EXHIBIT B

1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS TYLER DIVISION		
3		,	
4	WI-LAN, INC.)	DOCKET NO. 6:10cv521
5	-vs-)	Tyler, Texas
6	ALCATEL-LUCENT USA, INC., ET AL)	8:47 a.m. July 9, 2013
7	******	•	_
•	LIT I AND TING	\	
8	WI-LAN, INC.)	DOCKET NO. 6:13cv252
9	-vs-)	
10	HTC CORPORATION, ET AL)	
11			
12			
13			
14	MORNING SESSION BEFORE THE HONORABLE LEONARD DAVIS, UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE, AND A JURY		
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
	COLUMN DEPONDED C.	MG GIITI	a. GLOAN
20	I		Y WERLINGER
21		211 W. Ferguson Tyler, Texas 75702	
22	•	shea_sl	oan@txed.uscourts.gov
23			
24	Proceedings taken by Machine Stenotype; transcript was produced by a Computer.		
25	produced by a computer.		

- 1 THE COURT: All right. I apologize for
- 2 keeping you waiting. I really don't like to do that,
- 3 but we had a very important matter we had to take up
- 4 just with counsel. So know we've been working, although
- 5 you've had an extra long morning break there, but I will
- 6 give you another break later, though, so that doesn't
- 7 count.
- 8 All right. We'll continue with this
- 9 witness. You may proceed, Counsel.
- 10 MR. BORGMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
- JONATHAN WELLS, Ph.D., PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS,
- 12 PREVIOUSLY SWORN
- 13 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 14 BY MR. BORGMAN:
- Q. Good morning, Dr. Wells.
- 16 A. Good morning.
- 17 Q. When we left off, I think we were about to
- 18 start on the '211 patent, correct?
- 19 A. That's right, I think we were.
- Q. All right. And we've got Claim 5 up here.
- 21 Can you -- well, actually before I start going
- 22 to the '211 patent, there were a couple of additional
- 23 acronyms I had on my list I wanted to ask you about.
- 24 One of them was UMTS. Do you remember that?
- 25 A. Yes, I do.

- 1 Q. And what does UMTS mean?
- 2 A. UMTS stands for universal mobile
- 3 telecommunications system.
- 4 Q. How does that fit into about what we heard 1G,
- 5 2G, 3G, LTE, et cetera?
- 6 A. UMTS is the name given to -- general name
- 7 given to what we call the 3G system, everything that's
- 8 under the 3GPP moniker.
- 9 Q. All right. Now, yesterday we also heard
- 10 something about fixed access systems.
- 11 A. Yeah.
- 12 Q. Do you remember that testimony?
- 13 A. Yes. That's right.
- 14 Q. All right. Are the patents -- any of the
- 15 patents limited to fixed access systems?
- 16 A. No, they're not.
- Q. All right. Now, let's start off with the '211
- 18 patent.
- Can you tell us generally what the '211 patent
- 20 relates to?
- A. Yes, I can.
- So we talked yesterday about the first two
- 23 patents, the '326, the '819. These -- recall I talked
- 24 about these being from a cell tower, a base station
- 25 transmitting data down. The smart TDM data down to a

- 1 subscriber unit. This '211 patent is about the
- 2 subscriber unit, the handset that actually receives this
- 3 data.
- So it's -- in many ways, it's very closely
- 5 related to the other two. In fact, it's a mirror.
- 6 Everything that you'd expect to have on the
- 7 transmission. With all the various steps you go through
- 8 for transmission, you would expect to have those on
- 9 reception as well, because it would have to go through
- 10 those in an opposite order to un-code the signal.
- 11 Q. Now, Dr. Wells, is it possible to quickly walk
- 12 us through the different elements in this Claim 5 of the
- 13 '211 patent?
- 14 A. Yes, I can.
- 15 So this is a subscriber terminal. It has an
- 16 orthogonal code generator, a first decoder, a TDM
- 17 decoder. It then goes on to have an overlay code
- 18 generator, a second decoder as well. These are the
- 19 elements. And as I said, it kind of mirrors to what we
- 20 saw yesterday.
- Q. All right. Now, we've talked a bit about the
- 22 Court's claim construction. Remember that?
- 23 A. (Nods head affirmatively.)
- Q. All right. Are there any claim terms we need
- 25 to talk about here?

