of your declaration. Section two, the patents in suit.
A. If you could hold on just a second.
Q. Sure.
A. I just need to tidy up to remove the blizzard of paperwork. Page 6.
Q. Page 6, section 2, the patents in suit, subsection A, background and description of the claimed invention, paragraph 20.
A. I'm there.
Q. Okay. I'd like you to turn to the last

1 sentence of paragraph 20 which reads: "Then by
responding to user queries reporting the identities of those access stations that are observable to the user of a WIFI device, the database provides location information for the access points used to estimate the location of the WIFI device itself."

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. What do you mean by that sentence?
A. Just give me a moment to put it in context.

Okay. So there are actually a couple of points here. First, the paragraph is describing the creation and updating of the database; that database created by systematically -- as it states --
"systematically scanning for access points." So this is not casually or accidentally scanning. This is sort of deliberate, intentional scanning for access points. You have to go out there and specifically -- with the specific mission of scanning for access points.
Q. And that's your definition --
A. Let me finish, please.
Q. Let me just clarify.
A. I'd like to finish the question, if I may. I'd like to finish my answer, if I may.

So first, you scan for -- you -- you
intentionally -- one would intentionally scan for access points. Then based upon the systematic scan, locations for all of the access points within some area -- some geographically disbursed target region -would be -- would be created. Database containing estimated locations for all access points within some geographically disbursed target region would be created.

So first you scan. Based upon these scans, you estimate locations -- you systematically scan.
Then you estimate locations. And you put into the database the estimated locations of all access points. Then the user would make a query and report -- well, the user makes a query of the access -- of the database, and responding to these user queries -- let's get this clear.

The user reports back the identity of access points that it observes. So it's going to report to the database, I observed these -- these WIFI access points. Among all of those that you have located or that you've obtained location estimates for, these are the ones that I can see. Based upon that, tell me where I am.

Well, actually, what -- what the statement says here is the database would provide the location
information. These are the estimated location information obtained by this deliberate, systematic scan of using the scan to compute the estimated locations of the access points. Then provide, in response to a user's request, the estimated location for the access points that were included in the user's request.

And from that, the location of the WIFI device would somehow be computed.
Q. Okay.
A. So this is sort of a 10,000 -foot overview of what these patents address -- creation and application of the database. First, you collect the data by means of these systematic, deliberate scan, then you apply it to estimate locations.
Q. You used the phase "geographic area" in paragraph 20. Do you see that?
A. Well, no. I use the phrase "geographically disbursed target region."
Q. No. The top part of paragraph --
A. I do. I see that, yes.
Q. What's the difference between a geographic area and a geographic region?
A. Well, the -- the target region, I have an opinion on that.
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Q. Well, I'm not talking about target,

Dr. Acampora. I'm just talking about geographic area versus geographic region. And I think you understand the -- what I'm getting at here, which is Skyhook's proposed construction says "geographic area" and Google's proposed construction has the word "geographic region." And I'm trying to figure out if there is any meaningful difference between geographic area and geographic region.
A. Right. So once again, this is sort of a 10,000 -foot perspective. And as we bore in after the first line just to get to the next layer of the onion, I'm using terms more precisely.

So what I could have done -- I'm just looking at what's -- what I've written here. I could have substituted into geographic area the phrase "geographic disbursed target region." But I'm not sure that that would help in terms of this superficial description of the inventions in terms -- that would help a reader to understand the invention. So I sort of broke into the subject more gracefully.

When we get into the -- get deeper into the meat of the patents, the correct phrase "geographically disbursed target region." So I loosely characterize that by the phrase "geographic area" in line 2 of this
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10,000-foot overview. And perhaps that's just a question of style. I try to keep the sensitivity of the reader in mind in all of my writings by not jumping right in so that the person feels like they've just been submerged without -- without a lifeline.

So if we wanted to make this absolutely precise but perhaps not help in understanding, I could have substituted "geographically disbursed target region" for "geographic area" in line 2.

But the precise characterization, as used in these patents, would be "geographically disbursed target region." And that target region is the region which was deliberately scanned to create this database containing all WIFI -- the locations of all WIFI access points.
Q. Thank you for that answer. But I'm really just focusing on the words "geographic area" and "geographic region" and trying to figure out what the difference is between a geographic area and a geographic region.

You know, excluding all of the other limitations that you argue are present containing -- in the other parts of this targeted area of claim construction, I'm just focusing on the fact that Skyhook uses geographic area, Google uses geographic
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1 a radius on the order of 10 s of miles and a region having a radius on the order of 10 s of miles?
A. In what context?
Q. In the plain and ordinary meaning.
A. Well, are we talking about these patents? Are we talking about --
Q. Sure. We'll talk about these patents.

What is the difference between an area having the radius on the order of 10 s of miles and a region having a radius on the order of 10 s of miles?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: The question you're asking me is a claim construction issue because it's related to phraseology that we see in the claim. It's a disputed term, and that's why I asked if what context we're -we're referring to here. And the context of the patent -- I don't have an opinion of what an area is, but I do have an opinion of what a target area is, and you could read that opinion. It's --
BY MR. LU:
Q. Let me ask it in a different way.
A. Let me finish my answer, please.
Q. Sure. I apologize.
A. You have done that a few times. I really need to -- to interject.
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A. Okay.
Q. And I would note that in page 52 of your expert report, paragraph 129, you indicate that a target area is clearly a geographic area. That is not all that it is.

And again, if a target area is clearly a geographic area, I'm trying to figure out what the -why Google insists on having "geographic region" as part of its claim construction.

MR. BERTIN: Object to form. Argumentative. Mischaracterizes. I'm not sure if that's a question or not.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Can you explain why?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Well, I thought I just did. And I'm not sure you asked anything different than what you asked the first time, so I'm going to stand by my original answer.
BY MR. LU:
Q. What's the difference between an area and a region? Let me rephrase that.

What is the difference between an area having

So as stated paragraph 128, target area -- not area by itself, but target area -- the disputed term should be defined as a predefined geographical region throughout which the shortest route is planned along all drivable roads.

Now, Skyhook is proposing that that term be defined as a targeted geographical area. I don't think that the issue is, what is an area. The issue is, what is a target area? And in my opinion, it's -- Skyhook's construction is wrong, not because its use -- because of its use of the word "area," because it omitted the characteristics of that area.

So my objection would be just as strong if Skyhook had said "a targeted geographical region." That doesn't tell me the salient aspects of the region. It hasn't really told me what this target area is. So it's not area versus region that -- that's at issue. It's what special about this area or region. What makes it a target area or -- and what does make it a target area is that it's a predefined geographical region throughout which the shortest route is planned along all drivable roads.

That's what the phrase means in the context of this patent --
Q. Okay. Now looking --
A. -- in the context of the claim.
Q. Now, looking at you usage of the phrase "geographic region," which you use in paragraph 128, and your usage of the phrase "geographic area" in paragraph 129 -- and focusing just on those terms as you used them, what is the difference between a geographic area and a geographic region as you use them in your declaration?
A. Can you ask the question again?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
MR. LU: Can you reread the question, please.
Let me break that up.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Let's look at paragraph 128 of your
declaration which uses the phrase "geographic region" -- your words.
A. I see that.
Q. Let's look at paragraph 129 which uses the phrase "geographic area." Again, your words.

Do you see that?
A. Well, in paragraph 129 ?
Q. Paragraph 129.
A. Those are Skyhook's words.
Q. All right. Then let's look at paragraph 6 -paragraph 20. "Geographic area" -- your words.

1 is of the phrase "target area."
BY MR. LU:
Q. Okay. Going back to paragraph 128, you use the words "geographic region" -- your words. Going back to paragraph 129, you state, "Although a target area is clearly a geographic area, that is not all that it is."

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. What are you referring to as "that"?
A. The target area.
Q. Okay. And what are you referring to "it"?
A. Well, let me read this here again. Your first question is what does "that" refer to?
Q. Correct.
A. "That" refers to geographic area. "It" refers to target area.
Q. Okay. So you have an understanding, do you not, of what "that" is when you wrote this sentence in paragraph 129 of your expert declaration, correct?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form. Argumentative.
THE WITNESS: I don't understand the question. BY MR. LU:
Q. In paragraph 129, "Although a target area is clearly a geographic area, that is not all that it is."
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Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And when you refer to "that" in that -- in the sentence, you're referring to a geographic area.

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. What is your understanding of the phrase "geographic area" as you used it in the sentence where you made reference to geographic area?
A. Any old area. It's not any old area.
Q. Okay. And what is the difference between any old area and a region?
A. Any old area? Any old region? There might not be much difference. But again, that's -- the issue in my mind is not use of the word "area" versus use of the word "region." It -- as explained in paragraph 129, the target area -- the patent doesn't read "target region." But my answer would be the same if it did read "target region."

The target area must be proactively defined in advance. The plain, old, geographic area that would be inferred from Skyhook's construction is wrong. It's not any old area. It's an area that must be proactively identified in advance of the data collection so the route can be planned. You've got to

Page 100
define this area with the intention of applying an algorithm to choose a deliberate route and the Chinese postman algorithm, which was actually disclosed in the patent, for purposes of creating the database of all WIFI access points.
Q. Dr. Acampora, I understand that's the claim construction that's been proffered by Skyhook -- by -by -- by Google. I'm just trying to figure out the difference between a geographic area and a geographic region. So let me -- let me -- and I don't know why we're having such a huge difficulty here.
A. Nor do I.
Q. So let me ask some questions.

Would the city of San Francisco be a geographic area, having a radius on the order of 10 s of miles?
A. Are we in the context of the patent?
Q. We're in the context of the patent. We're in -- we're just talking about geographic region and geographic area in the context of the patent.
A. Well, I don't have an opinion on geographic area. I do have an opinion on target area.
Q. Well, you use the word --
A. So if you ask me, is San Francisco a target area? Well, San Francisco would be a target area if it
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1 paragraph 21. You mention that "their discovery, if any, appears to be a deliberate and possibly unachievable effort to improve the accuracy with which the location of a WIFI device might be determined by improving the collection process to only scan WIFI access points as described in the patents."

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. What do you mean by "deliberate effort"?
A. Not accidental. It's not casual. It's not random. It's -- it's an attempt to determine how to scan an area or region in such a way as to improve accuracy relative to some other scheme that was not so deliberately planned. This is sort of active measurement. I planned this in advance. I know exactly what I'm going to measure, where I'm going to measure, and why I'm going to choose this route. This route is expected to yield a superior result relative to something that was more casually or less deliberately planned in advance. This is not an accident. This was intentional. I planned exactly how I was going to scan to achieve some objective.

And the objective appears to have been: Be sure that every street is scanned the minimum number of times.
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was identified in advance so that the route could be planned. There's -- there's got to be a route associated with this target area. The target area was chosen so that a route can be planned.
Q. You use the phrase "geographic region" in your declaration, do you not?
A. It's part of my proposed construction for target area. That's correct. It's a part of it.
Q. And you -- and you use the phrase "geographic region" separately and apart from your -- from your proposed construction for target area; is that correct?
A. Can you ask that again? I don't think -- I didn't -- either I didn't understand that, or it's not correct.
Q. Well, let me ask you something a little different.

Is San Francisco a geographic region having a radius on the order of 10 s of miles?
A. Well, my geography might be a little bit rusty, but I believe the answer to your question is no.
Q. Is the city of New York a geographic region having a radius on the order of 10 s of miles?
A. Again, my geography may be rusty, but -- well, I don't know. It might be.
Q. Let's go back to page 6 of your declaration,
Q. Now, why do you say it's unachievable, this --
A. No. The phrase I used was possibly unachievable.
Q. Possibly unachievable. Why do you say it's possibly unachievable?
A. There's no -- I don't think there's any assurance, a priori, that using the Chinese postman routing algorithm to scan an area of access points is going to result in any improved accuracy.
Q. And what is the basis for that opinion?
A. Counter examples. Simplest example would be: Suppose I have a set of access points located on -along one street. And using this Chinese postman algorithm, I'm actually going to drive around the block and observe that access point from all sides. Because I've observed the access point from all sides, using the techniques disclosed in this patent, I'm going to compute a location of each of those access points that's interior to the street on which they're actually located.

Whereas, if I had scanned only the street in which their located, I would have gotten -- I would have at least known the access points were on that street. I would not -- I would not have produced a calculated position that was interior to the street
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1 within, let's say, the square block. So that's --
that's an example of how scanning in this fashion would actually produce inferior results relative to not scanning along each street.
Q. Any other counterexamples?
A. Yeah. I'll try to keep this simple.

There's another issue at play in wireless communications. I'm going to characterize another issue as propagation phenomenon. Radio waves -- you might think that the closer you are to a transmitter, the stronger will be the observed signal strength, and that is not true. I could be very close to a transmitter, but because there's a large building blocking line of sight to that transmitter, I would receive a very weak signal. Namely, that signal that's either penetrated the building or is scattered around other objects and sort of comes in from the back side. And at the same time, it would be quite a distance from the access point or from -- from the transmitter. But there may be only open space between transmitter and me, no shadow-fading, as we call it in the art, and I would receive a much stronger signal.

The end result is because of these various propagation effects, you really can't ensure that you're going to improve anything simply by driving
every street, relative to some other strategy. In fact, we had some discussion earlier about the siting of cell towers.

Part of the design process of siting the cell towers is to use geographical information system databases showing where the buildings are; in some cases, where the air-conditioning units are sitting on top of the buildings, taking a vast amount of information into account before determining where those base stations should be located to ensure that you've got decent penetration.

Simply driving up and down the streets without taking into account geographic information about the buildings, the heights, sizes, location of objects on top of the buildings, topology of the land itself, I don't see that it's providing -- that it is, a priori, providing any benefit because of the randomness of the propagation effects relative to a more casual -- a totally nondeliberate approach. Maybe it's better; maybe it's not.

By the way, there's another propagation effect called multipath, and that compounds the problem even further. So I -- I don't think there's any reason to think this is going to be better. It may be unachievable. It may not be possible to improve the
accuracy.
Q. What do you refer to as a "totally nondeliberate approach"?
A. Passively listening wherever you happen to be. It might be -- that would be one example of a nondeliberate approach. But deliberate approach, once again, is an approach that's intentionally designed to capture every access point in such a way as to -- as to reduce the uncertainty of the calculated location by driving every street and trying to drive each street once -- Chinese postman -- the Chinese postman algorithm.
Q. Next sentence says: "What they apparently believed that they discovered is what they described as a more accurate way to create a database of WIFI access point locations by deliberately taking measurements in some sort of systematic fashion."

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. What do you mean by "deliberately taking measurements in some sort of systematic fashion"?
A. Well, as I just described -- in this patent, one starts out with the expressed purpose of creating a database of WIFI access point locations. So my intent, a priori, is to do this.
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I equip a van. I go out. I take measurements. And I'm taking these measurements for the clear objective of using these measurements to create this database of WIFI access point locations. And not only am I deliberately taking measurements, but I'm taking these measurements in a systematic fashion. This is not a fashion disclosed in the patent to cover each street at least once and the fewest times by means of a Chinese postman approach -- Chinese postman routing algorithm -- which the inventors apparently believe will result in a more accurate database containing calculated WIFI locations.
Q. So you keep referring to this Chinese postman algorithm. What do you understand to be the Chinese postman algorithm?
A. Okay. Well, there are a whole class of problems in optimization theory involving graphs and objective functions and constraints. And one of these, as an example, is the traveling salesman problem. That problem can be state as I'm a salesman. I've got to visit a bunch of cities, and I want to plan my route in advance so that I hit each city. I must cover each city. I can't leave any out, but I want to drive the shortest distance. So what -- what's the sequence of cities that I should visit to accomplish that?

Second problem, same nature, is the Chinese postman problem. Here, I've got a graph defined by edges. And what I want to do is ensure that I drive along each edge -- I cover each edge in such a way that the total distance that I've driven is as small as possible.
Q. And what do you mean that it's an optimization?
A. The problems of this type are known as optimization problems in the field.
Q. Why are they optimization problems?
A. Well, notice I said I'm trying to minimize the distance covered. So I'm optimizing my route to achieve some objective function. The objective in this case being to minimize the distance traveled. And there's a cost associated with -- in the Chinese postman example, there's a cost associated with each -with each link, namely its distance. When I drive this link, I've accrued a certain distance. What I'm trying to do is add up all those distances so that the total is as small as possible but such that the subject can be restrained at each edge -- is covered at least once. I can cover an edge twice in order to minimize the distance, but each edge has to be covered at least once, and I need to cover -- I need to do that in the Page 109
shortest distance total.
Q. But one could drive other routes that cover each edge at least once but that don't minimize the distance, correct?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form. Mischaracterizes testimony.

THE WITNESS: Well, are you saying can I drive some other route that covers each edge but doesn't minimize the distance?

I suppose that one could do that, but that's not what's in the patent. Because if you were to do that -- one way to do it is -- just to make up an example -- just take Manhattan, rectangular streets and avenues. And first, just drive up and down each street when you get to the -- to the edge of Manhattan Island. You know, make a right turn, go to the next street, drive down, so forth and so on. When you get to the northernmost boundary, repeat the process by now driving the avenues of, first, north to south and south to north and complete the process. Except along the way, for whatever reason, I decide I'm going to backtrack and cover three streets 10 times.

Now, using your criteria, I would have covered every edge, but that would be contrary to what's actually taught in the patent. Because if I were to do

1 that -- remember the purpose of driving in this deliberate fashion in the patent is to scan for WIFI access points, and I would have recorded the same access points more times along the streets that I drove multiple times. And that would not accomplish the objective of creating a more accurate database. Remember here, you need to cover each street at least once, but try to cover each street the fewest time in order to ensure that you've got each street covered once, and you haven't spent, you know, three days driving up and down in order to collect the data. So the -- the patent was pretty deliberate in terms of -of disclosing how to accomplish this routing for the purposes of scanning the WIFI database -- the WIFI access points.
BY MR. LU:
Q. So that alternative route would be a nonoptimized route, correct?
A. The alternative route would -- would not have accomplished the objectives of the invention; that's correct. And if that's what you mean by not optimized, then it would not be optimized.
Q. Well, I'm referring to optimized in terms of what you've been referring to optimized, which is minimizing the distance that's covered.
A. In this case, in the case of this patent, that is a criteria.
Q. And so a --
A. That's what the Chinese postman problem -that's the problem the Chinese postman solution addresses.
Q. And so there are other routes that do not drive a Chinese postman route that would cover each and every street and each and every corner, but it would not be optimized because the distance covered would be greater than the Chinese postman algorithm route?
A. It -- it -- it's worse than that. It's not just the distance wouldn't be minimized, but it's also the fact that you will have covered -- you may have covered each street many times, which you don't want do if -- if -- you don't want to do unnecessarily because that will introduce errors that the invention, if any, is intended to avoid.
Q. I'd like you to turn to page 7 and paragraph 22. Second sentence says: "The scanning is performed using a Chinese postman format to drive each street a minimum number of times and preferably only once to avoid introducing a bias towards certain streets." Do you see that?
A. I do.
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Q. What is your understanding of that? What -what were you trying to say in that sentence?
A. Well, the -- the patent describes this phenomenon that the inventors characterize as being arterial bias. And they describe that as if -- if you drive only certain streets in accordance with the -how they believe these measurements would be made and used, the only recorded locations that you will make for the access points were along those streets. You won't actually record an actual location of an access point. The only recorded locations correspond to positions where the measurements were made. And if you're driving only on certain streets, then all of the measurements would result in a location on the driven streets. So it would be a bias in the database in the computer location of an access point toward the driven streets.

