

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

**LG ELECTRONICS INC.**

Petitioner,

v.

**JAWBONE INNOVATIONS, LLC,**

Patent Owner.

---

IPR2023-01110

U.S. Patent No. 7,246,058

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW  
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,246,058**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                                                           | Page No. |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| INTRODUCTION-----                                                                                         | 1        |
| I. BACKGROUND -----                                                                                       | 2        |
| A. Using Microphones and Tissue Sensors Together to Detect<br>Voiced and Unvoiced Speech Was Known. ----- | 3        |
| B. Using Cross Correlation to Determine Whether a Desired<br>Signal Is Present Was Known. -----           | 5        |
| C. Using Two Microphones and Differences in Signal Strength to<br>Detect Speech Was Known. -----          | 6        |
| II. THE '058 PATENT -----                                                                                 | 11       |
| A. Overview -----                                                                                         | 11       |
| B. Prosecution History -----                                                                              | 14       |
| III. STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED -----                                                                  | 15       |
| A. Grounds -----                                                                                          | 15       |
| B. The References Are Prior Art.-----                                                                     | 15       |
| C. The Asserted References Are Analogous Art. -----                                                       | 16       |
| IV. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL-----                                                                          | 16       |
| V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION -----                                                                               | 17       |
| VI. GROUNDS FOR UNPATENTABILITY -----                                                                     | 18       |
| A. Ground 1a: Holzrichter, Takano, and Kinsler -----                                                      | 18       |
| 1. Claim 1 -----                                                                                          | 18       |
| a. Preamble -----                                                                                         | 18       |
| b. At Least Two Microphones -----                                                                         | 18       |

|      |                                                                                                          |    |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| c.   | Voicing Sensor That Receives Physiological Information Associated With Human Voicing Activity            | 26 |
| d.   | Processor Coupled Among the Microphones and the Voicing Sensor-----                                      | 27 |
| i.   | Generating Cross Correlation Data Between the Physiological Information and an Acoustic Signal-----      | 27 |
| ii.  | Identifying Information as Voiced Speech -----                                                           | 34 |
| iii. | Generating Difference Parameters Between the Acoustic Signals Received at Each of the Two Receivers----- | 35 |
| iv.  | Identifying Information as Unvoiced Speech When the Difference Parameters Exceed a Gain Threshold -----  | 36 |
| v.   | Identifying Information as Noise When the Difference Parameters Are Less Than the Gain Threshold -----   | 39 |
| 2.   | Claim 2 -----                                                                                            | 40 |
| 3.   | Claim 3 -----                                                                                            | 40 |
| 4.   | Claim 4 -----                                                                                            | 41 |
| 5.   | Claim 5 -----                                                                                            | 42 |
| B.   | Ground 1b: Holzrichter, Takano, Kinsler, and Lyons -----                                                 | 43 |
| 1.   | Claim 3 -----                                                                                            | 43 |
| C.   | Ground 2a: Holzrichter, Torick, Kaneda, and Kinsler -----                                                | 47 |
| 1.   | Claim 1 -----                                                                                            | 47 |
| a.   | At Least Two Microphones -----                                                                           | 47 |