1 A. Yes. There's one new claim term here, which

- 2 is specific for the '211, and that's a TDM decoder. We
- 3 talked yesterday about a TDM encoder. This is a TDM
- 4 decoder. And the Court has construed this as hardware
- 5 and/or software for extracting a data item from a
- 6 channel that has been encoded using TDM techniques.
- 7 And then just for reference, I've put the
- 8 definition of TDM techniques, which we used yesterday.
- 9 So what this is basically saying is it's for decoding a
- 10 channel that's been encoded with that TDM techniques.
- 11 O. All right. Let's start with the first element
- 12 of Claim 5. Can you tell us what this is?
- 13 A. Yes. So this is the first element. Again,
- 14 I've broken this claim up into these -- these different
- 15 elements. The first one is 5(a), a subscriber terminal
- 16 of a wireless telecommunications system, comprising a
- 17 reception controller.
- 18 Q. And do the HTC mobile phones have a reception
- 19 controller?
- 20 A. Yes, they do. So, again, remember this is in
- 21 the context of the HSDPA standards. They define how
- 22 data is transmitted in a system. Of course, you have to
- 23 have a subscriber that's able to receive that system.
- 24 And -- which is what I'm showing here. We
- 25 looked yesterday about how there has to be a

- 1 that's what we're going to see, right?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Okay. And, in fact, the patent even lists
- 4 examples of how the code works.
- 5 So if we look at Column 10, right -- and
- 6 that's how patents are organized, in columns and line
- 7 numbers, right?
- 8 It says Column 10 of the '326 patent?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. If we look down below, we see it's got a
- 11 table, and this is the RW codes or the orthogonal codes,
- 12 right?
- 13 A. Yes, that's right.
- 14 Q. All right. And then you have a separate table
- 15 with additional codes for the overlay, which we find in
- 16 Column 15, Table 2, the overlay codes, a separate table
- 17 of codes for the overlay, right?
- 18 A. That's right. In this example, we do.
- 19 Q. All right. And the way that would work, just
- 20 like the structure we saw in the claims, is that you
- 21 would first use -- or you would use the orthogonal
- 22 codes, and then you would use the overlay codes in
- 23 whatever order you want, right?
- MR. BORGMAN: Objection, Your Honor. May
- 25 we approach?

- THE COURT: Yes, you may.
- (Bench conference.)
- MR. BORGMAN: This is a limine issue,
- 4 Your Honor. We've got a limine motion and order about
- 5 suggesting that the claims require something different
- 6 than the claim construction or saying things that are
- 7 contrary to the claim construction order.
- Mr. Arovas's question just went to the
- 9 order in which the overlay codes and the orthogonal
- 10 codes have to be applied. And in your order, it says
- 11 that they can be applied simultaneously; they do not
- 12 have to be applied in seriatim.
- 13 MR. AROVAS: I say in any order, but I'm
- 14 happy to reask the question and say simultaneously.
- 15 That wasn't the intent.
- THE COURT: All right. Reask the
- 17 question.
- 18 (Bench conference concluded.)
- 19 Q. (By Mr. Arovas) Okay. So going back to what
- 20 we were talking about, so when we look at the examples
- 21 in the specification, you see there's a set of
- 22 orthogonal codes, a different set of overlay codes; and
- 23 you can apply them in any order or simultaneously, but
- 24 there's two sets, right?
- 25 A. In -- in this embodiment, yes.