And with the invention -- what the -- which is all over this patent -- is an objective of avoiding that type of bias by driving in a deliberate way to ensure that you've covered each and every street, eventually eliminating the bias. That's what the inventors believe, in my opinion, that their invention accomplishes.

Ultimately, not to just reduce the bias --
because that would be sort of a relative thing -- but to eliminate the bias. Avoid the bias.
Q. So by avoiding the bias, you eventually eliminate the bias?
A. Well, I think that was the objective. And -and again, we had some discussion earlier as to why I believe that's unachievable or why I believe you're not necessarily even producing an improvement of any -- by any measure.
Q. So I'd like you it turn to figure 3 of

Exhibit 1, which is the 988 patent. It should be in front of you.
A. And what figure was that?
Q. Figure 3.
A. Okay.
Q. Now, figure 3 is titled "Example Scanning Scenarios Showing Arterial Bias."

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Can you explain what your understanding is of what's depicted in figure 3?
A. Okay. First of all, I'm actually looking in column 7 of the specification, line 64. Well, let's back up a little.

Line 61. "The model does, in fact, provide a
simple means to collect data. But the quality of the resulting data is negatively affected due to issues of, quote, 'arterial bias,' unquote. Figure 3 describes the challenge of the random model."

So what the -- and -- and what the inventors then -- let's go on just a little bit further. "When scanning vehicles traverse routes designed to solve other problems other than gather data; e.g. delivering packages, people commuting to and from work, they tend to follow destination routes. And the destination route is when a driver needs to get from point A to point $B$ and seeks the fastest route to get there."

So what they're describing here -- and this may well be understood to what a skill of the art is -one way to collect data is randomly. So secondarily, there's another objective of actually collecting the data -- collect some data. But because your doing this secondarily, you're not going to plan you're route in advance to improve the accuracy of the result in the database. You're going to accept what you get. And they characterize that as being random. And there's a whole bunch of discussion of why that's bad and why that shouldn't be done. And I believe that the inventors even used these phrases -- and we can talk about later if you care to -- in prosecution history
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1 the other invention was not -- they were teaching away from the random model.

But this random model -- what they're showing in figure 3 is how you get in double with this random model here. Because these -- the primary use -- the primary purpose of traveling was for -- was other than determining location of access points or measuring access points. The -- the example would be your delivery person. You're driving to and from work. You're likely to drive along arteries 304 and 305 . And accordingly, you're going to record the location, let's say, of access point 302. As you're driving along 304 and 305 , you're going to record the location for access point 302 each and every time as being along -- either along artery 304 or along artery 305 because that's where you're driving. And the measured location corresponds to where you are, not where the access point is. That's the problem.

So all of the recordings for the particular access point will be along either 304 or 305 , hence arterial bias. There's a bias in the computed location of the access point computed by -- considering all these measurements that were made along 304 and 305 to be a bias toward the arteries. And as an example, if you were to be -- the inventors seem to believe that if
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1 you drove around the block encircul- -- encircling 301
2 and measured the -- and -- and -- and -- and observed
the signal from 301 as you're traveling around the block, and then some sort of -- some sort of an average of the recorded locations as you drive around the block, you will -- you will somehow avoid this arterial bias. Because now you're getting measurements on different sides of the access point rather than always on one side.

So that's probably more than you asked for, but figure 3 is showing the -- their example of how this random data collection scheme -- where you're not deliberately planning the route, and doing this primarily for the purposes of scanning access points, can get you into trouble.
Q. Now, you say that the inventors believe this. You -- you -- you disagree?
A. We discussed that earlier. It may or may not help.
Q. So turning to figure 4, what is your understanding of what occurs in figure 4?
A. Okay. So now, let's go to column 8, beginning at line 28. This is sort of an alternative to the random data collection scheme -- what they call a "random model."

Another approach is to develop routing algorithms that include every single street in the target area so as to avoid arterial bias in resulting collection of data, thus producing a more reliable positioning system for the end users. Figure 4 describes an optimized routing algorithm, known as a Chinese postman, to calculate the most efficient driving route for covering every street in the target area. The Chinese postman routing algorithm is a known technique used by postal agencies, utilities, and census agencies, and is in a variant -- is a variant of the -- you -- you -- Eulerian cycle problem. The Eulerian cycle problem is a problem asking for the shortest tour of a graph which visits each edge at least once, and then there's a reference given.

This is exactly what we were tack about earlier. And figure 4 is an artist rendition of Chinese postman routing where every street is covered at least once, and only one, two, three, four, five -if I'm counting correctly -- it looks like only five edges are covered twice. One, two, three, four. It looks like 15 edges were covered once, and five were covered twice.

So the invention involves applying, if -- if any -- involves applying this type of routing that I --

1 I just -- I could reread the text, if you like -- this
2 type of routing to -- intentionally to scan for access 3 points to produce what the inventors believe will be a 4 more accurate database of estimated access point 5 locations.
Q. Now, looking at figure 3 and the locations of the WIFI access points -- the actual locations of the WIFI access points, which are denoted in black -- and the calculated locations of the WIFI access points that are denoted in the white squares, would you agree that -- at least using those locations shown in figure 3 -- that driving the Chinese postman algorithm, as shown in figure 4, would produce the calculated locations as shown in figure 4 ?
A. Would I agree?
Q. Would you agree?
A. Well, I neither agree nor disagree. This was the inventor's example of Chinese postman that, in accordance with this example, produced a calculated location. Again, you're quite right. These are the white diamonds that are closer to the actual location of the access point. So we're seeing the calculated locations. If we look at figure 4, one calculated location is 402 , and it appears to be reasonably close to the actual location of the access point. That's the
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1 solid circle, the dot.
But I could create an example where I could populate this one block with buildings and you would not have gotten that -- that result of the calculated access point 402 being closer to -- being closer to the actual access point.

So this is just an example that they created to show how to apply their -- the teachings of their -of their invention or of their patent. So as they made it up, the result is better. Sure.
Q. Have you ever heard the term "reverse triangulation"?
A. That's a pretty ill-defined phrase. And that's one where I needed to go back to the specification to see what the authors meant. That doesn't have a well-known meaning in the art.

MR. LU: Why don't we take a break for lunch.
MR. BERTIN: Sounds good.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're off the record. The time is 12:24 p.m.
(A luncheon recess was taken.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going back on the record. The time is $1: 30$ p.m.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Dr. Acampora, I had a question about the

1 Google's claim constructions. Did you have a role in 2 formulating the initial claim constructions that were
provided by Google to Skyhook?
A. I certainly participated in some discussion before Google's claim constructions were fully formulated. So if that means I had a role, then the answer is, yeah, I suppose so.
Q. The language of the claim constructions, who created that language? Who wrote that down?
A. Well, mechanically, not me.
Q. Whose language was it in the claim constructions? Was that something prepared by the attorneys?
A. Well, that's -- again, that's -- that's not -to say "yes" would be misleading, and to say "no" would also be misleading. So I was certainly consulted before these phrases were construed. I offered opinions.

As best I can recall, somebody then tried to capture some of those opinions. I suggested modifications to what -- what had been captured. And eventually, we see what's been produced.
Q. Do you have, sitting here today, any disagreement with any of the claim constructions that Google has proffered in this case?
A. Well, can I see those claim constructions?
Q. Sure. Why don't you --
A. Because I don't think I offered opinions on everything that is included in Google's claim constructions. I was asked to offer opinions on certain phrases, some of which I felt were -- were absolutely essential that opinions be offered, and some of which I was just asked what I thought -- how I thought these terms could be construed.

Now, I don't think that all the terms that are in dispute are included in my declaration. So I would need to look at the Google briefs, if you will, to see what Google's constructions might be on some other issues.
Q. Are you being offered up -- strike that.

So are the claim constructions for which you are offering opinions in this case limited to the ones in your declaration?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you disagree with any aspects of the claim constructions that Google has taken as offered up in your declaration?
A. Once again, I would need to see the Google constructions to be sure that -- well to -- to be able to answer that question one way or other.
Q. The Google --
A. The -- I would need to see Google's
constructions to see how closely they -- they conform to my opinions.
Q. Okay. Are you -- did you -- did you review Google's claim constructions which are part of Susan Baker Manning's declaration?
A. Well, okay. Again, I'm not sure what you're asking. At what point in time?
Q. When you prepared your declaration or immediately after.
A. Okay. Now, I didn't review the -- let me be sure that I get the chronology correct. I don't believe I reviewed the final briefs on this matter that was submitted by Google before I prepared my report. That does not mean that I didn't have a discussion concerning what the contents of those briefs might be. But if you're asking whether I reviewed and approved beforehand, the answer is no.
Q. The claim constructions that you provide in your expert declaration, those are claim constructions that you agree with, correct?
A. Well, that's not quite true either.

These are my opinions as how the phrases -- as some of the phrases in dispute should be properly Page 123
construed. And I also offer opinions as to the indefiniteness of some of the phrases that are in dispute. So these -- what is in my declaration represent my opinions. I'm neither ratifying or not ratifying anything else. I'm simply expressing my opinions on these terms.

I'm also offering some comments as to why, in some cases, I believe that Skyhook's construction is incorrect.
Q. Do you have opinions about how claims should be construed that are not articulated in your expert report?
A. Can you ask that again?
Q. Do you have any opinions upon how the claims ought to be construed differently that are not in your expert report?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I would need to look at some of the claims in dispute before I could answer that. BY MR. LU:
Q. So it's possible that you may have an opinion regarding how a claim ought to be construed that is different than the opinion that is expressed in your expert declaration; is that correct?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
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THE WITNESS: I'm going to have to play back the question that I think you're asking because I'm not sure it came out this way.

I think you're asking about terms about which I have not expressed an opinion in my report. And you're asking do I agree with Google's construction of those terms or do I have an opinion that's different than Google's construction of these terms? These are terms that are not -- that -- that -- that I haven't
offered an opinion in my report.
BY MR. LU:
Q. That is not my question.
A. Oh, that's not your question. Okay. Then --
Q. My question focused on --
(Reporter interruption.)
MR. LU: Sorry about that.
BY MR. LU:
Q. My question focused on the claim constructions that you offered up in your report.

Do you have any opinions that those claim terms can be construed differently than the claim constructions opinions that you have offered up in your report?
A. I have no opinions in that regard, no. I believe that I've offered up the correct construction
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for the terms on which I've offered an opinion where there is a construction, possibly. In some cases I think the terms are indefinite.
Q. Okay. Are you aware that Google has modified its claim construction with regard to weighted simple average -- weighted, simple, signal-strength average? Strike that.

Are you aware that Google has offered up a different claim construction now for simple, signal-strength, weighted, average model?
A. Different relative to when?
Q. Different relative to the one expressed in your report.
A. I believe you might have mentioned that earlier today. That would -- that's my only awareness.
Q. So you did not have any discussions with Google regarding the claim term "simple, signal-strength, weighted, average model" and a possible new claim construction for that claim term, correct?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Yeah. So again, I'm going to need to play back the question that I think --

MR. LU: Let me --
THE WITNESS: -- the question that I heard.
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1 BY MR. LU:
Q. Let me ask it differently.
A. All right.
Q. Subsequent to your offering up this declaration, did you have any discussions with Google regarding the meaning of simple, signal-strength, weighted, average model?
A. Well, okay. My declaration was signed on September 14th. So are you asking me whether I had any discussion with Google concerning the construction of that phrase subsequent to then and prior to today?
Q. Subsequent to then, yes.
A. Or -- well, subsequent to then and prior to when Google agreed to some other -- or Google offered up some other construction, assuming that they did? No.
Q. I'm afraid I don't understand your question.
A. Okay. I'm trying to bound -- I'm trying to bound -- create some bookends around the time frame.

Subsequent to the time I signed this report and prior to whenever Google might have modified its construction, if it did, I had no discussion with Google on that particular phrase.
Q. Have you had any discussion with Google subsequent to -- regarding the construction of that
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1 claim phrase subsequent to your assigning the report, question mark?
A. Yeah. The reason -- I'm actually not -- not sure of that. I did meet with Google -- well, with Mr. Bertin yesterday. I don't recall if that phrase was discussed or not, but I don't have an overt recollection of it. But if there was any discussion, it would have been then.
Q. So Dr. Acampora, what is your understanding of the claim construction process?
A. Again, I'm not sure that I understand that question. So once again, I'm going to need to play back the question I think you asked and then answer that.
Q. Let's -- let's answer the questions that I ask, which --
A. I don't understand the question.
Q. Okay. You've been involved in as a -- as a expert witness in -- I think you mentioned at least five Markman hearings, correct? Testified?
A. Well, I don't think the number was that high, but I -- I certainly have testified at some single-digit, fewer than five, Markman hearings, excluding tutorials.
Q. All right. And how many declarations or
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expert reports have you submitted in connection with claim construction in your role as an expert witness?
A. Rough estimate, 20.
Q. So do you have an understanding of the process of construing a claim in a court in a patent case?
A. Well, I don't know. And the reason I don't know is in each and every instance among these approximately 20 , including the current matter, I was provided with a set of instructions that I was asked to follow in performing my opinions. Those instructions I understand.

Whether they conform to some other criteria that you're alluding to, I'm not a lawyer. I don't know. But I do know the instructions that I was provided with, and I'd be happy to tell you what they are. And these are the -- these are the instructions that I followed in forming my opinions.
Q. So you don't have any formal legal training in patent law?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And as you mentioned, you are not a lawyer. You have no JD?
A. That's correct.
Q. So where are the instructions that you
followed for the purposes of the -- of construing the
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claims in this particular case?
A. They begin on page 26 of my declaration.
Q. That's the section that's labeled "claim construction principles"?
A. That's correct.
Q. And where do they end?
A. They appear to end on page 28. But without reviewing the entire document, I don't know if there may be any other claim construction principles appearing elsewhere in my declaration. There are none that I'm aware of right now. I believe they're all contained in these four pages.
Q. Other than the claim construction principles --
A. Three pages.
Q. Sorry.

Other than the claim construction principles that are listed in pages 26,27 , and 28 , and what may appear elsewhere in your declaration, were you provided any other instructions regarding how claim construction is to proceed?
A. Not to apply a -- a term that is sprinkled throughout my report of indefinite -- but I find your question indefinite.

What time frame would you be referring to now?
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Q. In preparing your report, were you provided any principles of claim construction that are not articulated in your report or declaration, including the claim construction principles listed on page 26, 27 , and 28 ?
A. Okay. There may have been some additional discussion with regard to claim construction principles that I was exposed to as I was preparing my declaration. But the principles that I applied are contained on these three pages.
Q. Do you recollect what other principles you may have been exposed to that would not be listed on these three pages or anywhere else in your declaration?
A. Not that I can recall.
Q. As an expert, what do you understand -- strike that.

What do you understand your role as an expert to be in the claim construction process?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I believe that it's my role to offer an opinion as to how one of skill in the art would view the proper construction -- or would view the proper construction of these claims to be -- a person of skill in the art at the time of the inventions. Who would that person be and how would that person
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understand these claims.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Now, you have not applied claim construction principles in construing these claim terms that are not listed either on pages 26,27 , and 28 of your expert report or elsewhere in your declaration; is that correct?
A. I -- I -- I don't know if that's the same question or a different question than one or two that you asked already. It sounded like exactly the same question. So what I'm going to do is take a couple of minutes just to read these three pages and then respond to that question.

By the way, in reading, I immediately see that -- you asked what my understanding is of the role of an expert with regard to claim construction, and I mentioned that -- to the effect that my role is to offer opinions as to how one of skill in the art would understand these claims, what it would mean to a person of skill in the art.

But I need to modify that. I'm looking at paragraph 59 of my report. "Unless the terms have been given a special meaning in the patent or related documents, such as the prosecution history." So there may be some understanding of how -- of what these
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1 phrases would mean to one of skill in the art. But
they may have been given a different interpretation or special meaning in the patent or related documents. So in such case -- in such cases, it would be my role as an expert to identify that as well.

No.
Q. So all of the principles for claim
construction that you have relied upon for preparation of your declaration are recited in those three pages of your expert declaration?
A. The principles that I applied in forming my opinions as to how these phrases should be construed are based on these three pages.
Q. Now --
A. The instructions provided to me in these three pages.
Q. Now, if they were additional legal principles of which you were not aware, could that influence your opinion?
A. I don't know.
Q. So it's possible it could influence your opinion?
A. I -- I -- I don't know. You need -- you need to give me a specific example.
Q. Let's go through these claim construction
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principles, and you can explain your understanding of them to me.

So please explain your understanding of paragraph 59 of the section in claim construction principles.

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: My understanding of paragraph 59 is that one of skill in the art would have an interpretation as to what the words in the claims mean, unless the terms have been given a special meaning in the patent or related documents, such as prosecution history.

So when I read the claims, I'm looking for a deviation from what the words would ordinarily mean to a person of ordinary skill in the art in that era. And I look through the specification -- I look at the claim itself. I look at the specification. I look at the prosecution history and other related documents.

And based upon what I find there, I either conclude, yes, this phrase has a plain and ordinary meaning, or perhaps some clarification is needed in light of the specification or the claim language itself or related documents, or perhaps the inventor has intentionally defined a phrase to mean X or -- and -or any variation along this scale of, yes, everyone
knows this is plain and ordinary. It's not used any differently. And, no, the inventor has specifically defined this in an unconventional fashion. There are shades of gray between those two.

And what I did is attempt to find support in the claim -- the specification and prosecution history -- as to how one of ordinary skill in the art, having read all of this, would construe the phrase. BY MR. LU:
Q. Are there any claim terms for which you believe the patentee or the inventor specifically defined the claim term in an unconventional fashion?
A. Well, there are several cases where I believe the inventors coined phrases or used phrases in an unconventional fashion. And I even have opinions on those expressed in my declaration. There may be other instances where that was done as well, but I don't have an opinion on that.
Q. Which phrases, in your opinion, were phrases in which the inventors coined phrases or used phrases in an unconventional fashion?
A. Reference symmetry, arterial bias, avoids arterial bias, rules and predefined rules, being suited, target area, several related terms, calculated position information, calculated positions of the WIFI
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access points, calculated locations, and recorded location information.
Q. Let's address each of those.
A. I'm -- I'm not finished.