|       |                                                                                                          |    |
|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| b.    | Generating Difference Parameters Between the Acoustic Signals Received at Each of the Two Receivers----- | 51 |
| c.    | Identifying Information as Unvoiced Speech When the Difference Parameters Exceed a Gain Threshold -----  | 53 |
| d.    | Identifying Information as Noise When the Difference Parameters Are Less Than the Gain Threshold-----    | 54 |
| 2.    | Claim 2 -----                                                                                            | 55 |
| 3.    | Claim 4 -----                                                                                            | 55 |
| 4.    | Claim 5 -----                                                                                            | 55 |
| D.    | Ground 2b: Holzrichter, Torick, Kaneda, Kinsler, and Lyons -----                                         | 55 |
| 1.    | Claim 3 -----                                                                                            | 55 |
| VII.  | SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NONOBVIOUSNESS -----                                                         | 56 |
| VIII. | DISCRETIONARY DENIAL UNDER § 314(a) IS NOT APPROPRIATE.-----                                             | 56 |
| A.    | Factor 1: Potential Stay-----                                                                            | 57 |
| B.    | Factor 2: Proximity of Trial to FWD -----                                                                | 58 |
| C.    | Factor 3: Investment in Parallel Proceeding-----                                                         | 59 |
| D.    | Factor 4: Overlapping Issues -----                                                                       | 60 |
| E.    | Factor 5: The Parties-----                                                                               | 60 |
| F.    | Factor 6: Other Circumstances -----                                                                      | 61 |
| IX.   | DISCRETIONARY DENIAL UNDER § 325(d) IS NOT APPROPRIATE.-----                                             | 61 |
| X.    | MANDATORY NOTICES-----                                                                                   | 62 |

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,246,058

|                                 |                                                       |    |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|----|
| A.                              | Real Party-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)) ----- | 62 |
| B.                              | Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)) -----        | 62 |
| C.                              | Lead and Backup Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3))----- | 64 |
| D.                              | Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4)) -----    | 65 |
| E.                              | Payment of Fees Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.103 -----  | 65 |
| F.                              | Grounds for Standing Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)----- | 65 |
| CONCLUSION -----                |                                                       | 65 |
| CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE ----- |                                                       | 67 |

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| <i>Cases</i>                                                                                                        | <i>Page(s):</i> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| <i>Amazon.com, Inc. v. Jawbone Innovations, LLC</i> ,<br>IPR2023-00222, Paper 1 (PTAB Nov. 17, 2022)-----           | 2               |
| <i>Amazon.com, Inc. v. Jawbone Innovations, LLC</i> ,<br>IPR2023-00222, Paper 7 (PTAB May 24, 2023)-----            | 57, 61, 64      |
| <i>Apple v. Fintiv</i> ,<br>IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 20, 2020)-----                                   | <i>passim</i>   |
| <i>Cal. Inst. Of Tech. v. Broadcom Ltd.</i> ,<br>25 F.4th 976 (Fed. Cir. 2022) -----                                | 60              |
| <i>GAF Materials LLC v. Kirsch Research and Dev., LLC</i> ,<br>IPR2021-00192, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. May 25, 2021)----- | 58              |
| <i>Global Tel*Link Corp. v. HLFIP Holding, Inc.</i> ,<br>IPR 2021-00444, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. Jul. 22, 2021) -----    | 58              |
| <i>Google LLC v. Jawbone Innovations, LLC</i> ,<br>IPR2022-00623, Paper 12 (PTAB Oct. 31, 2022)-----                | 57, 61, 64      |
| <i>In re GPAC Inc.</i> ,<br>57 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1995)-----                                                      | 16              |
| <i>Haliburton Energy Servs., Inc., v. U.S. Well Servs., LLC</i> ,<br>IPR2021-01036, Paper 12 (Jan. 19, 2022)-----   | 62              |
| <i>Huawei Techs. Co. v. WSOU Investments, LLC</i> ,<br>IPR2021-00226, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. June 10, 2021)-----        | 60              |
| <i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> ,<br>550 U.S. 398 (2007)-----                                                 | 25, 33, 50, 52  |
| <i>Leapfrog Enters. v. Fisher-Price, Inc.</i> ,<br>485 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2007)-----                              | 56              |
| <i>Newell Cos. v. Kenney Mfg. Co.</i> ,<br>864 F.2d 757 (Fed. Cir. 1988)-----                                       | 56              |