- Q. Okay. And, in fact, if we were to go through
- 2 the entire specification, we wouldn't find any example
- 3 that uses one code to both contain the orthogonal and
- 4 the overlay code, right?
- 5 A. Well, there's examples in there about how
- 6 codes can be mixed together.
- 7 Q. Okay. Here's my question, okay? It's a fact
- 8 that there isn't any example or embodiment in any of the
- 9 patents-in-suit that disclose the orthogonal code and
- 10 the overlay code to be a single code, correct?
- 11 A. The answer to that is no -- I beg your pardon.
- 12 The -- you are correct.
- 13 Q. I'm correct. There isn't a single example
- 14 that uses the orthogonal code and the overlay code to be
- 15 a single code, right?
- 16 A. That's right. There's examples of how you can
- 17 mix codes together, but you are correct.
- 18 Q. Okay. So now let's turn to some of your
- 19 allegations where you compare the claims to -- and I'll
- 20 just leave this up here in case we need to refer to
- 21 it -- when you compare the claims to the accused
- 22 products, okay?
- 23 So first let's talk about Alcatel-Lucent.
- 24 And so I think you explained on direct, as you did in
- 25 your deposition, that you were relying on the same

1 under oath, in your deposition, you said that it's a

- 2 single spreading operation? Right?
- 3 A. I did, but I tried to put that in context on
- 4 my --
- 5 Q. I understand your position that one can be
- 6 two, okay; and that you say that there's two functions.
- 7 But let's just talk about the spreading operation.
- 8 It is a fact that this single structure performs a
- 9 single spreading operation with a single OVSF code;
- 10 isn't that right?
- 11 A. I feel uncomfortable answering this as a yes
- 12 or no, but yes.
- 13 Q. Okay. And, in fact, if we go to the
- 14 Alcatel-Lucent product, you would see the same thing:
- 15 Single structure, single OVSF code, single spreading
- 16 operation, correct?
- 17 A. Performing the --
- 18 Q. I understand your position, that two-in-one,
- 19 but let's just -- but let's just talk about how the
- 20 products work.
- 21 Single structure, single OVSF code, single
- 22 spreading operation in the Alcatel-Lucent products,
- 23 correct?
- MR. BORGMAN: Your Honor, may we
- 25 approach?

```
1
                  THE COURT: Yes, you may.
 2
                  (Bench conference.)
 3
                  MR. BORGMAN: We are getting back to the
   motion in limine involving the simultaneous operation.
                  In the Court's claim construction, the
   Court held that the claims do allow simultaneous
   operations.
                  Mr. Arovas' question says I understand
 8
    that's your position, but he's suggesting that that's
10
   not allowed by the Court.
11
                  MR. AROVAS: That's not our position at
12
   all. Our position is there are two encoders. There are
   two sets of codes. Whether you apply them at the same
14 time or not, is not the point.
                  The point is, it's one code, one encoder
15
16 applied once. I think it's fair cross-examination.
                  THE COURT: Okay. You can clean it up on
17
18
   cross-examination.
                  MR. BORGMAN: All right.
19
20
                   (Bench conference concluded.)
21
              (By Mr. Arovas) Okay. Let's pick up where we
         Q.
22
    left off, and I want to be crystal-clear: I'm not
    talking about order here.
23
```

You can use one code first, another code --

25 you can use the orthogonal code first and the overlay

- 1 codes second; the overlay code -- I'm sorry -- the
- 2 orthogonal first -- you can use the orthogonal first,
- 3 the overlay second; the overlay first, the orthogonal
- 4 second. You can do them simultaneously.
- 5 I'm not suggesting anything about order, okay?
- 6 A. Okay.
- 7 Q. Okay. But what we know is for both the
- 8 Ericsson and the Alcatel-Lucent products, as well as the
- 9 handset products, the structure that's the
- 10 encoder/decoder, single structure, uses single OVSF
- 11 code, and a single spreading operation, correct?
- 12 A. Well, yes.
- 13 Q. Thank you.
- 14 So now let's talk very briefly about where
- 15 those codes are or where they sort of physically reside
- 16 in the products. And it's correct, isn't it, that the
- 17 Defendants' products basically have an on-the-fly system
- 18 where they generate the codes as they need them, right?
- 19 A. Yes, they do.
- 20 Q. Okay. So whether you're talking about the
- 21 Alcatel-Lucent products, the Ericsson products, or the
- 22 HTC or Sony Mobile products, it's a fact that none of
- 23 those products store at any one point in time the entire
- 24 set of orthogonal codes, correct?
- 25 A. I mean, that's not required by the claims,