Substantially, all WIFI access points in the target area providing a reference database of calculated locations of WIFI access points --
(Reporter interruption.)
THE WITNESS: Providing a reference database of calculated locations of WIFI access points in a target area. And I'm still not finished. The means-plus-function terms.

By the way, you were asking me earlier how I applied paragraph 59, and I tried to limit my answer to only paragraph 59. But there's a whole different section in my report describing the principles that I applied for means-plus-function limitations that go in the instructions, substantially more detailed than what appear -- appears in paragraph 59. If you'd like me to discuss those as well --
Q. No. We can address those --
A. And -- so then I guess you don't want me to list the means-plus-function limitations that may have a special or unconventional or defined meaning different than what one of skill in the art might
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1 understand, or phrases -- might have been coined
specifically for this patent. So one would have to read the specification to get an understanding of what the inventors intended.
Q. So on -- just to seek clarification on that last answer, are there any means -- are there any claim terms that you contend are means-plus-function in which the function has a coined meaning or a deviation from the plain and ordinary meaning?
A. Yes.
Q. And which ones are those?
A. Well, actually, I think that was a compound question. I think you first asked which -- which limitations that I've offered an opinion on that I believe are means-plus-function limitations, and they're listed in my report. If you'd like, I can identify them for you, but they're all there.
Q. Tell you what. We'll address the means-plus-function elements separately.

So could you tell me whether -- which of the following -- strike that.

Okay. So is it your view that reference symmetry is a coined meaning?
A. I believe that reference symmetry is not a term of art. One would need to under- -- to read the
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specification to understand what the inventors meant. And it's only by reading the specification that one could come up with how -- what the term means, if anything, as it's used in the -- as it's used in claims.
Q. So is it a coined meaning, or is it a meaning that's used in an unaccustomed and unconventional fashion?
A. Well, in this case, it's so vague that I'm not sure either of those categories applies.
Q. Is arterial bias a coined term or a deviation from the ordinary and custom meaning?
A. As it's used in this patent, I believe it's a coined phrase.
Q. Is "avoids arterial bias" a coined phrase or a deviation from the ordinary and custom meaning?
A. That's another phrase that I'm not sure has a construction in the context of this patent and in the context of the claims. I don't -- I don't think that -- I think that's a term that's indefinite.

So it's not that the inventors defined the term and then applied that term in the claim. Here's a case where I don't -- I -- I think that the phrase was used throughout the patent, but one could not glean the proper construction for what it means, avoiding
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arterial bias.
Q. Now, you do offer up an alternative construction of eliminating arterial bias for that claim term, do you not?
A. Well, we need to talk about that too.
Q. Well, my question is: Is "eliminates arterial bias" a claim construction based on a coined meaning or a deviation from the ordinary or custom meaning?
A. Well -- well --

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Well, neither.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Okay. What -- so does -- so you don't offer up a alternative claim construction for avoiding arterial bias?
A. I didn't say that. I said we need to talk about that. That was an earlier question.
Q. Okay. What do we need to talk about? Strike that. We'll move on.

Is "predefined rules," in your view, a coined meaning or a deviation from the ordinary and custom meaning?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I think one of skill in the art would have an a priori understanding of what is meant

Page 139
1 by "predefined rules. "But when I look at the application of -- or the use of that phrase in the claims, I find that that does not conform with any preconceived notion. In fact, I can't figure out what it means.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Does "being suited" have a coined meaning, or is it a deviation from the ordinary or custom meaning?
A. It's basically the same response that I just gave. "Being suited" might have some -- one of skill in the art might have some understanding of what that means. But when you put it into the context of this patent and especially in the context of the claim, that meaning breaks down. I don't think that that phrase has a construction.
Q. Does the phrase "target area" have a coined meaning, or is it a deviation from the ordinary or custom meaning?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Well -- well, they're the same. As a coined meaning which is a deviation from what one might otherwise understand that phrase to mean. The phrase itself might require some context for one to understand what it means.

But as it's used in this patent, it's
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effectively being specifically defined. You'd have to read the patent to get an understanding of what that phrase means. How the inventors apply that phrase and how they use that phrase in the claim is not at all how one would, in a vacuum, understand that phrase. It has a special meaning in this patent.
BY MR. LU:
Q. The same would be true of the location terms "calculated position information," "calculated position to the WIFI access points," "calculated locations," and "recorded location information"?
A. Are you asking my -- would my answer be the same?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
BY MR. LU:
Q. I'm asking you whether those terms are a coined meaning or a deviation from the ordinary or custom meaning.

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: As used in the claims, both. BY MR. LU:
Q. Okay. Are the phrase "substantially all WIFI access points in the target area" a coined meaning or a deviation from the ordinary or custom meaning?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
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THE WITNESS: That's one where one of skill in the art would need to see the context. And in the context of this patent, I believe that's a special meaning.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Is the phrase "providing a reference database of calculated locations of WIFI access points in a target area" a coined meaning or a deviation from an ordinary or custom meaning?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Could you ask that question again?
BY MR. LU:
Q. Is the phrase "providing a reference database of calculated locations of WIFI access points in a target area" a coined meaning or a deviation from the an ordinary or custom meaning?
A. As used in this patent, its both. The inventors defined that phrase.
Q. How does one know in the context of a patent when a inventor has given a special meaning to a claim term?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form. BY MR. LU:
Q. What is your understanding of how one of
ordinary skill in the art would know that a claim term has been given a special meaning in a patent or in a related document, such as a prosecution history?
A. I'm sorry. I was actually focusing on your earlier question. Can you ask that question again?
Q. Yes. One of -- how would one of ordinary skill in the art know that a claim term has been given a special meaning in the patent or in related documents, such as the prosecution history?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: By seeing how the inventor used the phrase.
BY MR. LU:
Q. And --
A. In some cases I've seen patents where the inventor actually included a glossary. That appears not to be the case with regard to these patents, but there's a consistency in how the phrase has been used. And that would teach one of skill in the art what the inventors meant. In some cases it's quite clear. In some cases the -- the -- the phrases defy meaning.
Q. So what sort of indicia does one of ordinary skill in the -- in the art look for in order to determine that a claim term has a defined meaning?
A. I guess I'm not sure what you're asking. One Page 143
example, which I gave, is if the inventor actually includes a glossary. That one's kind of simple.

Another example is where the teachings are so consistent that one of skill in the art reading the specification would be led to the unavoidable conclusion that this phrase, as used in this claim in the context of the specification and possibly what was found in the prosecution history, can only mean this. In some cases, in the prosecution history, the inventors may even -- in order to secure the -- the -the claims to -- to avoid prior art, the inventions may make specific admissions that limit or define what the phrases mean. So that -- in fact, that has happened in this case in -- in -- in -- with regard to these patents. But you're asking for the indicia. There were several.
Q. What are the --
A. And again, one needs to read -- it's not a simple task. And the job of -- of defining what these phrases mean, given the background and the skills of one of ordinary skill in the art, the technical training that person has had, and familiarity with the field, the problems being solved at the time, the literature being published, and how the words have been used to teach the invention in the specification in the
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1 prosecution history, as I just described, and in the 2 claims themself, tell one what the phrase -- or may
tell one what the phrase means -- in some cases the phrases defy construction.
Q. But we're talking about some circumstances where it's a coined phrase or the phrase is used in an deviation from its ordinary and custom meaning.

What are the indicia of a deviation from the plain and ordinary meaning?
A. Are we talking in -- in the abstract now or specifically with regard to specific term in dispute?
Q. Sure. Why don't we address in the abstract first and then the specific terms in dispute.
A. I -- I don't know what else to add to the answers I've already given.
Q. All right. What about for the particular claims in dispute? What is the language that you rely upon for the claim terms that you believe have a coined -- or meaning or a deviation from the ordinary and accustom meaning?

What is the language that you rely upon in order to arrive at that deviation or coined meaning?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form. Asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: What term do you want me to Page 145
discuss? Because the answer would vary by term. BY MR. LU:
Q. Sure. Let's talk about reference symmetry first.

MR. BERTIN: And object to form.
THE WITNESS: Well, we can talk about that first, but you're going to need to ask the question.
Because the question that I heard was, what language did I rely on that told me that the term was used -- is either coined or deviated from the norm. That's a term that I think defies construction, so neither of those conditions applies.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Okay. What about the term "arterial bias"?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
BY MR. LU:
Q. For the term -- I'm just going to rephrase the question to address your lawyer's objections.

For the phrase "arterial bias," what are -what is the language or the evidence that you have to support the notion that that claim term has a coined meaning or is a deviation from the ordinary or accustom meaning?
A. Well, here, the phrase itself is not a term of art. So one would need to consult the patent to find

1 out how it's used.
And "arterial bias" does seem to have an interpretation in the context of the patent. "Avoiding arterial bias," that's a different matter. It doesn't have an interpretation, but "arterial bias" does. And in fact, I explain this here.

In paragraph 78 of my report it reads: "The inventors appear to believe that their proposed database creation technique of deliberately taking measurements along every street reduce the source of WIFI device location error that they refer to as "arterial bias." I do not believe that this term has a recognized technical meaning. Rather, I believe the meaning of 'arterial bias' and 'avoid arterial bias/avoids arterial bias' found in the claims must be obtained from reading the patent and prosecution history."

Now, we're talking about arterial bias. "More review of the specification and prosecution history informs me that one of skill in the art would understand arterial bias. It's the deviation of the calculated position for a WIFI access point toward heavily trafficked roads and away from the actual geographic location of the access point due to the tendency of random scanning to result in a greater
number of scans from heavily trafficked roads."
Now, we had a fairly lengthy discussion on this just topic this morning. I believe it was with regard to figure 3 of -- was it the 245 patent? And we can repeat that discussion, if you'd like, or we can just take that response and include it as part of my answer to the question you're currently asking --
Q. Okay.
A. -- asking.

MR. LU: Why don't we move on.
We have five minutes remaining on the video, so why don't we take a short break to change the CD.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This marks the end of Media No. 2 in the deposition.

We are going off the record, and the time is 2:15 p.m.
(A brief recess was taken.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Here begins Media No. 3 in the deposition of Dr. Anthony Acampora.

We're back on the record. The time is 2:24 p.m. BY MR. LU:
Q. Dr. Acampora, I'd like to direct your attention to paragraph 60 and 61 of your expert declaration. It's on page 26.

Now, in paragraph 60 you provided your opinion regarding what one of ordinary skill in the art would be, and that's a bachelors degree in electrical engineering or computer science and three to five years of experience working in wireless communication hardware and software design.

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And in -- on page 61 -- I'm sorry -- paragraph 61, you state that you considered a number of factors in coming to this conclusion.

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. Turning to the first factor, the field of the purported invention of the patents in suit.
What was it about the field of the invention -- field of the purported invention of the patents suit that led you to come to the conclusion regarding the level of ordinary skill in the art?
A. Well, "The patents themself describe the field of the invention as generally related to location-based services, and, more specifically, to methods and systems of determining locations of WIFI access points, and use this information to locate a WIFI-enabled device."
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The background section goes on. "Discussion of related art."
"In recent years a number of mobile computing devices has increased dramatically." And it gives examples of the need that's been created for different types of mobile and wireless service -- just going on paragraph 45 -- line 45 -- line -- column 1 ,
"location-based services under merging area of mobile applications." Reading further. "Using radio signals coming from known reference points, these devices can mathematically calculate the user's position relative to these reference points."

GPS is mentioned. Cell tower triangulation is mentioned. Combination of GPS and cell tower techniques is mentioned.

WIFI location systems deployed by Microsoft and Intel --
(Reporter interruption.)
THE WITNESS: Microsoft and Intel are mentioned. 802.11 is mentioned. WIFI radio is mentioned. WIFI access points are mentioned. So WIFI cellular wireless communications are all over this patent.

And accordingly, I believe that my construction -- my opinion as to who one of ordinary
skill in the art would be is correct. To read and understand this patent -- because of it's total domination by wireless communications -- one would need an electrical engineering or computer science degree at the bachelors level and three to five years of experience working in wireless communications, hardware and software design.
Q. Another factor you indicate you consider is
"the skill required for implementing wireless
communications, hardware and software."
What do you mean by that?
A. Well, just what it says. In order to design wireless communications hardware and software, what skill set would be needed? Now, I've educated many, many, many engineers since I became an academic 23 years ago. I work with people from industry who implement wireless communications, and I have, for the past 23 years while I've been an academia -- I was actually part of a commercial R and D operation responsible for, among other tasks, implementing wireless communications, hardware and software.

So I believe that I have an awareness of what the skill set is of somebody working in implementing wireless communications, hardware and software. I consider that in defining who one of ordinary skill in Page 151
the art would be. And that's consistent with the construction -- with the opinion that I've offered. Three to five years of experience in wireless communications, hardware and software design, and a bachelors degree in electrical engineering/computer science.

I believe somebody with that background would be -- would have the skills required for implementing wireless communications, hardware and software.
Q. Turning to paragraph 65 of your declaration on page 27, the first sentence says: "Essentially, a structural limitation says what something is, while a functional limitation says what it does."

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. What is your understanding of the meaning of that sentence -- strike that.

What did you mean by that sentence? Well, let me actually ask you a different question.

This was a sentence that was written by you when provided by the lawyers, right?
A. Well, probably. Or it may have been something that was -- well, the answer to your question is yes. Whether it was -- whether it was in the form it was initially provided to me or whether it was response to
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1 some questions I had about the language in that -- in

2
what was initially provided to me, that, I can't say with certainty. But I certainly understand what this means. So this -- it was presented to me in a way that I understand.
Q. So what is your understanding of the phrase:
"Essentially a structural limitation says what
something is, while functional limitation says what it does"?
A. Well, a structural limitation would be a noun, and a functional limitation would be a verb.
Q. The next sentence says: "I understand that one determines whether a claim term is a means-plus-function form by considering whether the claims disclose a structure or whether the limitation speaks in purely functional terms."

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. What is your understanding of that sentence?
A. Well, I understand the sentence. I'm not sure that I can clarify much beyond what it says here, but I can give examples.

A thing that performs this function, I believe, would be -- if -- if a limitation would be written in that phrase, that would be
means-plus-function form, if it says "means for performing this function." Well, to me, that's --means-plus-function form because, did the claims disclose -- disclose a structure, or did the limitation speak purely in terms of what this thing does? So do I understand the thing by itself, or do I understand the thing only through what it does?

That's what I mean. And I probably just stated it in -- less articulately than it appears in my report, but I don't know how better to express it.
Q. So let's give an example. A processor for computing pi. Would that be means-plus-function form, or would that be a structure?
A. Well, that's not something that I have an opinion on. So you're asking me to do it on the fly -to create an on-the-fly opinion?
Q. Well, you -- you -- you -- you indicated that -- that your understanding of this phrase is that someone can determine whether something's means-plus-function form by considering whether the claims disclose a structure or whether the limitation speaks in purely functional terms.

And I'm giving you a phrase, "processor for computing pi."
A. Can I see the rest of the claim that this is
drawn from? I mean, you're asking me to do an analysis, so I need -- I need something more.
Q. Is a processor something that discloses a structure, or is it in purely functional terms?
A. What else does this claim say? Does the claim say anything more about the processor or anything less about the processor? Are you asking me -- if we're playing sort of a what-if game -- so suppose the claim -- the entire claim read: "A processor for computing pi."
Q. Sure.
A. Can we simplify the question to that? So the entire claim?
Q. Sure.
A. And in fact, there's not even any specification. There's just -- the patent consists of one claim which reads "a processor for computing pi."
Q. Sure.
A. I would think that is a means-plus-function term.
Q. Okay. What about the phrase "computer code for computing pi"? Would that be a means-plus-function term?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form. Improper hypothetical.
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THE WITNESS: Well, I'd have a different problem with that. So again, let's be sure we understand what you're asking because I can't do an on-the-fly analysis without more context. So let's delete any -- remove any possibility of -- of context. This is a one-claim patent with no specification. The claim reads "computer code for computing pi."

I would have several problems with that construction. I'm not even sure that I'd say that's means-plus-function. It might be. But computer code doesn't do anything. I mean, a computer code -- I -I -- I would have real difficulties understanding that claim. Would -- this computer code might be written on this piece of paper, and that piece of paper is not going to compute pi. Something executing the steps of this code, whatever that something might be, might produce pi as a result, but the piece of paper with the code written on it is a piece of paper with a code written on it.

## BY MR. LU:

Q. What about digital circuitry for computing pi? Would that be a means-plus-function claims element?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form. Improper hypothetical.

THE WITNESS: So once again, I'm going to
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create my own context for answering that question.
It's a single-claim patent, no specification, and the single claim reads -- was it digital circuitry for
computing pi?
BY MR. LU:
Q. Correct.
A. In my opinion, that would be means-plus-function form.
Q. So the next sentence in paragraph 65 states: "A term that uses words like 'means for' is presumed to be a means-plus-function form. While a term that does not use similar means phrasing is presumed not to be a means-plus-function form.

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And what is your understanding of that?
A. Once again, I'm not sure that I could clarify the words that are written here.
Q. Next sentence says: "Those are only presumptions however and the true test --"
A. I wasn't finished answering, but if you want to move on, that's fine.
Q. Oh, I'm sorry. Please answer.

When you said you weren't sure you could clarify any further, I assumed that that was the
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answer.
A. Okay. So if the -- if the words "means for" and what follows that consists of some action that this "means for" does, then it's my understanding that would be presumed to be means-plus-function. Doesn't mean that it is means-plus-function. It may not be means-plus-function.

And a similar term that does not use means phrasing is presumed not to be means-plus-function. Again, doesn't mean that it's not a means-plus-function limitation. It might very well be. But it's presumed not to be. You'd have to show and explain the support for concluding otherwise.

In fact, you called my attention to that one sentence. The rest of this paragraph clarifies that sentence, as I just described.
Q. That is the following sentence "I'm advised" --
A. No. "These are only presumptions, however, and the true test is whether the claim recites sufficient structure. "
Q. What is your understanding of that sentence?
A. If I read the function, would I have an understanding of what the thing is that performs that function? Or would -- would I not have a clear
understanding of what that thing is? Would I, in fact, maybe not even know what that thing is and I'd have to look elsewhere in the claim itself or in the specification to find out what that thing is.
Q. Okay. Next sentence of paragraph 65 says: "I'm advised that as an aid in determining whether sufficient structure is recited in the claim, the federal circuit has considered, quote, "whether the term as the name for a structure has a reasonable well-understood meaning in the art."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. What is your understanding of the meaning of that sentence?
A. If one sees this named structure or the term that's -- let me state this correctly.