|                                                                                                                                        |        |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| <i>Nidec Motor Corp. v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co. Ltd.</i> ,<br>868 F.3d 1013 (Fed. Cir. 2017) -----                             | 17     |
| <i>PNC Bank, N.A., v. United Services Auto. Ass’n</i> ,<br>IPR2022-00075, Paper 21 (June 13, 2022) -----                               | 62     |
| <i>Qualcomm Inc. v. UNM Rainforest Innovations</i> ,<br>IPR2021-00582, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 27, 2021)-----                          | 59     |
| <i>Samsung Elec. Am. Inc. v. Snik LLC</i> ,<br>IPR2020-01428, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 9, 2021) -----                                   | 60     |
| <i>Sand Revolution II, LLC v. Cont’l Intermodal Group-Trucking LLC</i> ,<br>IPR2019-01393, Paper 24 (PTAB June 16, 2020)-----          | 60     |
| <i>Skechers U.S.A., Inc. v. Nike, Inc.</i> ,<br>IPR2021-00160, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. May 19, 2021) -----                                  | 58     |
| <i>Snap, Inc. v. SRK Tech. LLC</i> ,<br>IPR2020-00819, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 21, 2020) -----                                         | 59     |
| <i>Uniloc 2017 LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc.</i> ,<br>No. 2:19-cv-00259-JRG-RSP, 2020 WL 1433960<br>(E.D. Tex. March 24, 2020) ----- | 57     |
| <i>Unwired Planet, LLC v. Google Inc.</i> ,<br>841 F.3d 995 (Fed. Cir. 2016) -----                                                     | 16     |
| <i>Vivid Techs., Inc. v. Am. Sci. &amp; Eng’g, Inc.</i> ,<br>200 F.3d 795 (Fed. Cir. 1999) -----                                       | 17     |
| <br><i>Statutes and Rules:</i>                                                                                                         |        |
| 35 U.S.C. § 102 -----                                                                                                                  | 16     |
| 35 U.S.C. § 103 -----                                                                                                                  | 15     |
| 35 U.S.C. § 112 -----                                                                                                                  | 17     |
| 35 U.S.C. § 325 -----                                                                                                                  | 61, 62 |

## TABLE OF EXHIBITS

| Exhibit No. | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1001        | U.S. Patent No. 7,246,058 (“the ’058 patent”)                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| 1002        | Declaration of Richard Stern, Ph.D.                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 1003        | U.S. Patent No. 6,006,175 (“Holzrichter”)                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| 1004        | Excerpts from Kinsler, Lawrence E., et al., FUNDAMENTALS OF ACOUSTICS (Wiley 1982) (“Kinsler”)                                                                                                                                                   |
| 1005        | Certified Translation of Japanese Patent Application Publication No. H-11-305792 (“Takano”)                                                                                                                                                      |
| 1006        | Torick, E.L., et al., <i>An Interphone System for “Hands Free” Operation in High Ambient Noise</i> , 14 <i>IEEE Transactions on Audio and Electroacoustics</i> 4 (Dec. 1966) (“Torick”)                                                          |
| 1007        | U.S. Patent No. 5,208,864 (“Kaneda”)                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 1008        | Lyons, Richard G., UNDERSTANDING DIGITAL SIGNAL PROCESSING (Addison-Wesley 1997) (“Lyons”)                                                                                                                                                       |
| 1009        | Excerpts from David Crystal, THE PENGUIN DICTIONARY OF LANGUAGE, SECOND EDITION (Penguin Books 1999)                                                                                                                                             |
| 1010        | Gregory C. Burnett, <i>The Physiological Basis of Glottal Electromagnetic Micropower Sensors (GEMS) and Their Use in Defining an Excitation Function for the Human Vocal Tract</i> , Dissertation, University of California at Davis (Jan. 1999) |
| 1011        | U.S. Patent No. 6,542,857                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| 1012        | U.S. Patent No. 7,283,948                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| 1013        | Excerpts from Michael J. Chapman <i>et al.</i> SIGNAL PROCESSING IN ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS (Horwood Publishing Limited 1997)                                                                                                                  |