The term that's being used as a name for structure, would I know what that thing is? Would one of skill in the art have the -- have an understanding of what that thing is? Or would one need to look elsewhere to find out just what it is is being claimed? Would I understand the boundaries of this claim? How would I know if I infringed it? Is the term so reasonably well-understood as to limit what the invention is or not? Do I need further information so
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I know what the boundaries are of -- of this claim?
Otherwise, how would I know if I've infringed it?
Q. Let's go to the next section,
"Indefiniteness." Turn to paragraph 69. It reads:
"In the case of means-plus-function limitations, it is my understanding that if a corresponding structure for performing the function is not set out in the specification, then the claim is indefinite."

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. What is your understanding of that sentence?
A. Once again, I'm not sure how I can make it any clearer than -- than it is. But if we have a means-plus-function limitation, then it's my understanding that the limitation is met only by the structure disclosed in the specification that is capable of, linked to, and actually does perform that function. And as I -- and here again, I'm going on memory, which may be less than perfect -- or its equivalence. Otherwise, the claim is indefinite.
Q. Going back to paragraph 67. "I also have been informed on legal principles concerning patent validity, including the definiteness requirement, and have used those principles in forming my opinions."

Do you see that?
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A. I do.
Q. What do you mean by that sentence?
A. Just what it says. I was provided with principles that I was asked to apply concerning patent validity, including the definiteness requirement. And I've applied those principles in forming my opinion.

So again, I'm not sure how to make it clearer than -- than it is. I was given instructions regarding definiteness and indefiniteness. In fact, those instructions are -- are summarized in paragraph 68 and 69.
Q. Are there any instructions that you were given regarding indefiniteness that are not listed in paragraph 68 and 69?
A. Not that I can think of.
Q. Let's turn to page 29 of your expert report.

And let's turn to page -- paragraph 73. First sentence reads: "The patents describe reference symmetry in a context where there is significant error in a location calculation caused by either two few reference points or by reference points that lack symmetry -- balance or symmetry around the user."

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. What did what did you mean when you wrote that
sentence?
MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Well, the short answer is, I meant what I wrote. If you want me to elaborate on that, then I refer back to the patent itself. If I can direct your direction to the citations in the patent that are included in paragraph 63, one of which is a section from the specification titled "reference symmetry."
BY MR. LU:
Q. So you took your understanding of what reference symmetry means, at least in part, from the section of Exhibit C, the patent -- I believe that is the 694 patent.
A. 998 patent.
Q. Or the 998 patent. Excuse me.

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
MR. LU: Strike that.
BY MR. LU:
Q. So at least -- so your understanding of reference symmetry or the description of -- strike that.

So your description of your sentence -- the first sentence -- first sentence of paragraph 73 is based, at least in part, upon the portion of the 988

1 patent titled "reference symmetry;" is that correct?
A. Well, let's first back up to paragraph 72.
"Reference symmetry is not a term that has an established meaning in the art."

I'm not aware of any special meaning to reference symmetry in the art. This is one of the terms where one would need to read the patent, the specification of claims, and the prosecution history to understand what the inventors' mean by "reference symmetry." So accordingly, one of the places that I looked was the section in the patent titled "reference symmetry." Not the only place, but one place.
Q. Okay. Where else did you look?
A. Column 1, lines 53 to 57. Column 2, lines 53 to 57. Let me check those because I just want to make sure that's not a typo.

Yeah. The first one of those sites perhaps shouldn't be there, one -- Column 1, lines 53 to 57. The second one, Column 2, lines 53 to 57 is the description of -- of the, quote, "the classic example," end quote.
Q. Okay.
A. Figure 5, which is titled "lack of reference symmetry," and as I -- as I mentioned, that figure shows access points on only one side of the user.
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1 Figure 6, which shows access points distributed around the user.
Q. So let's --
A. Column 9, lines 55 through Column 10, line 4, which describes the Chinese postman routing, resulting in a situation in which there were numerous access points on all sides of the user.

That's -- that probably -- that list probably includes most of the material that I relied on from the patent in reaching my opinions regarding reference symmetry. But of course, I read that in the context of the entire patent and its prosecution history.
Q. Okay. So let's turn to figure 5. What is shown in figure 5?

MR. BERTIN: Are we still on the 988 ?
MR. LU: We are still on the 988.
THE WITNESS: What's shown in figure 5 is a situation that the inventors characterize as lacking reference symmetry. The title of the figure is "lack of reference symmetry." And what's shown here are a bunch of access points. These access points are predominantly on one side of the user. The user's location is marked by an X. The calculated locations of the access points -- not the actual locations -- but the calculated locations are all predominantly on one
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side. And this is a situation that the inventors characterize as lack -- as being in lack of reference symmetry.
BY MR. LU:
Q. And what is shown in figure 6? Just back up -- back up a little bit on -- back to figure 5 .

So we have calcu- -- calculated location of user, marked with a little X. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And we have user 501, which is a solid black dot. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And you see radio range of user devise being surrounded by a circle? Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Okay.
A. By the way, thanks for calling my attention to that. The X in figure 5 is the location -- the calculated location of the user. The actual location is the -- the black circle. And all of the calculated locations of access points are on one side of that user. They're all to the left of that user. Some of them are beneath the user, some of them are above the user, but they're all to the left. And this again, is a -- this is a situation that the inventors
characterize as a "lack of reference symmetry."
Q. Okay. Let's turn to figure 6. Is this --
A. And if -- if -- if -- if I can go on. And the section of the patent titled "reference symmetry" tells us what the inventors mean by "reference symmetry" -or what they're trying to express by the term "reference symmetry," at least in the specification.

When I looked at that and tried to relate that description to the claim language, I found that there wasn't -- it wasn't a relationship. They didn't map over. And I don't know where else to look for reference symmetry. I scoured the patent and its prosecution history, and as the phrase is used in the claims, it -- it -- it -- it -- there simply isn't a description.
Q. Let's turn to figure 6, what the inventors have characterized as "positioning with reference symmetry." Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Can you describe what's depicted in figure 6, "positioning with reference symmetry"?
A. Well, yeah, I can. If you look at column 9, beginning at line $64-$ - and this is part of the description of figure 6 . In fact, it may be the totality of description of figure 6.
"With Chinese postman model of scanning for access points, the user typically encounters a physical location" -- figure 6 , and -- "in which there are numerous access point locations on all sides of the users." So the user is 601, and there are numerous access stations, 602, that we see marked on figure 6 that are, as the specification describes it, on all sides of the user within range of the -- of the devices 802 radio. The resulting in position calculation has reduced location bias and is more accurate as a result.

So that's what figure 6 is -- is showing. But there's a real problem in -- in this regard. This perhaps is what the inventors would like their invention to produce. They have no way of knowing if this is going to be produced or not because they have no way of knowing in advance where the access points are and whether it's possible to achieve this reference symmetry that's represented in figure 6 and discussed in the accompanying text. The access point locations may not be conducive to production of reference symmetry. It may really all be on one side of the user.

So this reference -- that we had some discussion earlier about whether things were achievable or not, and here's an example of something that may not

Page 167
be achievable. It's something beyond control of whoever is taking measurements of -- of access points in an attempt to determine where the access points are located. The access points may not be symmetrically located around the user. It may not be possible to get to this situations that the inventors are -- are -- are striving for. Just may not be possible. It's beyond -- it's beyond the control of the -- whoever's taking the measurements.
Q. And what --
A. I think I -- I think I even discuss in my expert declaration that what's not disclosed at all in the patent is intentionally seeding the target area with access points in an attempt to ensure access symmetry. Otherwise, I just don't see how the teachings of the patent can produce reference symmetry as it's represented in figure 6 and described in the specification.

And again, the claims -- the use of the phrase in the claim don't even relate to this. They relate to something else that's not discussed at all in the specification.
Q. Just on that point, if a target is -- if a targeted area is intentionally and densely seeded with access points, a person having ordinary skill in the
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1 art would be more likely to be able to determine
reference symmetry, correct?
A. What do you mean by "determine reference symmetry"?
Q. Well, you're talking --
A. Reference symmetry of what? Are we talking now about the claim language or the specification?
Q. We're talking about the -- we're talking about the specification.
A. Just the specification. Because again, as I testified earlier, the use of the phrase in the claim is different than what's described in the specification.

In neither case would one know, a priori, what this means without reading. In the case of the specification, one can sort of glean what the inventors meant. But in my opinion, it's not possible to ensure that you've gotten to that there, no matter what measurement technique you use. And it's with regard to the claims. It -- it -- it -- it -- it just -- it -it -- it -- it -- there's no suggestion as to what the phrase means as it's used in the claim because it's used -- there's a different reference in mind. I know what the reference point is that they have in mind in the specification. I don't even know what the
reference point is in the -- in the claim.
And if you'd like, I can explain that.
Q. Well, let's get an answer to my question that I originally presented which is: If you have an area that is intentionally and densely seeded with access points, known access points, a person having ordinary skill in the art would be likely to be able to determine reference symmetry in accordance with what's described in the patent specification, correct?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I'm -- I'm -- I'm -- I'm not
sure that's even a properly posed question.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Well, okay.
A. What I would know is that unless the access points coincidentally were cited in such a way as to provide this -- and now I'm going to read from the specification -- "to provide a sufficient number of reference point with balance or symmetry around the user," then you could not have reference symmetry. And that would suggest that you've got to intentionally deploy the access points in such a way that you have got a sufficient number and balance or symmetry around the user no matter where the user might be. This -this would be rather difficult to accomplish.

And -- and that's as the phrased is used in the specification. How it's used in the claim, it's -it's just not described. One would not know how it's -- what the phrase means as it's used in the claim.
Q. Okay. So ultimately, the conclusion of your paragraph 74 is that even practicing the technique disclosed in the patent, illustrated in figures 5 and 6 , one would have no idea of whether or note there is indeed a condition of reference symmetry because the location of the WIFI access points is simply not known? MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: That's not what paragraph 74 says.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Okay. So what about my statement was incorrect?
A. Well, you -- you -- you -- you tried to characterize what you said was a conclusion I've drawn in paragraph 74, and I don't think I've drawn that conclusion.
Q. What is the conclusion that you draw from paragraph -- in paragraph 74 ?
A. Well, the last line reads -- if that's a conclusion -- there is a fundament -- thus -- and I
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gave the reasons why earlier in the paragraph -- "there is a fundamental lack of any objective standard for determining whether distribution of WIFI access points might have reference symmetry with regard to a user."

And again, this does not relate to how the phrase appears in the claim. There was a claim -- the phrase is used differently in the claim. It's not with regard to a user. The description in the specification is with regard to a user.
Q. Okay. So turning back to figures 5 and 6 --
A. There was something else in your question that -- that -- that -- that troubled me a little bit.

You asked about figure 5 and the conclusion that I've drawn concerning --
Q. And 6?
A. Yeah. Figures 5 and 6.

Figure 5 has nothing to do with reference symmetry. In fact, the -- except as an example of the situation that lacks reference symmetry.
Q. Okay.
A. Now that -- that sort of gets to the heart of what I've been trying to explain. Figure 5 may be the reality. It may not be as a result of any particular measurement technique or any particular location technique. It may, in fact, be the case that there are
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access points located only on one side of the user, so there's nothing you can do to fix that. If reference symmetry means you have sufficient density of access points and they're uniformly spread around the user -here's an example of where that situation could not -is -- is simply unachievable. You can't -- you can't get to that point without intentionally laying down a whole bunch of additional access stations above the eight that are shown here, if these are, in fact, the locations of those eight access points. You're stuck.
Q. What's a sufficient number of WIFI access points, in your opinion?
A. You got me. Those are the inventors' words, not mine.
Q. Turning to figures 3 and 4 --
A. Okay.
Q. -- we have in this image known locations of WIFI access points, which are in black circles. We have calculated locations of access points, which are in white diamonds.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And this is a example of a scanning scenario showing arterial bias.
A. Yeah. The so-called random model, where the Page 173
collection of data was coincidentally some other reason for traversing the route.
Q. Okay. And I'd like you to put an X, if you won't mind, in the middle -- in the upper right-hand corner of the middle box.
A. You want me to mark it right on the --
Q. Yes, please?
A. -- on Exhibit 1 itself?
Q. On Exhibit 1 itself.
A. So you want me to put an X in the middle of --
Q. The upper right-hand corner of the middle box.
A. You mean just put an X here?
Q. Just put an X there.
A. Like that?
Q. Yeah. And why don't you put an X on figure 4 as well.
A. Same spot?
Q. Same spot.
A. Done.
Q. Okay. Let me just grab my pen back.

And I'll tell you what. We're also going to draw a circle right -- right here.
A. You mean you want -- well, where you point, you want that to be the center of the circle.
Q. Yeah. Put that as the center of the circle.
A. Okay. And how large a radius do you want me to draw?
Q. Just around the size of the other circles.

MR. BERTIN: So this is a circle that --
MR. LU: And let's label that --
MR. BERTIN: -- Dr. Acampora is being asked to draw in the lower left-hand corner of the center box on figure 4 of the 988 patent, just so the record is clear.

MR. LU: Let's label that circle "user."
Let's draw a similar circle in the exact same location with the exact same label on figure 3.

You can keep that. All right.
BY MR. LU:
Q. So getting back to figure 3. What we have here are calculated locations of WIFI access points that are in white diamonds and the location of the actual access points in black circles and then a blue circle, which is now labeled "user."

And we have in figure 4 the exact same thing, except that rather than simply driving artery 304 and artery 305, a Chinese postman routing methodology has been driven.

MR. BERTIN: And to be clear, the circles have been added to the -- to these figures. They don't
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exist in the patent by themselves.
MR. LU: Correct.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Now, Dr. Acampora, per the teachings of the patents, is there a greater degree of reference
symmetry around the user in figure 4 than there is in figure 3?
A. Well, before I even attempt to answer that, I've got to ask a question.

Are you referring to the claims, or are you referring to the specification?
Q. My patent -- my question made it clear, per the teachings of the patent specifications.
A. So the specifications. So we're not -- we're not considering the claim. Again, the claim appears to use reference symmetry in some other way that's not defined at all. You can't glean what it is from claim or anything in the specification. It's indefinite.

So we're looking now only at the specification, as if I could rip the claims off and focus only on the specification.

Is that what you're asking me to do?
Q. Yes. That's what I'm asking you to do?
A. Okay. And the question once again is?
Q. Is there a greater degree of reference

1 symmetry for the calculated location of WIFI access
2 points in figure 4 around "user" than there is in figure 3?
A. Well, I -- I have to ask another question before I can begin to answer that. What are the Xs that you asked me to draw represent?
Q. You can ignore the Xs.
A. Ignore the Xs.

Okay. I think I understand your question.
And the answer is going to require a certain amount of explanation. So let me try to be as brief as I can and as clear as I can.

On the one hand, both figures 3 and 4 have the same degree of reference symmetry with regard to the user, which is the only context in which reference symmetry is discussed in the specification because location of the access points and location of the user have not changed one bit. So let me give an example of what I mean.

Let's suppose that the actual locations of the access points are the -- the computed locations -- the calculated locations are the actual locations. So I'm going to divorce this notion of reference symmetry from the scanning method for the moment.

Suppose I know exactly where the access points Page 177

But the perceived degree of reference symmetry might be affected favorably by using what I believe the authors feel is their invention, deliberately driving every street in the target area in according with the Chinese postman routing algorithm.

And again, that's reference symmetry with regard to the user, which has nothing to do with how reference symmetry is used in the claims. It's used in a different way. It's not discussed relative to the user at all. In fact, one would not know how it's used in claims.
Q. Turning to paragraph 75 of your declaration, the statements that you make in that paragraph are directed towards the statement that you just made which is, "as used in the claims, one -- it's not discussed relative to the user, and one would not know how it's used in the claims." "It" being reference
symmetry -- strike that.
Why don't you explain what paragraph 75 says.
MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Okay. So as I testified several times already, the only discussion of reference symmetry that would suggest what it means, how the inventors use the phrase, is in -- there's a section on reference symmetry in the specification. And that
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reference symmetry is discussed with regard to a user. There's a known reference point. The point -- the -the location of the user. And reference symmetry is described with regard to some dense and uniform distribution of access points relative to that point.

Now, when we look at the claim, we see no language of that type whatsoever. In fact, what we do see is -- so I'm reading from claim 1 now.

MR. BERTIN: That's of the 988 patent; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: 988 patent, claim 1, correct. Column 14, line 22, beginning with the "wherein."
"Wherein said calculated position information is obtained from recording multiple readings of the WIFI access points at different locations around the WIFI access points so that the multiple readings have reference symmetry relative to other WIFI access points in the target area."

I have no idea what that means. We no longer have a point of reference. We have multiple readings. Somehow these multiple readings have reference symmetry relative to other WIFI access points. In the specification, reference symmetry is defined, A, relative to a user -- the location of the user -- and is described in such a way as to suggest that the
access points are uniformly distributed and densely distributed around that user.

Here, somehow, that concept of reference symmetry is -- appears -- well, the words "reference symmetry," not the concept -- but the words "reference symmetry" appear -- regard to other WIFI access points and multiple readings from different locations around a WIFI access point. What -- what reference point must the access points be distributed uniformly and densely relative to, as was taught in the specification for the known reference point of the user? I don't know where the reference point is here. I -- I -- I -- I don't know what they're talking about here.

MR. LU: Okay. Why don't we take a quick break.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the record. The time is 3:21 p.m.
(A brief recess was taken.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going back on the record. The time is 3:30 p.m.

MR. LU: So when we were off the record, we reviewed some testimony that Dr. Acampora had provided regarding figures 3 and figure 4 and, specifically, the distribution of the calculated locations of the access points in figure 3 compared to figure 4.
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The question was: "Was the distribution in figure 4 -- did that have better reference symmetry than the distribution in figure 3?" And the answer may not have reflected -- at least as transcribed -- may not have reflected Dr. Acampora's answer.
BY MR. LU:
Q. So would you like to comment on that particular answer?
A. Yes. Figure 4 in the context of the question and the context of the reply that was given appears to have better reference symmetry than figure 3 . Whereas, as you read it to me off the record, the roles of figure 3 and 4 were reversed.
Q. Thank you.

MR. BERTIN: Just to be clear, the rest of your answer is accurate other than the transposition of figures 3 and 4.

THE WITNESS: That is correct.
MR. BERTIN: Okay.
BY MR. LU:
Q. So let's turn to page 31 of your expert declaration. And I direct your attention to paragraph 79 which states: "Based on my review of the specifications and prosecution history, it is my opinion that the term 'arterial bias,' standing alone,

1 can be understood to mean the deviation from the towards heavily trafficked roads and away from the actual geographic location of the access point due to the tendency of random scanning to result in a greater number of scans from heavily trafficked roads."

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. What is the basis for your statement that this is, quote, "due to the tendency of random scanning as a result in a greater number of scans from heavily trafficked roads"?
A. Okay. So this may be somewhat repetitive to a discussion we had earlier today with regard to figure 3 in the 988 patent -- or it might have been from the 245 patent. But it's the same figure in either case and the accompanying text from the specification. So let me just locate that, and we'll review this.

Okay. So figure 3, example scanning scenario showing arterial bias.

By the way, I'm using figure 3 from the 988 patent, but I'm going to assume that the blue markings that you asked me to include are not present, so I'm using the pristine figure 3 not the marked-up figure 3 .
Q. That's fine.
A. And what we have in figure 3, the black dots represent the actual locations of access points. The white diamonds represent the calculated position of the access points. And the accompanying description, which appears in column 7 and 8 of the patent, tells us that -- and I'm reading now from column 7 , line 52.
"The quality of the data collected is greatly affected by the scanning methodology employed by the scanning vehicles. Each model has its own benefits and limitations. One approach, known as the random model, places scanning devices in vehicles as they are conducting daily activities for business or personal uses" -- business or personal "use," singular.
"These vehicles could be delivery trucks, taxi cabs, traveling salesmen or just hobbyists. The concept is that over time, these vehicles will cover enough streets in their own random fashion in order to build a reliable reference database. The model does, in fact, provide a simple means to collect data, but the quality of resulting data is negatively affected due to issues of arterial bias.
"Figure 3 describes the challenge of the random model. When the scanning vehicle traverses routes designed to solve other problems than gathering data."
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So let me just interrupt here. Gathering data is not the primary objective in this random model. There's some other primary objective. And then coincidentally, because you happen to be traveling around, gather some data.
"So when the scanning vehicles traverse routes designed to solve other problems than gathering of the data, e.g., delivering packages, people commuting to and from work, they tend to follow destination routes. A destination route is when a driver needs to get from A to B and seeks the faster route to get there. So the driver looks for the shortest route to the nearest main artery, whether it be a highway or a main thoroughfare. As a result, over time, the random driving covers more and more ground by the cumulative coverage -- shows a bias to the main roads or arteries at the expense of the smaller and surrounding roads. Figure 3 -- in figure 3, arteries 304 and 305 are heavily traversed by the scanning vehicles resulting in a healthy amount of scanning data for those streets. But streets 306 and 307 are rarely, if ever covered, because there is no frequent destination on those streets, and the arteries are more optimal travel roads.
"The result is that access points 308 and 309 are not scanned at all by the scanning vehicles, so the
positioning system will struggle to identify a user who's traveling on streets 306 and 307. The result is that when the system attempts to calculate the location of the access points from the scanned data, it is limited to a bias collection of input data."

And we see that in figure 3.
Q. Okay.
A. The calculated positions are along the arteries 304 and 305. That's arterial bias that results from random scattering where the data-gathering is secondary to some other purpose for driving the routes, like delivery, and they -- they give a number of examples. But the data-gathering is secondary. This is random. You sort of take what you get, and arterial bias results.
Q. So --
A. And the construction they give was my attempt at succinctly capturing the vivid description from the is the scheme that the inventers walked away from during the prosecution history to gain allowance of their claims.
Q. So the phrase --
A. Excuse me.
Q. So the phrase "due to the tendency of random

1 scanning to result in a greater number of scans from heavily trafficked roads" is described in the patent specification as the cause of arterial bias, correct?
A. Can you repeat that, please?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form. BY MR. LU:
Q. So the phrase, "due --
A. Are you reading from my -- from the patent now or -- it will be easier if I could follow you.
Q. So your patent claim has the phase, "due to the tendency of random scanning to result in a greater number of scans from heavily trafficked roads as part of the construction for arterial bias," correct?
A. So you're reading now from my declaration?
Q. I'm reading from your claim construction in your declaration.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. And what you've read to me from the patent specification suggests that the phrase "due to the tendency of random scanning to result in a greater number of scans from heavily traveled roads" is a cause of arterial bias, correct?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I'm not sure I understand the question, so one more time, please.
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## BY MR. LU:

Q. Well, you -- you spent about five minutes discussing -- reading, quoting from the patent what the cause of arterial bias is, correct?
A. Well, I think it's more than the cause. I think that's definitional. Remember, arterial bias is not a phrase that would be -- that would have a well-known meaning to one of skill in the art. You got to read the patent to see how they characterize it to gain an understanding of what they meant, and I think they actually did describe that pretty well. They -they -- they tell us what arterial bias is and how it is caused.
Q. Are there other ways in which the calculated position information for a WIFI access point would be bias towards a main artery and away from the actual geographic location of the WIFI access point?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I -- I suppose it can concoct some, but they're certainly not described in the patent. And to a certain extent, we discussed this earlier when you were asking me about the language in my report to the effect of possibly unachievable, I think the language was. Let me find it exactly.

BY MR. LU:
Q. So because the patent doesn't describe any other way in which --

MR. BERTIN: Were you done with your answer there?

THE WITNESS: I was not.
MR. LU: Okay.
MR. BERTIN: Do you mind just letting him finish?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. The language that I was referring to that we discussed earlier appears in paragraph 21 of my report. "Their, quote, 'discovery,' unquote, if any, appears to be a deliberate and possibly unachievable effort to improve the accuracy."

So they're setting up this arterial bias.
They're telling us how it's created. And even the name itself, "arterial bias," it's bias caused by the fact that the measurements are being taken along arteries. That's what they intended when they used the phrase "arterial bias."

So the construction -- and I won't reread it -- but it's exactly what I opine on in paragraph 79. And that's just -- that's nothing more than a summary of exactly what the inventors taught us they meant by arterial bias in the specification.
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Now, is there another way that you could get arterial bias? So suppose you drive the -- and this is why the objectives of the invention might not be achievable.

Suppose you drive some different route. Let's call it a quasi- -- quasi-deliberate route so we're not pinning it down to any specific routing algorithm. So maybe you're driving on streets other than main arteries. But as I testified earlier, there are propagation effects of shadow-fading caused by line of sight blockage by buildings, multipath propagation, that can still cause the resulting access point location calculations to be significantly in error.

Whether the errors would coincidentally cause them to be bias towards arteries, that, I don't know. But -- so, yeah, maybe you -- I -- I guess I'm convincing myself even further that arterial bias can only be caused by driving in this random way where there would be a tendency to scan heavily trafficked roads.

Coincidentally, and probably highly unlikely, one might get arterial bias because of some unpredictable propagation patterns. But that just further shows that the objectives of the patent cannot be guaranteed. But in any event, there's no doubt what
the inventors mean by arterial bias. It's the only description they give, and I had to struggle to create a situation. And even as I was struggling to invent a situation on the fly, I realize that that may not result in arterial bias. It's more likely to result in significant errors, but not necessarily arterial bias -- arterial bias? The word itself "arterial," it's bias caused by the fact you're traveling the arteries. This is quite clear.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Now, what if I were to provide instructions to my drivers to drive a programmatic route but only to take roads that had at least four lanes. Would that create arterial bias?
A. Well, how many lanes are there on the average roads? If -- if four -- if four lanes would be regarded as a very wide road and other streets have one lane, then that might be arterial bias. On the other hand, if most roads have four lanes and a few roads have eight lanes, then what you just described would not produce what the authors intended by the use of the phrase "arterial bias."

Arterial bias means you're scanning the heavily trafficked roads, the main arteries, the big streets. That's completely consistent with common
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sense and understanding, what we mean by an artery in the vehicular traffic sense and what's disclosed in the specification.
Q. But one can create arterial bias by scanning that is other than random; in my example, instructions to only drive streets that are at least a certain number of lanes wide, correct?
A. Not as it's used in this patent, no, not correct. The patent does not suggest that there -they're setting up a problem. They're telling you how that problem would commonly be -- would commonly occur. A bunch of vehicles are sent out on a mission -- on missions. Those missions are to get from point A to point B . And as the patent describes, you're more likely to navigate onto an artery, travel that artery, and that's what's going to cause the arterial bias. The patent does not suggest deliberately creating what you're characterizing as arterial bias by instructing the fleet to drive only on the main roads.

Now, if you instructed -- I think common sense consistent with what's in the patent, why this arterial bias exists, would be consistent with telling the fleet to drive the main arteries because you want them to get to their destination quickly. It's not an attempt to create arterial bias as much as an attempt to get to
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the destination.
And as a result of your instruction to drive the main arteries, you're going to produce arterial bias because you're going to produce a greater number of scans on the heavily trafficked roads.
Q. Now, turning back to figures 3 and 4 -- and we're going to reference a clean copy of figures 3 and 4 without the markings.
A. Okay. I'm -- I'm sort of waiting to hear your question because I might need to ask for a clean copy if I have to ponder the figure in order to respond.
Q. Okay. So figure 3 is indicated by the patent as showing arterial bias. And figure 4 is described in the patent as not -- as being the Chinese postman routing; is that correct?
A. Well, figure 3 is titled "Example of Scanning Scenarios Showing Arterial Bias," and there's a whole description of that figure that I just read into the record from the patent.
Q. Okay.
A. So I'll avoid repeating that, but that's what figure 3 shows.
Q. All right.
A. Figure 4 is titled "Chinese Postman Routing," but that's not the whole story.
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Q. Now, would you --
A. I'm not finished. Please.

Another approach -- this is column 8 from the 988 patent. Another approach is -- and remember, in the prosecution history, the inventors taught away from the random -- the random model. So the other approach is develop 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 more reliable positioning system to the end users.

Figure 4 describes an optimized routing algorithm, known as the Chinese postman, to calculate the most efficient driving route for covering every single street in the target area. The Chinese -- we discussed this earlier as well.

The Chinese postman routing algorithm is a known technique used by postal agencies, utilities, and census agencies and is a variant of the Eulerian cycle problem. The Eulerian cycle problem is a problem asking for the shortest tour of a graph which visits each edge at least once.

So you're trying to visit each edge at least once, but such that the total distance traveled is shortest. That's the approach that is described in -that -- that is presented in figure 4. Figure 4 is an
deliberate attempt to cover every street at least once, such that the total distance covered is the shortest possible.

That's the only alternative that the patent discloses to random routing. And I might have used the wrong phrase before. And if -- if I did, I'm not a lawyer. I apologize. It's not that they detoured away from it. They disavowed random routing in order to get their claims issued in the prosecution history.
Q. All right. Now, just to be clear because I'm getting a little frustrated here. My question was, "Figure 4 is titled Chinese postman routing?" And is that -- that's the question that could have easily been answered yes or no without you going off on a spiel reading, you know, sections of the patent in there.
A. I don't think that's was your question.
Q. That was my question. You said, "Well, but that's not the whole story."
A. No. No. That was when you interrupted, if I'm not mistaken. But let's go on.
Q. Okay. But if there are -- my point is simply being the following: I've been asked by counsel to try to get us out of here at a decent time. I'm trying to do that, but it's very difficult when you continue to Page 195
read back portions -- extensive portions of the patent specification that you've read, at this point, multiple times.

If it be possible -- and if you want to cite that, we can perhaps, at least, just have a citation to the language that you are interested in putting on the record without having to read the whole, you know, lengthy -- lengthy passages to help speed things along. If that's the case, I would very much appreciate it. Can we try to do that?
A. Well, I'm not sure. You asked the question, and I'm trying my best to answer your question each and every time.

MR. BERTIN: Yeah. Let's just keep asking questions, please.

THE WITNESS: In some cases you've asked a question several times.
BY MR. LU:
Q. The record is pretty darn clear that my question was, basically, "Figure 4 is the Chinese postman algorithm," and you just continue to go on. So let's try to move things along. Otherwise, we're going to continue here until the end of the day, and we may ask for additional time from this witness.
A. I'll answer your questions --
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Q. Fair enough.
A. -- as I've been trying to do to the best of my ability.
Q. Okay. All right. So turning back to figures 3 and --

MR. BERTIN: Just to be clear, I mean, I think we've been on the record since 9:00 o'clock in the morning. It's almost 4:00 o'clock now. And we just need to keep on -- keep on going. I think you might refine your questions a bit if you want to move more quickly, but let's just keep going.

MR. LU: Your objection is noted.
How long have we been in this deposition so far?

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Five hours and 25 minutes. MR. LU: Thank you.
BY MR. LU:
Q. So turning to figure 3 and figure 4, would it be correct that the patent discloses that figure 4 exhibits less arterial bias than what is shown in figure 3?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I think I understand the question. What I'm pausing over is whether it's essentially the same question that you asked me earlier
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today. I understood it to be, so I don't know how else to answer except by repeating my testimony from earlier. But I'll try to abbreviate it by referencing that, as you suggested.

For the example given in figure 4, for this location of access points for what appears to be a building-free environment, the -- the inventors appear to be showing how their Chinese postman routing scheme reduces -- or results in less arterial bias. That appears to be what they're attempting to show in figure 4.

So they've created this example. And in this example there appears to be less arterial bias in figure 3 -- figure 4 -- which uses Chinese postman routing relative to figure 3 , which uses the random model.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Okay. I'd like you to turn to page 33 of your declaration, which is the section titled, "C, The Logic Terms."
A. I'm there.
Q. Okay. And you can use that paragraph 84 to familiarize yourself with what this section is discussing, but I'm really interested in asking you questions about paragraph 85.
there's some description of the algorithm. Perhaps it's a flow chart. Perhaps it's given in a code -it's -- a software code itself, showing what the -what the -- the -- the algorithm that the box in the block diagram has been programmed to carry out.
Q. Would a high-level description of the code disclosing the algorithm be a sufficient disclosure, to the best of your understanding?
A. You'd need to give me -- I -- I -- this is sort of a claim construction issue, not necessarily related to this patent, but sort of a general thing. You'd have to give me an example.
Q. But a high-level description of code to carry out an algorithm could be a sufficient structure for the purposes of means plus function. You haven't excluded it?
A. I don't know what you mean by "high-level description."
Q. Well, you've described a example -- two examples of where a sufficient disclosure of an algorithm might be possible. And one of those descriptions was a flow chart, and another one of those decisions was the actual code itself, correct?
A. I said that. But there was an assumption on my part that the code -- both the code and the flow
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diagram had sufficient detail that one could actually identify unambiguous steps to be followed. It couldn't be so high level as we know better than the box labeled computer to begin with.
Q. So if there were a description that was sufficient to identify unambiguous steps to be followed, that description could disclose sufficient structure, correct?
A. Where are you reading from now? If -- if you're going to read from my report --
Q. That was not --
A. -- it might help if you tell me where.
Q. That was not a question from your report.

That was a question based upon what you just said about flow charts. And -- I'll tell you what I'm trying to get at.

Are flow charts and algorithms the only means by which a sufficient structure can be disclosed? Flow chart and code -- excuse me -- are the only means by which a sufficient structure can be disclosed for purposes of means-plus-function?
A. Probably not.
Q. Okay.
A. Things are coming to mind -- might be a recipe. Do this, followed by this, add three cups of
this, et cetera, et cetera. I could imagine a recipe having enough specificity that I'd know -- one would know how the computer was programmed.
Q. Okay. And if a description had sufficient specificity to know how the computer would be programmed, would that be sufficient structure for means-plus-function?
A. If what had?
Q. A description, a written description --
A. Written description had --
Q. -- sufficient disclosure so that you would know how to program the computer, would that be sufficient structure under your understanding of the law relating to means-plus-function?
A. Well, possibly. But that sort of just shift with the debate. And that's why we really need to see a specific example of what you're referring to.

The debate has now shifted to: Is the description adequate to know how the computer is programmed?
Q. Fair enough. I'm just trying to make sure that there are no categories of, you know, information that you would automatically say would not constitute a description because it happens -- or constitute sufficient structure because it happens to fall into

1 one category rather than another category.
A. I understand.
Q. Okay.

Now, turning to paragraph 86, it states: "As discussed below, I have considered the claims and here's my opinion that logic is not a structure and that these terms are therefore means-plus-function terms.
"I have reviewed the disclosure of the 988 patent and for the reasons discussed below, it is my opinion it does not disclose corresponding structures capable of performing the functions stated in the logic limitations."

Now, the first question is: Is this statement -- are these two statements made in paragraph 86 true for all six of the logic terms listed in paragraph 84 ?
A. I believe the answer to the question is yes. But if you'd like an unambiguous confirmation of that, I'll need to read -- reread my opinions for each of them. But I believe the answer to the question is yes.
Q. Okay. Now paragraph, 87 states: "Logic is not a structural term."

Do you see that?
A. I see that.
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## said "logic is not a structural term"?

A. When I see the word "logic," I don't know what the structure of that logic is. So as I write: "A person of ordinary skill in the art would understand logic to mean a series of defined steps for performing function as opposed to a structure." So "logic" is functional, not physical.

You know, thinking could be logical, as an example. So you need to see more context. You need to see the language of the claim itself. You need to go back to the specification in order to infer what, if any, structure corresponds to logic. If the claim term is written so that the logic is as it appears in the claim, is defined only by what it does.
Q. Now, the patent relates to a WIFI location server; is that correct? The 988 patent, claim 1, relates to a WIFI location server, correct?
A. That's how the preamble reads.
Q. Okay. What is your understanding of what a WIFI location server is?
A. Well, I'm not aware that that's a term that's in dispute. If it is, I certainly haven't offered an opinion on it, so I'm not going to create an on-the-fly claim construction. That will take lot of time. If
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1 you'd like me to, I can try, but I can tell you that
will take time because I haven't been asked to do that, and I haven't got an opinion on that.
Q. So in interpreting the logic terms of the 988 patent, you did not consider what the meaning of a WIFI location server is, correct?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: No. I didn't say that either. BY MR. LU:
Q. Okay.
A. But you -- you asked me for a construction, and that I'm not prepared to do. Whether I considered the preamble with regard to these logic limitations, well, sure. I read the entire patent, including the claim, and all parts of the claim, including the preamble.
Q. Okay. So did you have an understanding when you interpreted the logic terms what a WIFI location server is?
A. Well, I have an understanding of what that is with regard to the parts of it as claimed in claim 1.
Q. Okay.
A. Except that I don't know what these logic things are because they were defined only by the function.

So I know that -- I could sort of see what -based upon what's written in the specification, this location server is some sort of a thing that is being accessed by WIFI users -- that's being queried by WIFI users in an attempt to determine the location. And it's created by means of some this deliberate scanning algorithm, the Chinese postman. I would understand that.

But then the claim goes on. It's -- it's --
it's -- it's telling -- then it's telling us exactly
what's being claimed, and that's where I fall off the bandwagon because there is some -- some of these terms, in my opinion, are indefinite.
Q. So "thing." A WIFI location server can be a human brain?

MR. BERTIN: Object to -- object to form. Argumentative.