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,246,058

|      |                                                                                                                                        |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1014 | The '058 Patent's File History                                                                                                         |
| 1015 | Excerpts from Paul A. Lynn, AN INTRODUCTION TO THE ANALYSIS AND PROCESSING OF SIGNALS, SECOND EDITION<br><br>(Macmillan 1982) ("Lynn") |
| 1016 | U.S. Patent No. 5,809,455                                                                                                              |
| 1017 | Curriculum Vitae of Richard Stern, Ph.D.                                                                                               |
| 1018 | Japanese Patent Application Publication No. H-11-305792                                                                                |
| 1019 | Declaration of Carol Peterson Regarding Kinsler, Lyons, and Torick                                                                     |
| 1020 | Declaration of Brian Toth Regarding English Translation of Japanese Patent App. Pub. No. H-11-305792                                   |

Petitioner LG Electronics Inc. (“LGE” or “Petitioner”) requests *inter partes* review (“IPR”) of Claims 1-5 of U.S. Patent No. 7,246,058 (“the ’058 patent”), which Jawbone Innovations, LLC (“Patent Owner” or “PO”) purportedly owns.

## INTRODUCTION

Voiced speech—speech sounds produced using vocal fold vibration—and unvoiced speech—speech sounds made without vocal fold vibrations—are well known categories of human speech. (Ex. 1009.) The challenged claims recite a system for identifying voiced and unvoiced speech using conventional components that were widely known in the art: a “voicing sensor” and two microphones.

In 1996, Professor John F. Holzrichter at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory filed a patent application for a system that uses a voicing sensor and a microphone together to detect voiced and unvoiced speech. (Ex. 1003.) That patent issued in 1999 and is assigned to the Regents of the University of California. (*Id.*)

Gregory C. Burnett (“Burnett”) worked under Dr. Holzrichter at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory for years on research related to the voicing sensor invented by Dr. Holzrichter. (Ex. 1010; Ex. 1011 (listing Holzrichter and Burnett as co-inventors); Ex. 1012 (same).) Burnett even thanked “the efforts and enthusiasm of John Holzrichter” for “tirelessly [] promot[ing] this new sensor and its possible applications” and suggesting “several experiments” in his Ph.D. dissertation. (Ex. 1010, v.)

In 2001, after leaving Dr. Holzrichter's lab, Burnett filed the '058 patent, which describes nothing more than known uses of the very sensor that Dr. Holzrichter developed. (Ex. 1001.) The '058 patent, which identifies Burnett as the sole inventor, describes trivial changes to the system described in Dr. Holzrichter's patent. For example, Burnett's '058 patent describes using two microphones instead of one microphone and processing data using the conventional mathematical technique of cross-correlation. But two-microphone systems for detecting speech were disclosed as early as 1966 and cross-correlation for audio processing was described as early as 1982. (Ex. 1006, 169, Ex. 1004, 252, 257; Ex. 1013, 231-237.) Thus, Burnett's '058 patent merely combines Dr. Holzrichter's known sensor with well-known signal processing features in a conventional manner. The challenged claims were obvious to a person skilled in the art in view of Holzrichter's teachings, and the Board should cancel the claims.

## **I. BACKGROUND<sup>1</sup>**

---


<sup>1</sup> Sections I-VII and IX of this petition are substantively identical to the corresponding sections of the petition in *Amazon.com, Inc. v. Jawbone Innovations, LLC*, IPR2023-00222, Paper 1 (PTAB Nov. 17, 2022), which Petitioner seeks to join pursuant to the motion for joinder and consolidation filed concurrently herewith.

**A. Using Microphones and Tissue Sensors Together to Detect Voiced and Unvoiced Speech Was Known.**

Dr. Holzrichter's patent issued in 1999. That patent described a system and sensor for detecting voiced and unvoiced speech in the presence of varying background noise. (Ex. 1003; Ex. 1002 ¶ 38.) The system included **electromagnetic (EM) sensors directed towards the speech organs (69)** and a **traditional acoustic microphone (70)**. (Ex. 1003, 31:15-17 (disclosing "microphone 70"), 32:31-35 (disclosing "tongue and jaw motion EM sensors"), Fig. 19; Ex. 1002 ¶ 38.) The **EM sensors** use radar waves to detect physiological information associated with human voicing activity, such as jaw, tongue, and vocal fold motions. (Ex. 1003, 32:31-35, 8:1-24, claim 42; Ex. 1002 ¶ 38.)