THE WITNESS: I would not interpret this -- I don't think one of skill in the art would interpret the server to be a human brain.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Okay.
A. It's telling us it's comprising a database of WIFI access points. So there's got to be a database. It can be -- it can't be only a brain.
Q. So it's a computer, correct? A WIFI location server is a computer, correct?
A. Well, possibly. In the -- at -- completely out of context, a server would be -- one of skill in the art would have some understanding that the server is some type of a computer.
Q. Now, is the term "logic" in the field of electronics a purely functional term?
A. You need to be more specific. If -- if the logic that's -- when you say "in the field of electronics," if the logic is given in the form of bunch of Boolean operations to be performed -- to be performed, then it is presented in functional form, yes.
Q. But --
A. If it's a specific circuit showing gates and interconnection of gates and so forth and so on to accomplish some tasks, then perhaps. But again, we need to -- I'm sort of borderline speculation right now. Then perhaps it's -- it's not just functional form but actually showing a block diagram, so I would know how to build this thing. And I need -- then I would need to see the context.
Q. Okay.
A. But none of that, by the way, is presented in
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this patent. There are no circuit diagrams.
Q. So you would disagree with a definition of logic that would included hardware, such as applications, specific integrated circuit, or field-programmable gate array software, or a combination of hardware and software?
A. What logic? The claimed logic?
Q. Just -- just the use of the word "logic."
A. I -- I need this in context.
Q. Okay. So in the context of computer and computer electronics, you would disagree with a definition of logic that would be hardware, such as an application, specific-integrated circuit, or a field-programmable gate array software, or a combination of software and hardware, correct?
A. At this point I would neither agree nor disagree. I need to see more context.
Q. Have you heard the phrase "emitter-coupled logic"?
A. I have.
Q. What is emitter-coupled logic?
A. It's a type of electronics. It's a -- I believe it's a type of bipolar electronics that's actually capable of operating at substantial clock speeds.
Q. Okay. Have you heard of the phrase CMOS logic?
A. I have. It's complementary metal oxide on silicon. That's a another type of semiconductor technology, as is emitter-coupled logic. But I left out the semiconductor I want to put that in.
(Reporter interruption.)
THE WITNESS: Okay. It's another type of semiconductor technology, as is emitter-coupled logic. And the transistors are fabricated in a different way. These are not bipolar devices.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Have you heard of the phrase "programmable logic devices"?
A. Probably.
Q. Do you understand what a "programmable logic device" is?
A. That's where I would need to see some context. You said programmable logic array, I would know what it is. Programmable -- what was the phrase you asked about?
Q. Well, let's ask about programmable logic
array. What is a programmable logic array?
A. PLA is something that I'm familiar with.

That's a semiconductor chip that can be burned so that
it will perform some objective Boolean operation.
Q. What would you understand if I were to use the phrase "custom high-speed logic"?
A. Well, again, I would need to see some context. But the first thing that comes to mind -- by the way, i don't know -- I'm not aware of any of these phrases being used in these patents, but I'd have to reread the patent to confirm that. But you're asking me sort of in the abstract. You're hitting me with these phrases cold.

The first thing that would come to mind is some sort of a application-specific circuit that operates at high speed.
Q. Okay. What would come to mind if I used the phrase "commercially available logic families"?
A. TTL, ECL, CMOS -- these are the -- these are the -- these would come to mind. But again, this is completely out of context.
Q. That would be TTL logic, CMOS logic, ECL logic, correct?
A. Those are some examples.
Q. Other examples could include RTL logic, DTL logic, BiCMOS logic, correct?
A. Possibly.
Q. What comes to mind if I use the phrase "custom
logic chip"?
A. Custom logic chip is something that when -the first thing that comes to mind would be an application-specific circuit designed to execute some Boolean operation or some truth table.
Q. What comes to mind when I use the phrase "reconfigurable logic"?
A. There, I'd have to see some context.

Nothing -- nothing is -- is just coming to mind. By
the way, for all of these, I'm just giving you the
first thing that comes to mind. But depending on the context, the response that I gave -- if you showed me the context I may say oh, no, that's not what I was thinking about. That's something else. All of these are context-specific.

That one, nothing comes to mind.
Q. Okay. What about the phrase "logic gate"?
A. Logic gate is something that is defined by its input/output Boolean properties, like an AND gate or a NOR gate. It would -- so -- but that's it. All I have in mind is some sort of a function that this logic gate might perform, not what the logic gate is itself. Is it a truth table? It is a couple of transistors connecting a certain way? Is it a programmable computer? That -- that, I wouldn't know. But I would Page 211
have some notion if you said "logic gate," something that is performing a Boolean operation like AND, or, NOR or something -- some such thing.
Q. What do you understand if I use the phrase "computer program logic"?

MR. BERTIN: Tony, you might need to slow down a little bit when you're going through these Boolean operations so the court reporter can get them down.

THE WITNESS: Okay. So the question once again is?
BY MR. LU:
Q. What do you understood when I use the phrase "computer program logic"?
A. Nothing. I need to see context.
Q. What about the phrase "computer control logic"?
A. Same answer.
Q. Have you ever heard the -- strike that.

Have you ever heard computer programs also being called "computer control logic"?
A. No.
Q. Would you disagree with a characterization of computer programs also being called "computer control logic"?
A. Show me the context.
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Q. What about computer programs also called "computer control logic" being stored in main memory and/or secondary memory? Does that provide sufficient context to understand the meaning of "computer programs"?
A. Run that past me again. I didn't absorb the question.
Q. Strike that.

Would the phrase "computer programs," in the context of being stored in main memory and/or secondary memory, provide you with any further understanding of what "computer control logic" might be?
A. No.
Q. Would you equate computer program stored in main memory and/or secondary memory with computer control logic?
A. Show me the context. Possibly, but not necessarily. Don't know. Show me the context.
Q. Would a computer program write -- recite sufficient structure to -- under means-plus-function -under your means-plus-function claim construction analysis?
A. Are we talking about a specific element now in the claim as opposed to first things that come to mind?
Q. First this that come to mind.
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A. I need -- I would need to see context.
Q. So without seeing context, computer programming, in your mind, would be -- strike that.

So without context, computer programs in -- in your mind may be purely functional language, thus subject to a means-plus-function analysis, correct?
A. I -- I -- I -- I'm lost. What -- what -what -- what hypothetical are you posing now?
Q. I'm just posing a hypothetical of the plain and ordinary meaning of the phrase "computer programs"?
A. Are we talking about a means-plus-function limitation? Is that a claim term?
Q. Is that a means -- would you interpret "computer programs" to be a means-plus-function claim term because it's purely functional in nature?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Put the phrase in the context of the claim -- the -- the -- the -- this hypothetical claim limitation, and perhaps I could try to answer it, but I -- I -- I -- it's just too abstract.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Okay. What if it said "computer programs to add records to the database for newly discovered WIFI access points"? Would that be a means-plus-function claim element?
A. So which claim element are you reading from now?
Q. Well, if you were to substitute any of the claim elements that are identified in paragraph 84 with the phrase "computer program," would that still be a means-plus-function claim element?
A. So as an example, let's take the first one. "Logic to recalculate position information." Do you want "logic" replaced by "computer program" too?
Q. Correct.
A. Well, I have not done that analysis, so I haven't got an opinion on that. I would need to reread the instructions I was given, and I might even need to ask some questions -- some points of clarification before I could offer an opinion on that.

So do you want me to do all of that? Right now, I don't have an opinion on that.
Q. Okay. How long do you think it would take you to render an opinion on that?
A. Don't know. It might be a few minutes. It might be much longer than that. I -- claim construction is not something that can be rushed. There's a -- there's an analysis involved. And the first thing that I need to be sure that -- is that I'm applying the right standard. So I might even need -- I
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So that might be an example of something of logic in electronics that's not purely functional. I've read the circuit diagram. That circuit diagram is -- is -- represents the electronics that has been fabricated on a chip. And it -- I know the Boolean or truth table functionality that the chip is performing. There I think there's some structure.
Q. Is custom high-speed logic structural or functional?
A. Don't know. I need to see the -- I would need to see the -- the context.
Q. Are logic families structural or functional? Are commercially available logic families structural or functional?
A. I need to see the context once again.

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Is reconfigurable logic structural or functional?
A. Well, I -- I -- I -- again -- and let me this time try to elaborate a little bit. I would need to see the context.

If it's reconfigurable logic for performing a function and the specification included a block diagram -- a circuit block diagram of that
reconfigurable logic that performs that function, then that might denote something other than function.

But if there's no description in the specification whatsoever about this reconfigurable logic for performing this function -- no Boolean operations, no truth tables, no flow chart -- then, in my opinion, that would be functional.
Q. And --
A. And that's why I said you'd need to tell me the context.
Q. Is emitter-coupled logic structural or functional?
A. I -- I don't even know how to comprehend that question. Does structural --
Q. Does emitter-coupled logic bring to mind a structure, or is that a purely functional term?
A. It brings to mind a class electronics, so it's neither structure nor function. It brings to mind a class of electronics.
Q. Something that you can hold in your hand?
A. It brings to mind a class of electronics.

That's all. I know what emitter-coupled logic is. It's not necessarily something I can hold in my hand. It's a technology that can be used to build chips. So it's not something I can hold in my hand, no.
Q. Is a programmable logic array something that can be held in your hand?
A. I can buy a PLA, a programmable logic array. But all that is is a bunch of gates that have not yet been programmed at that point. So that's -- that -that -- that -- it -- it -- it -- that's a bunch of gates.
Q. Can you buy a emitter -- an emitter-coupled logic device?
A. Let me see if I can help you out. Can I buy a chip that was built using emitter-coupled logic technology?
Q. Sure.
A. Yes.

But once again, if I saw the phrase -- because again, we are talking here about -- I came here to testify about construction of certain phrases using these patents, and you're asking me a bunch of abstractions. So I need to be sure that you're not going to misapply some of the responses that I'm giving.

If I saw emitter-coupled logic for performing some function in a claim specification and -- and -and -- and -- and in a claim -- it's a limitation of a claim, and the specification does not show me the block
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diagram for that emitter-coupled logic, then whether I know that emitter-coupled logic thing is something I could hold in my hand or not is still being described functionally. I need the block diagram, a flow chart, something that's describing how this emitter-coupled logic is structured. I need something more than just the phrase "emitter-coupled logic."

You're asking can I -- can I hold a chip that was built based upon emitter-coupled logic in my hand -- emitter-coupled logic technology. Answer, yes. If I see emitter-coupled logic for performing a function in a claim, I'd have to go back to specification to find out whether there's any disclosure of the blocked diagram, the circuit connections, a flow chart, something, to tell me when that emitter-coupled logic used in the claim is structure. And if it's not in the specification, then it will be my opinion that emitter-coupled logic is being described purely in functional terms.

MR. LU: Why don't we take a short break since we're about to run out of tape.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This marks the end of Media No. 3 of the deposition of Dr. Anthony Acampora.

We're going off the record, and the time is 4:30 p.m.
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(A brief recess was taken.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Here begins Media No. 4 in the deposition of Dr. Anthony Acampora.

We're back on the record. The time is
4:39 p.m.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Dr. Acampora, I'd like you to turn to page 49 of your declaration.
A. I'm there.
Q. And I'd like you to take a look at paragraph 121 and any other portions of this section that you need to review in order to answer any questions.

First question I have for you is: Outside the context of the patent specification, do you have an understanding of what a "rule" is?
A. So outside of the context of the patent, as I understood your question, I would understand a "rule" to be an instruction to be followed.
Q. And --
A. Like add a cup of water, mix thoroughly.
Q. Would a rule also include a statement like: If $A$, do $B$; but if $C$, then do $D$ ?
A. Again, we're outside the context of the patent?
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Q. Yes. Outside of the context --
A. So you're asking is that -- is that an example of a rule? And suppose I know what A and B are and C and D are, then, yes, that might be a rule.
Q. Okay. Now, outside the context of the patent specification, do you have an understanding of what a "predefined rule" would be?
A. That's less clear. There I think one would need -- one would need some context to get an understanding of what a "predefined rule" is.
Q. Do you have an understanding of the phrase "predefined" standing on its own --

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
BY MR. LU:
Q. -- outside of the context of the patent specification?
A. Well, no. I -- I don't. I can tell you what comes to mind, but that's not to say that it's correct.

So suppose I'm going to perform some process. But that's a big "if." I'm not sure that's a context in which "predefined" is being used or not. And again, we're not talking about the patent at all now.

So maybe there's some sort of a process that's going to be performed. "Predefined" might mean something that was defined before this process was

1 begun, as an example. That -- that might be, but I'm not sure that that would be the only understanding of "predefined." That's just by way of -- really more by way of example. So I don't know what a "predefined rule" is, absent context.
Q. Okay. Let's turn to paragraph 123. The second sentence, referring back to the term "being suited," states that "it is applied apparently to different types of equations or algorithms that can be used for different numbers of access points."

What is -- what did you mean when you wrote that sentence?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Well, once again, I think the words speak for themself. So are you asking me to state what I'm written here differently?
BY MR. LU:
Q. Well, I'm trying to understand what is meant here because it's not absolutely crystal clear to me what -- what you're stating here.
A. Well, in a role reversal, let me ask, what's not clear about it?
Q. Well, the word "apparently to different types of equations or algorithm," what equations or algorithms are you referring to there?
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A. Well, in -- in the claims, if I look at -- if we look at claim 1 of the 245 patent, next to last element, the claim speaks about choosing a corresponding location/determination algorithm. From plurality of the location/determination algorithms, said chosen algorithm being suited for the number of identified WIFI access points.

So your question was, as -- as I understood it, related to what's the location determination algorithm? Was that your question?
Q. Well, my -- my question was, what are you -to what were you referring when you made reference to "algorithms" in that second sentence of paragraph 123 ?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Different methodologies. Methodologies expressed by some sort of a mathematical relationship.

## BY MR. LU:

Q. So an algorithm requires a methodology expressed by a mathematical relationship, correct?
A. Well, mathematical in the most general sense. It might be some sort of a -- it might be Boolean math as opposed to real-number arithmetic. But there'd be a procedure to be followed. Well, it's equations or algorithms. So a procedure to be followed. And I
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guess it may be expressed by means of some sort of logic or instructions or mathematical symbolism. But that's what I get from reading the specification.
BY MR. LU:
Q. So an algorithm in this instance can be an equation, Boolean logic, a series of instructions. Anything else?
A. Well, let me go back to the specifications.

MR. BERTIN: Can you read back the question? (Record read.)
MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: Okay. Here's the difficulty that I'm having in addressing your question. But by explaining the difficulty, maybe I'll answer your question.
"Being suited" appears in claim 1 of the 245 patent. And I read some of the claim language, and that claim language, again, is suggesting that there are different types of -- let's be specific -different types of algorithms -- different algorithms, in any event, that it be chosen from among. So I'm going to choose an algorithm being suited from some number of algorithms.

And again, these algorithms are described in the specification. Specification refers to simple
signal strength, weighted models, nearest neighbor models combined with triangulation techniques, adapted smoothing based on device velocity, different equations perform better under different scenarios and tend to be used together in hybrid deployments to product the most accurate final readings. Preferred embodiments --
(Reporter interruption.)
THE WITNESS: Preferred embodiments of the invention can use a number of positioning algorithms. Decision of which algorithm to use is driven by the number of access points observed and the user case application using it."

And it goes on. But it describes some filtering techniques, common filters. That's where the math -- or the equations come in. But also some broad references made to all of these algorithms from among which one might be chosen -- that one being best suited, whatever that means -- there's actually only one algorithm this close. I actually don't know what -- all of the different algorithms are. The patent doesn't tell me what they are. It simply says, there are a whole bunch of different things that you could do, but it doesn't reveal what they are, except in one instance -- the equations appearing in column 12 , or the same equations weighted by the C parameter
in the event that the numerical accuracy needs to be improved.

So there are a set of equations, and -- given in column 12. And when I go back to the claim, I see that the claim actually requires some plurality of the algorithms. And then I'm gonna -- and I'm not sure what those algorithms are. There's one algorithm that's actually shown. And then I'm going to choose one that's best suited, whatever that means.

So I'm concluding that these algorithms are rules or mathematical descriptions, something of this type, based upon what I'm reading here.
BY MR. LU:
Q. The patent claims reference that the algorithms can include a simple, signal-strength, weighted, average model. Do you see that? That's in the appended claim 6 ?
A. I do.
Q. Do you have an understanding of what a simple, signal-strength, weighted, average model would be?
A. Well, I think we discussed that earlier today.
Q. Fair enough. So I think it the answer is "yes"?
A. I -- well, yes.
Q. Okay. Dependent claim 7 says: "The plurality
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of the location determination algorithms includes the nearest neighbor model."

Do you know what a "nearest neighbor model" is in terms of a location determination algorithm?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Claim 8 says: "The plurality of the location determination algorithm includes a triangulation technique."

Do you know what a "triangulation technique" would be in the context of location determination?
A. Yeah. I believe I have an opinion on that in my report. I think I know what a -- what -- what a triangulation technique is.

A location determination algorithm that includes a triangulation technique -- not from what I'm seeing in this specification, no. In fact, I'm finding that to be quite ambiguous.
Q. Okay. Do you have a -- turning to dependent claim 9, do you have an understanding of what an "adaptive smoothing technique based on device velocity" might be in the context of a location determination algorithm?
A. Well, I might have some understanding of what an adaptive smoothing technique is. Based upon device velocity, no. But moreover, the claim is to -- is
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1 referring back to the method of claim 1, wherein the
plurality of location determination algorithms includes an adaptive smoothing technique based on device velocity.

Well, here, I have some understanding of what adaptive smoothing is. Adaptive smoothing based on device velocity, no. And location determination algorithm including adaptive smoothing technique based on device velocity, again, no. Not from what's taught in the specification and not from anything outside of this either.
Q. Now, if one were to have multiple location determination algorithms and use each of those multiple location determination algorithms with a particular number of WIFI access points and determine that one performed better than the others, is that something that one of ordinary skill in the art could do?
A. I'm going to ask you to repeat that question.

But first, we need to do something about the glare that is blinding me right now.
Q. Which pane is it coming through?
A. It's coming through this one here, but I'm not sure what we can do since those shades are not providing enough -- now, we may actually need to hang something up. That -- that -- that just is -- I --
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I -- I -- I really can't go on like this, at least not in this position.

MR. BERTIN: Do you want to take a break?
MR. LU: Sure. Let's take a short break.
MR. BERTIN: And reposition you is probably the easiest thing.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going off the record. The time is $4: 58 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$.
(A brief recess was taken.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're back on the record.
The time is 5:07 p.m.
BY MR. LU:
Q. I'd like you to turn to page 51, and
specifically paragraph 125 of your declaration. Second sentence of paragraph 125 states: "As discussed above the common specification is dominated by a single method for creating the database, which involves driving a vehicle in a systematic manner along every street."

> Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. What do you mean by "dominated by a single method"?
A. Okay. Well, we had a good deal of discussion about this for much of today.
Q. Well, let me narrow my question a little bit.

When you say "dominated by a single method, are there alternative methods disclosed in the patent specification for creating the database?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: No. There were -- there were -there are one-sentence sound bytes, if you will, but no discussion of how it would be done, leaving one to sort of scratch one's head -- what's meant by this.

## BY MR. LU:

Q. Would one of ordinary skill in the art know how to create a database which involves driving a vehicle in a systematic manner around -- along every street without using the Chinese postman model?
A. Not without some further description.
Q. Would one of ordinary skill in the art know how to drive a vehicle in a systematic manner along every street without utilizing the Chinese postman model?
A. Would one know how as opposed to could one create some alternative to the Chinese postman?
Q. Well, let's --
A. No. I think one would -- would need to ponder that for a while and figure out how to do it.
Q. What is your --
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A. And then there'd also be some limitations of cost, time, and other factors to take into consideration as well.
Q. What do you mean by "there could also be some limitations of cost, time, and other factors to take into consideration as well"?
A. Well --

MR. BERTIN: Object to form. Asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: If I thought about it, I could probably create some sort of a brute-force approach, like marking on a map every street that I've driven along and then occasionally looking at the -- the -the -- the marked-up map to see where I haven't driven and then go back out and drive those. And by brute force, given enough time and given enough money and given enough gasoline, eventually being sure that every street on my map has an X to it. That's brute force.

But even that's not suggested in the patent at all. So I don't think that was -- that was the intent. There's a systematic manner, not a brute-force manner. And I don't know what that system -- what -- the only systematic manner that's disclosed is the Chinese postman, and one would have to create an alternative -in my opinion, one would have to create an alternative
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systematic manner.
And then, again, there might be some limitations based upon cost and time. The specification tells us that this Chinese postman is driving each street such that the total distance traveled is minimized. So this clearly calls for a time constraint associated with what the inventors had in mind here.
BY MR. LU:
Q. I'd like you to turn to page 56 and, specifically, paragraph 137 of your declaration.
A. I'm there.
Q. Okay. So you state that Skyhook's proposal does not conform to the applicant's stated goal of collecting more complete information. And you further state that "by rewriting the claim to insert 'observed' into substantially all WIFI access points so that it become substantially all observed WIFI access points, Skyhook is divorcing the methodology disclosed in the specification, collecting access points using a planned route from the intended resulting method to fully explore and cover the streets of a target region in order to gain more access points than would be achieved through random collection."

Do you see that?
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A. I do.
Q. What is -- what did you mean when you wrote those two sentences?
A. Well, those two sentences follow the first sentence that -- the first couple sentences in this paragraph. And in my opinion, all Skyhook did in this proposed construction was include a further limitation, substantially all observed WIFI access points -- or the claim language states substantially all WIFI access points.

So what this means is -- and what's shown the -- the -- in the specification, the objective is to really capture all the access points. And you're going to drive and observe until you've -- you're going to drive and measure, I should say, until you've accomplished that. And if you can't observe an access point from one location, perhaps you'd be more successful in some other location. But you're going to give it your best shot. You're going to try to capture all of them.
Q. But would this claim limitation be met if you're unable to capture all of them?
A. Well, that's depends. "Substantially all WIFI access points" is somewhat subjective. But in reading the specification, I understand that what the inventors
had in mind, once again, is driving this deliberate planned Chinese postman routing algorithm in a heroic attempt to capture all of them. Now, they might miss some. And that's why in my proposed construction, I believe I included the word -- let me not guess.
Q. "All but an insignificant number," I believe was your claim construction.
A. "All but an insignificant number of WIFI access points."
Q. Would this claim limitation require the capture of WIFI access points that are not observable from driving along a street?
A. Well, again, we got to be careful. The -the -- the patent also mentions this special -specially equipped van. By the way, I have lot of familiarity with driving vans and making radio measurements based upon special equipment that's loaded into these vans.

But the patent actually describes the use of directive antennas. So they're really describing a heroic attempt to capture all access points. These directive antennas are making WIFI access points that might otherwise not be observable -- more observable -by pointing the antenna and trying to detect a signal, as opposed to the use of an omnidirectional antenna -Page 235
without getting too technical -- the gain of an omnidirectional antenna is much lower than that of a directive antenna. And the patent is telling you this is a special van -- I'm even using directive antennas. This is an heroic attempt to capture all access points by pulling the signals out of the noise by means of this directive antenna. It's -- it's clear what they're trying to do it.
Q. To capture all but an insignificant number using the techniques that are disclosed with respect to the van, correct?
A. The claimed invention involves capturing all but an insignificant number of WIFI access points in the target area. That's one of the limitations of the invention.

And if I can go on and elaborate just a little bit. It does that by using the specially equipped van directive antennas, and deliberate -- and driving that van along a deliberate route, including every street, Chinese postman -- we've been discussing for much of this day -- to capture all but an insignificant number.
Q. Now, let's assume a scenario where you're in a city where everyone shields their WIFI access points using Faraday cages surrounding the building to prevent EM signals -- electromagnetic signals -- from escaping
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their building.
Would all but an insignificant number, as you interpret that claim, require the capture of those WIFI access points that are shielded so that they cannot be captured from the street, using any technology?
A. I -- I understand the question. What claim are we discussing here?
Q. Well, both of the independent claims, the 988 and the 694 patents.
A. So let's just discuss one of them. I
haven't -- I haven't reached the 988 patent first.
So as I understood your question, if all of the access points were enclosed in the Faraday cage -let's say a small Faraday cage -- not one that would actually extend over streets that a van -- that the van is driving up and down. But these are small Faraday cages that don't extend over any streets.

Then I don't think that -- I can't imagine the situation where one would -- where one could infringe this claim if every access point were captured in a Faraday cage. But because there would be no access points in the database. There wouldn't be no database of WIFI access points in that case.
Q. So by that reasoning as well, one would not infringe the claim if somehow all of the -- all but an Page 237
insignificant -- strike that.
So by that same reasoning, if building interference alone was sufficient to prevent WIFI access point signals from exiting the building and being captured on the street, those WIFI access points would still need to be captured. And all but an insignificant number would need to be captured in order to infringe the claim, correct?
A. Well, the claim requires a database of WIFI access points. And included in that database are records for substantially all WIFI access points in the target area. And substantially, all means -- all but an insignificant number of. Well, again, since we're dealing with the claim term, let me be precise.

The disputed term is substantially all WIFI access points. And my proposed construction is -- and I should have bold fast -- faced these constructions so I could find them easily. "All but an insignificant number of WIFI access points in the target area."

So in the scenario that you just painted, some reason the signals can't get out of the buildings, but you haven't put in Faraday cages, which means some of the signals did leak out. You're not -- so we're no longer talking about a complete electromagnetic shield. Then you made your heroic attempt; you've done the

1 Chinese postman routing; you've used the special van 2 with the directive antennas.

One of the problems I'm having is that the patent doesn't tell you how much directivity to use in these antennas. So if I have something other than a perfect shield around these access points, I could deploy a van with a sufficiently large aperture antenna that I'm going to capture all but an insubstantial number of the access points by driving this Chinese postman routing algorithm.

And maybe it's in the eye of the beholder. If after the end of the day, whoever is responsible for gathering data comes back to the -- back to the office and concludes, I haven't got enough files. I know there were more access points out there. Maybe the next day they go back out with a bigger antenna. I don't know.
Q. But what your -- but the claims -- all but -substantially all of the WIFI access points, as you understand it, requires a heroic effort, including the use of directional antennas, such as the ones that are disclosed in the patent specification?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form. Mischaracterizes his testimony.

THE WITNESS: That's not what I said.
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proposed construction would destroy the usefulness of
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the alleged improved location system."
What do you mean by that --
A. Okay.
Q. -- series of sentences?
A. Okay. So let me try to explain that. Here, some explanation perhaps is -- is called for. I think the words speak for themselves, but you asked for an explanation, so let me try to give that to you.

I go out on January 15th, and I scan the target area, using the Chinese postman algorithm. And, in fact, I record locations of 500 access points. Now, let's suppose that between January 15th and, let's say, July 15th, when I'm going to go out and rescan, 500 more access points were installed.

If I went out and actually -- let's say I -- I
go out -- I'm -- I'm -- I'm -- I'm not the person that did the original scan. I'm not the one who's going to rescan in July. I'm a different company. And I go out, and I follow the patent. I -- but I -- I substitute substantially all observed WIFI access points to -- substantially all WIFI access points into the claim, and I meet every other claim limitation. I would not infringe that claim. I would not infringe the claim because the observed access points made on January 15th were a subset of those that actually
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existed sometime later.
So I -- I guess the point is, as stated here, if the limitation involves all observed WIFI access points rather than -- substantially all observed access points rather than substantially all WIFI access points, I'm not sure what's happening as the number of access points is being increased because they have not yet been observed. So have I captured substantially all of the observed access points when the database was originally built based upon 500 that were observed and now an additional 500 observable ones were installed -they have not yet been observed -- there's some temperable ambiguity that would be introduced by Skyhook's construction.
Q. Now, would the database, as it existed on January 15th, infringe?
A. Oh, I don't know. I -- I -- I don't know. You'd have to tell me what other -- if -- if -- if -if all of the other limitations were somehow met --
Q. If all of the other --
A. -- given the fact there were a bunch of ambiguities in here, I -- I -- I don't know.
Q. If all the other limitations were met, would the database in existence on January 15th with 500 access -- with 500 access points infringe, given the
fact that there were in existence only 500 access points in that region?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I -- I -- I think we're actually getting into the -- the realm of the unreal, and -and -- and here's why.

I think the claim is indefinite. So I don't know how -- I -- I wouldn't know if I have or have not infringed this claim because I don't know the boundaries of this claim.
BY MR. LU:
Q. My hypothetical assumed that all of the other limitations were infringed. And the only one we're looking at is substantially all WIFI access points in the target area.
A. I -- I don't --

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: I can't even conceptualize that because I don't know how you would meet these other claim limitations. I can't imagine the situation that you're -- that you're -- that you're trying to characterize now because I don't know what these limitations mean.
BY MR. LU:
Q. Let me ask you differently then.
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Looking -- focusing only on substantially all WIFI access points in the target area. Would that limitation be met -- and only that limitation be met -by the hypothetical January 15th database that included the 500 WIFI access points based upon a scan taken on January 15th?
A. Depends upon whether that 500 includes substantially all. If there were only 500 , and they were all in there, then that would have been met.
Q. Okay.
A. If the actual number is equal to the number that's put into the database, then I think that substantially all the access points would have been included.
Q. Now, is it your view that it would be impossible to determine whether substantially all WIFI access points in a target area would be stored in a database?
A. That's another question. I don't think I have an opinion on that at this time.

What I was asked to do in this assignment was offer my opinion as to how one should construe substantially all WIFI access points -- and we discussed my proposed construction several times -- all but an insignificant number of WIFI access points in
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the target area. I think you're asking me a different question.

If -- here's what I'm hearing you ask. If substantially, all WIFI access points means all but an insignificant number of WIFI access points in the target area, would I know what that claim limitation meant?
Q. Would I know whether that claimed limitation were ever met?
A. I don't know. I -- I actually have not got an opinion on that. I would need to think about that probably fairly deeply. I -- I don't know.
Q. Because I wouldn't know -- because one wouldn't know whether or not some paranoid, wearing an aluminum foil hat hasn't put, you know, 1,000 WIFI access points within a Faraday cage within his building, correct?

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: That's not the only reason. BY MR. LU:
Q. But there are other reasons because a WIFI access point might be located underground not -- and still in a target region, correct?
A. That's another reason.

There are -- that's the problem why I -- at
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this point I actually haven't got an opinion on that because I'd have to think about these different scenarios and which one of those were covered by the claims and which ones are -- are not covered by the claims. I -- I don't know. The -- the -- the -- the claim might be indefinite for that reason. It's -it's -- in my opinion, it is indefinite for other reasons. But that particular reason, I don't actually have an opinion on that at this moment.

I wasn't have to provided one, and I didn't. I was just asked to give my opinion as to, what substantially all WIFI access points means.
Q. Would, substantially, all WIFI access points require one to take a survey of possible WIFI access point holders in order to determine whether they have a WIFI access point in the target area.

MR. BERTIN: Object to form. Asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: I didn't understand the question.
BY MR. LU:
Q. How would one count -- how would one determine what all of the WIFI access points would be in a particular target area?

Let me put it to you differently.
A. I haven't formed an opinion on that.
Q. Let me put to you differently.

As an expert in WIFI technology, if I were to ask you how would you go about determining the number of WIFI access points on the island of Manhattan, how would you go about doing that?

He smiles.
A. Yes.

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
THE WITNESS: First, you'd have to give me the budget. Then I would tell you if I thought it was possible, given the budget and the time. So you -- you need to give me --
BY MR. LU:
Q. Million dollars. Million dollars and one year.

MR. BERTIN: Object to form.
BY MR. LU:
Q. That's the budget; that's the time.
A. You know, I -- even then I'm not sure it could be done. One thought that's going through my mind is setting out on foot, knocking on doors, looking for access points, and maybe even needing to buy my way into the premises to do a visual inspection. So I -- I might run out of your million-dollar budget before I
got a -- if I start at Battery Park, I may not get past Wall Street and run out of budget. I -- I don't know. You're really creating a -- a -- a wild hypothetical here.
Q. And it would be crazy because they'd be adding WIFI access points, potentially, in Battery Park by the time you got up to Wall Street, right?
A. Well, that's another problem.
Q. Okay.

MR. LU: Can we take a short break, figure out if we have any other --

MR. BERTIN: Sure.
MR. LU: -- what other line of questioning, and then maybe conclude.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going off the record. The time is 5:36 p.m.
(A brief recess was taken.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're back on the record. The time is $5: 40$ p.m.

MR. LU: We have no further questions, and so we can go off the record.

MR. BERTIN: Okay. And I have no -- I have no questions either. Thanks to all.

MR. LU: Thank you.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This concludes today's
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| 195:3 233:5 | 185:23 192:15 | 172:12 | 10:22 | ultimately |
| totality | traveled | trucks | tutorials | 26:18 27:17 113:25 |
| 166:25 | 109:15 187:21 | 184:14 | 11:12,15 12:1 | 171:6 |
| totally | 194:23 233:6 | true | 128:24 | umbrella |
| 23:6 42:21 106:19 | traveling | 29:21 44:22,22 45:9 | twice | 36:2,6 |
| 107:2 | 108:19 116:6 117:3 | 45:11 47:1 105:12 | 10:13 109:23 118:21 | unable |
| tour | 184:15 185:4 186:2 | 123:23 141:8 | 118:23 | 234:22 |
| 118:14 194:20 | 191:8 | 157:20 158:20 | two | unaccustomed |
| tow | travels | 203:16 250:8 252:9 | 8:25 9:8 11:14 16:12 | 138:7 |
| 47:6 | 42:19 | truth | 16:18 17:19 18:6,8 | unachievable |
| tower | traverse | 13:7 211:5,23 | 18:22,25 30:18 | 103:3 104:1,3,4,5 |
| 38:11 39:23 40:1,2,9 | 115:7 185:6 | 216:22 217:6 218:6 | 38:2 65:7,9,9,24 | 106:25 114:7 173:6 |
| 41:7,8 43:5,23 44:2 | traversed | truthful | 66:15 74:10,10,15 | 188:23 189:14 |
| 44:3,8,24 45:1,17 | 185:18 | 14:8 | 75:9,9,10,11 76:1,1 | unambiguous |
| 45:19,20 47:3 | traverses | try | 76:3,24 77:6,14,15 | 201:2,6 203:19 |
| 67:12 74:24,25 | 184:23 | 11:5 38:4 42:23 45:3 | 88:16 118:19,21 | unavoidable |
| 75:1,4,5,6,8 77:15 | traversing | 45:3 93:2 98:8 | 132:9 135:4 161:20 | 144:5 |
| 150:13,14 | 174:2 | 105:6 111:8 177:11 | 200:19 203:15 | uncertainty |
| towers | tri | 195:23 196:10,22 | 234:3,4 | 107:9 |
| 33:7 39:20 40:20 | 74:13 | 198:3 205:1 214:19 | two-dimensional | unconventional |
| 41:2,4,5 42:3,17 | trial | 217:21 234:19 | 67:13 | 135:3,12,15,21 |
| 43:2,3 45:7,12,12 | 11:1,25 | 241:5,8 | two-year | 136:24 138:7 |
| 47:9 67:18,21,25 | triangle | trying | 18:13,14 | underground |
| 74:11,15 77:7 | 65:23,24 66:17 67:1 | 35:23 64:17 76:17 | type | 245:22 |
| 106:3,5 | 67:5 75:19 77:11 | 81:10 92:7 93:18 | 30:22 37:7,15 109:9 | undersigned |
| trace | 77:16 | 94:1,9 98:18 101:8 | 113:20 118:25 | 252:1 |


| understand | uniformly | user | variant | videotape |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12:25 13:3,6,9,22 | 173:4 181:1,9 | 38:9,22 65:6 82:24 | 118:11,11 194:18 | 13:10 |
| 14:3 26:14 34:2,8 | United | 82:25 83:19,23 | variation | Videotaped |
| 40:12 52:3 66:16 | 1:1 2:1 4:9,11,13,15 | 84:4,11 85:6,19 | 134:25 | 1:15 2:17 |
| 67:9 81:23 87:7,9 | 6:8 48:10,13 49:8 | 86:16,17 87:10 | varied | videotaping |
| 92:3,20 99:22 | units | 89:2,3 90:13,14,15 | 17:15 | 6:19 |
| 101:6 102:13 | 106:7 | 90:17 161:22 | variety | view |
| 108:14 127:17 | university | 163:25 164:2,7,22 | 37:20 76:7 83:3 | 39:9 56:11,13 65:13 |
| 128:11,17 129:11 | 9:15 10:24 30:5,6 | 165:8,10,13,19,22 | 86:24 | 65:17 73:10,19 |
| 131:15,17 132:1,19 | 31:22 | 165:22,23,24 167:2 | various | 131:22,22 137:22 |
| 137:1 138:1 140:22 | unnecessarily | 167:5,8,22 168:5 | 105:23 | 139:20 244:15 |
| 140:24 141:5 | 112:16 | 170:20,24,24 172:4 | vary | views |
| 147:21 151:2 153:3 | unpredictable | 172:8,9 173:1,4 | 146:1 | 54:5 |
| 153:5,12,20 154:6 | 190:23 | 175:10,19 176:6 | vast | visit |
| 154:6 156:3 159:22 | unquote | 177:2,15,17 178:2 | 46:23 106:8 | 108:21,25 194:22 |
| 163:9 177:9 187:24 | 50:24 115:3 189:13 | 178:9,15,23 179:7 | vehicle | visits |
| 197:23 203:2 204:5 | unreal | 179:10,16 180:1,3 | 184:23 230:18 | 118:14 194:20 |
| 206:7 209:16 210:2 | 243:5 | 180:24,24 181:2,11 | 231:13,17 | visual |
| 212:4 213:4 221:18 | unwieldy | 186:1 226:11 | vehicles | 60:10 247:24 |
| 223:18 234:25 | 24:23 | users | 115:7 184:9,11,14 | vivid |
| 237:6 239:20 | updating | 118:5 167:5 194:10 | 184:16 185:6,19,25 | 186:18 |
| 246:19 | 89:13 | 206:4,5 | 192:12 | Volume |
| understanding | upgrading | user's | vehicular | 1:18 2:18 |
| 13:12,18 64:7 65:2 | 47:17 | 84:21,22 91:5,6 | 192:2 | vs |
| 67:16 72:23 93:7 | upper | 150:11 164:22 | velocity | 1:5,10 2:5,10 |
| 98:13 99:18 100:7 | 174:4,11 | uses | 226:3 228:20,25 |  |
| 113:1 114:20 | usage | 65:18 93:25,25 | 229:4,7,9 | W |
| 117:21 128:9 129:4 | 97:2,4 | 97:15,18 157:10 | verb | waiting |
| 132:15,25 134:1,3 | use | 184:13 198:14,15 | 153:11 | 193:9 |
| 134:7 137:3 139:25 | 31:8,14 32:20 33:10 | utilities | Verizon | walk |
| 140:11 141:2 | 33:25 34:13,20 | 118:10 194:17 | 39:25,25 40:1,19 | 44:20 |
| 142:25 152:16 | 36:21 37:9,10 | utilizing | 41:3,5,11,13,15,17 | walked |
| 153:6,19 154:18 | 39:10 40:19 65:11 | 231:18 | 42:11,14 43:7,9 | 186:20 |
| 156:12 157:16 | 67:21 70:20 72:12 | U.s | 44:19,23 51:1 | Wall |
| 158:4,22,24 159:1 | 73:2,8,11 74:13,18 | 8:1,3,6,9 | versus | 248:2,7 |
| 159:13,19 160:6,11 | 74:20 77:9,20 | U/ Long | 6:7 92:3 96:17 | Wanner |
| 160:15 162:11,20 | 91:18 96:10,11 | 84:9 | 100:15 | 1:21 2:21 252:24 |
| 188:10 192:1 | 97:3,7 98:4,5,11,20 |  | vertex | want |
| 199:13 200:8 | 99:3 100:15,15 | V | 77:14 | 7:23 12:21 13:24 |
| 202:13 204:20 | 101:23 102:5,9 | vacuum | vertices | 17:22 21:10 24:20 |
| 205:17,20 207:5 | 106:5 116:5 140:2 | 141:5 | 65:12,20 66:1,6,22 | 34:9 39:7,7,15 |
| 213:11 221:16 | 141:4 149:24 | vague | 67:3,5 72:25 77:10 | 64:23 108:21,23 |
| 222:6,10,11 223:2 | 157:12 158:8 | 41:22 138:9 | 77:13 | 109:3 112:15,16 |
| 227:19 228:19,23 | 168:19 169:11,19 | validity | video | 136:22 145:25 |
| 229:5 | 176:16 178:13 | 160:23 161:5 | 148:11 | 157:21 162:4 |
| understood | 179:24 184:13 | van | videographer | 163:15 174:6,10,23 |
| 23:24 26:8 115:14 | 191:21 198:22 | 81:7,12 108:1 | 3:12 6:4,15,23 7:12 | 174:24 175:1 |
| 183:1 198:1 212:12 | 208:8 210:2,25 | 235:15 236:4,11,17 | 51:10,13 79:23 | 192:23 196:4 |
| 221:18 224:8 | 211:6 212:4,12 | 236:19 237:15,15 | 80:3 120:19,22 | 197:10 209:6 215:9 |
| 237:12 | 226:9,10 229:13 | 239:1,7 240:9 | 148:13,18 181:16 | 215:16 216:3 230:3 |
| undertook | 235:19,25 239:4,21 | vans | 181:19 197:15 | wanted |
| 33:9 | 240:1,3 | 235:16,18 | 220:22 221:2 230:7 | 93:6 |
| uniform | usefulness | vantage | 230:10 248:15,18 | Washington |
| 180:4 | 240:25 | 36:16 | 248:25 | 3:10 |


| wasn't | 85:8,16 | 89:4,6 90:19 91:8 | 4:2 7:13 10:9,17 | 62:1,4 63:7,14,23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 29:5 38:5 66:2 70:9 | well-known | 93:14,14 101:5 | 17:14,20 19:6,9 | 69:11 84:1 115:9 |
| 157:21 166:10,10 | 120:16 188:8 | 103:4,5 107:15,24 | 40:4 42:6 50:18 | 116:9 151:16 185:9 |
| 246:10 | well-understood | 108:4,12 111:2,14 | 53:8 54:10 58:12 | worked |
| water | 159:10,24 | 111:14 119:7,8,9 | 59:3,12 60:16 | 14:24 15:1 34:15 |
| 77:17,21 221:21 | went | 135:25 136:5,7,10 | 62:21 63:17 66:8 | working |
| waves | 61:21 241:15 | 141:10,22 142:7,15 | 70:4 73:7 74:1 | 32:6 61:11 149:5 |
| 105:9 | weren't | 147:11,22 149:23 | 79:1,10 80:19 | 151:6,23 |
| way | 157:24 | 150:16,20,21,21 | 85:21 86:12 88:10 | world |
| 26:22 36:20 41:13 | West | 171:11 172:3 | 94:18 95:12 98:7 | 216:10 |
| 43:6 74:22 75:19 | 2:19 6:13 | 173:11,18 175:16 | 99:22 110:7 124:18 | worldwide |
| 76:18 80:21 83:12 | we'll | 177:1 180:15,16,17 | 125:1 126:22,25 | 33:5 36:14 |
| 84:9 87:13 95:21 | 14:4 21:24 33:21 | 180:22 181:6,8 | 128:19 129:2 | world-wide |
| 103:12 106:21 | 95:7 137:18 139:19 | 183:2 188:15,17 | 131:20 134:7 136:9 | 33:4 |
| 107:8,15 109:4 | 183:18 | 204:16,18,21 205:5 | 139:11,24 140:20 | worried |
| 110:12,21 113:20 | we're | 205:18 206:4,4,14 | 141:20 142:1,11 | 38:20 |
| 115:15 122:25 | 23:24 29:3 51:10,13 | 206:24 207:1 | 143:11 145:25 | worse |
| 125:3 132:14 | 58:14 70:16 72:24 | 214:23 224:7 | 146:6 150:19 156:1 | 112:12 |
| 136:13 153:4 | 79:25 80:3 85:11 | 229:15 233:17,18 | 156:25 162:3 | wouldn't |
| 165:17 167:14,16 | 85:25 86:3,5,6,6 | 234:8,9,23 235:8 | 164:17 170:11 | 112:13 211:25 |
| 170:16,22 176:16 | 95:15,16 98:23 | 235:11,22 236:13 | 171:13 179:21 | 237:22 243:8 |
| 179:9 180:25 | 101:11,18,18,19 | 236:23 237:3,23 | 180:11 182:18 | 245:13,14 |
| 183:21 186:19 | 119:22 120:19 | 238:3,5,9,11,15,19 | 187:24 188:19 | write |
| 189:3 190:1,18 | 145:5 147:18 | 239:19 240:16,18 | 189:6,10 196:16,24 | 25:16 26:24 69:5 |
| 207:25 209:10 | 148:20 155:7 169:8 | 240:21,23 241:20 | 197:23 205:8 | 70:11 204:4 213:19 |
| 210:5 211:10,24 | 169:8 174:21 | 241:21 242:3,5 | 206:18 209:8 212:9 | writing |
| 223:3,4 235:15 | 176:14,14,19 | 243:14 244:2,5,16 | 214:17 216:18 | 69:13,14,19 70:25 |
| 240:8 247:23 | 181:19 190:6 193:7 | 244:23,25 245:4,5 | 223:14 224:15 | 71:21 |
| ways | 196:22 220:21,24 | 245:15,21 246:12 | 225:12 226:8 231:6 | writings |
| 67:19,20 188:14 | 221:4,24 222:22 | 246:13,14,16,23 | 232:10 239:25 | 93:3 |
| weak | 230:7,10 238:13,23 | 247:3,5 248:6 | 243:4,18 245:19 | written |
| 105:15 | 243:4,13 248:15,18 | WI FI-enabled | 246:19 247:10 | 70:8 71:10 92:15 |
| weaker | we've | 83:19 85:6 149:24 | 250:4 252:18 | 152:20 153:25 |
| 85:17 | 51:7 76:17 197:7 | wild | witnesses | 156:13,18,19 |
| wearing | 236:20 | 248:3 | 252:5 | 157:18 202:9,10 |
| 245:14 | whatsoever | wireless | word | 204:14 206:2 |
| week | 180:7 218:4 | 1:3,11 2:3,11 6:6 7:5 | 65:3 92:6 96:11 | 223:16 |
| 21:4 | what-if | 7:7 20:7 31:6,8,13 | 98:20 100:15,16 | wrong |
| weight | 155:8 | 31:16 32:5,8,12,15 | 101:23 191:7 204:3 | 96:10 100:22 195:7 |
| 82:1,23 84:3 85:16 | WHEREOF | 32:17,20,23 33:2 | 208:8 216:7,12 | wrote |
| 86:15 87:12 | 252:18 | 33:14,21,23,25 | 223:23 235:5 | 70:7,21 99:19 121:9 |
| weighted | white | 34:7,11,12,16,19 | words | 161:25 162:4 |
| 77:25 78:6,12,16,22 | 119:10,21 173:20 | 35:1,6 36:2,3,5,10 | 85:7 93:17 97:16,19 | 223:11 234:2 |
| 79:6 80:12,15,25 | 175:17 184:3 | 36:12 37:1,17,24 | 97:23,25 99:4,4 |  |
| 81:2,21,23 82:11 | whoever's | 38:14,17,18 41:6 | 134:9,14 144:24 | X |
| 83:9,16,18 84:20 | 168:8 | 42:14 43:7 50:2 | 157:10,18 158:2 | x |
| 85:12 86:8,13 87:1 | wide | 51:21 52:6,24 | 173:13 181:4,5 | 4:1,7 134:24 164:23 |
| 87:17,24 126:5,6 | 191:17 192:7 | 105:7 149:5 150:6 | 223:15 241:7 | 165:8,18 174:3,10 |
| 126:10,18 127:7 | wife | 150:22 151:3,6,9 | work | 174:12,13,15 |
| 226:1,25 227:16,20 | 9:21,22 18:5,24 | 151:13,17,21,24 | 16:22 18:8,17,19 | 232:18 252:14 |
| weighted-by-signal | WIFI | 152:3,9 | 19:18,21,24 20:2,5 | Xs |
| 79:18 | 35:13 49:7,12,13,23 | wishes | 20:8,11 30:12,16 | 177:5,7,8 |
| weighting | 49:25 51:2 68:4 | 6:21 | 30:16 32:15 34:10 |  |
| 82:9,12 83:22 84:5,8 | 77:9 84:20 88:3,5 | witness | 47:15 61:7,12,21 | Y |


| yeah | 205:21 224:2 | 99:5,20,24 100:17 | 4:10,12 | 197:18,21 198:14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45:25 54:25 105:6 | 225:16 229:1 | 12965 | 2009 | 198:15 220:23 |
| 121:7 126:22 128:3 | 1,000 | 1:22 2:22 252:25 | 4:16 | 3:21 |
| 163:17 166:22 | 240:18 245:15 | 137 | 2011 | 181:17 |
| 172:16 173:25 | 1.5 | 233:11 | 1:17 2:21 4:18,20,24 | 3:30 |
| 174:15,25 189:10 | 18:10 | 14 | 5:2 6:1,11 250:11 | 181:20 |
| 190:16 196:14 | 1:10-cv-11571-R... | 4:16,18,20,24 5:2 | 202.373.6000 | 301 |
| 228:11 | 1:5 2:5 | 180:12 | 3:11 | 117:1,3 |
| year | 1:30 | 14th | 2020 | 302 |
| 14:22 247:16 | 120:23 | 127:9 | 3:10 | 116:12,14 |
| years | 1;10-CV-11571-R... | 15 | 21 | 304 |
| 9:10 17:15,20 18:8 | 6:10 | 118:22 | 103:1 189:12 | 116:10,12,15,20,23 |
| 18:22,25 31:18,21 | 10 | 15th | 22 | 175:21 185:18 |
| 31:23 32:10 149:4 | 82:4,6,7,8 84:6,7 | 241:9,12,13,25 | 1:17 2:21 4:21 6:1 | 186:9 |
| 150:3 151:5,16,18 | 110:22 164:4 | 242:16,24 244:4,6 | 80:5 112:20 180:12 | 305 |
| 152:3 | 10s | 152 | 22nd | 116:10,13,15,20,23 |
| yesterday | 95:1,2,9,10 101:15 | 78:9,18,19,25 80:9 | 6:11 | 175:22 185:18 |
| 16:13 20:23 21:3 | 102:18,22 | 154 | 23 | 186:9 |
| 28:5 128:5 | 10,000-foot | 60:22 | 151:15,18 | 306 |
| yield | 91:11 92:11 93:1 | 155 | 245 | 185:20 186:2 |
| 103:18 | 10:07 | 68:1 | 52:10 80:20 82:17 | 307 |
| York | 51:11 | 172844 | 148:4 183:15 224:2 | 185:21 186:2 |
| 102:21 | 10:17 | 1:23 | 225:16 | 308 |
|  | 51:14 | 1800 | 25 | 185:24 |
| Z | 100 | 3:5 | 197:15 | 309 |
| Zavislak | 50:7,8,10,12,15,21 | 19 | 26 | 185:24 |
| 3:13 7:11,11 | 100,000-foot | 4:10 | 24:25 130:2,18 | 31 |
| zero | 36:8 | 1968 | 131:4 132:5 148:25 | 182:21 |
| 98:23 | 108 | 30:4 | 26,000 | 310.277.1010 |
| \$ | 55:3 60:10 | 1970 | 62:22 | 3:6 |
|  | 11 | 30:5 | 27 | 33 |
| \$1.6 | 54:25 55:25 60:12 | 1973 | 130:18 131:5 132:5 | 198:18 |
| 18:1100,000 | 11:11 $80: 1$ | 30:7 | $28^{152: 11}$ | $4$ |
| 19:1 | 11:15 | 2 | 117:23 130:7,18 | 4 |
| \$20,000 | 80:4 | 2 | 131:5 132:5 | 4:14,15 8:9,11 31:3 |
| 17:9 | 12 | 4:11 8:3,5 51:17 | 29 | 73:15 117:20,21 |
| \$600 | 80:19 83:11,13 | 53:9,12,15 62:7 | 161:16 | 118:5,17 119:13,14 |
| 17:7 | 226:25 227:4 | 88:21 92:25 93:9 |  | 119:23 164:4 |
| \$600,000 | 12:24 | 148:14 163:14,19 | 3 | 173:15 174:15 |
| 18:23 | 120:20 | 2:15 | 3 | 175:8,20 176:6 |
|  | 121 | 148:16 | 4:13 8:6,8 59:15 | 177:2,13 178:9,16 |
| 0 | 221:11 | 2:24 | 60:5 86:7 114:10 | 181:23,25 182:2,9 |
| 0407 | 123 | 148:21 | 114:14,16,21 115:3 | 182:13,17 193:6,8 |
| 9:2 | 223:6 224:13 | 20 | 116:4 117:11 119:6 | 193:13,24 194:11 |
|  | 125 | 4:10,12,14 88:23 | 119:12 148:4,18 | 194:25,25 195:13 |
| 1 | 230:14,15 | 89:1 91:17 97:25 | 173:15 175:12,15 | 196:20 197:18,19 |
| 1 | 127 | 98:4,9,20,21 129:3 | 176:7 177:3,13 | 198:5,11,14 221:2 |
| 1:18 2:18 4:9,19 6:5 | 60:21 | 129:8 | 178:9,16 181:23,25 | 4:00 |
| 8:1,2,16,17 33:1 | 128 | 20006 | 182:3,11,13,17 | 197:8 |
| 73:15 79:24 81:14 | 96:1 97:3,14 98:5 | 3:10 | 183:14,19,21,24,24 | 4:30 |
| 114:11 150:7 | 99:3 | 2007 | 184:1,22 185:17,18 | 220:25 |
| 163: 14,18 174:8,9 |  | 4:14 | 186:6,19 193:6,7 | 4:39 |
| 180:8,11 204:17 | 94:5 97:5,18,21,22 | 2008 | 193:12,16,22 197:5 | 221:5 |


| 4:58 | 57 | 52:10 162:14 237:9 | 802.11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 230:8 | 163:14,15,18,19 |  | 150:20 |
| 40 | 58 | 7 | 811 |
| 31:18 | 25:13,18,24 26:9 | 7 | 60:19 |
| 402 | 59 | 4:5,12,21 5:2 22:5 | 84 |
| 2:19 6:13 119:24 | 25:13,24 26:9 | 22:22,24 72:1 | 198:22 199:1,5 |
| 120:5 | 132:22 134:4,7 | 84:19 86:7 112:19 | 203:17 215:4 |
| 41 | 136:14,15,19 | 114:23 184:5,6 | 85 |
| 80:20 |  | 227:25 | 198:25 199:7 |
| 42 | 6 | 7,305,245 | 86 |
| 81:15 | 6 | 4:13 | 203:4,16 |
| 45 | 4:16,19 8:15,19 29:9 | 7,414,988 | 87 |
| 150:7,7 | 29:12 82:16 86:7 | 4:9 | 203:22 |
| 48 | 88:15,20,21 97:24 | 7,433,694 | 897 |
| 4:20 | 102:25 164:1 165:5 | 4:11 | 52:10 |
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| 4:17 8:12,14 23:25 | 78:4 148:24 149:1 | 5:2 163:2 | 9:00 |
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| 5:07 | 25:4,20 114:25 | 171:7,13,20,23 | 90s |
| 230:11 | 148:24 149:9,10 | 7414988 | 70:2 |
| 5:36 | 62 | 8:1 | 900 |
| 248:16 | 25:13,24 26:9 64:12 | 7433694 | 2:19 3:5 6:13 |
| 5:40 | 64:21 66:12 | 8:4 | 90067 |
| 248:19 | 63 | 7474897 | 3:6 |
| 5:41 | 25:18 162:7 | 8:10 | 92037 |
| 2:20 6:2 249:4,5 | 64 | 75 | 9:6 |
| 50 | 114:23 166:23 | 50:13 179:12,19 | 92093 |
| 10:4,5 50:5,9 | 6473 | 762 | 9:3 |
| 500 | 9:5 | 60:19,20 | 92101 |
| 240:16,20 241:11,14 | 65 | 78 | 6:14 |
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