To identify voiced and unvoiced speech, Holzrichter describes separating a portion of the audio signal received from **microphone 70** into a frame. (Ex. 1003, 31:61-63; Ex. 1002 ¶ 39.) Then, Holzrichter's system determines if the strength (also known as the "gain") of the output signal in that frame exceeds **a preset threshold (73)** and is lower than a **noise threshold (77)**. (Ex. 1003, 31:67-32:4; Ex. 1002 ¶ 39.) If the gain exceeds the preset threshold (73) and is lower than a noise threshold (77), then the system identifies the frame as speech. (Ex. 1003, 31:67-32:10; Ex. 1002 ¶ 39.) If the gain is not within these thresholds, then the system can **discard the frame as noise (81)**. (Ex. 1003, 33:43-46; Ex. 1002 ¶ 39.)

For frames identified as speech, Holzrichter's system determines whether the speech is voiced or unvoiced. (Ex. 1003, 31:67-32:10; Ex. 1002 ¶ 40.) This determination is made by an algorithm that "looks for vocal fold motion to occur within the same speech time period[.]" (Ex. 1003, 31:67-32:4, Fig. 19 (box 79); Ex. 1002 ¶ 40.) If vocal movements occurred at the same time as the speech frame, Holzrichter's system identifies the frame as **voiced speech (78)**. (Ex. 1003, 32:4-7; Ex. 1002 ¶ 40.) If no vocal movements occurred, the frame is labeled as **nonvoiced speech (79)**. (Ex. 1003, 32:7-10; Ex. 1002 ¶ 40.) Holzrichter explains that speech organ location information "can be *correlated with* simultaneous acoustic word signals from a microphone." (Ex. 1003, 26:44-27:4 (emphasis added); Ex. 1002 ¶ 40.) Thus, Holzrichter discloses a method of detecting voiced and unvoiced speech based on the correlation between physiological information (vocal movements as detected by a voicing sensor) and acoustic speech signals (as detected by a microphone). (Ex. 1002 ¶ 40.) This process is shown in Holzrichter's Figure 19:



(Ex. 1003, Fig. 19 (annotated); Ex. 1002 ¶ 40.) Holzrichter shows that it was known in the art to: (a) compare the strength of a microphone signal to a threshold and identify the signal as speech when a threshold is exceeded; and (b) correlate physiological vocal movements with an acoustic signal to determine whether the speech is voiced or unvoiced. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 40.)


## B. Using Cross Correlation to Determine Whether a Desired Signal Is Present Was Known.

Although Holzrichter does not describe using a specific mathematical function for correlating the vocal fold movements and microphone signals, various correlation functions were well known in the art. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 41.) For decades, the cross-correlation function has been used to determine whether a desired signal (e.g.,

speech) is present. (*Id.*) For example, 40 years ago, Kinsler disclosed methods of detecting a known signal, such as human speech, in an acoustic sample. (Ex. 1004; Ex. 1002 ¶ 41.) Kinsler explained that the “optimum processing system” to search for a “known signal” in a “received signal” is through “cross correlation.” (Ex. 1004, 256; Ex. 1002 ¶ 41.) Kinsler taught that the cross-correlation method is used to calculate a value using a “cross correlation” function,  $F(T)$ . (Ex. 1004, 256; Ex. 1002 ¶ 41.) The value is then compared against a threshold. (Ex. 1004, 252, 256-57; Ex. 1002 ¶ 41.) If the converted value meets or exceeds the threshold, then the desired signal (*e.g.*, speech) is present in the noise. (Ex. 1004, 252, 257; Ex. 1002 ¶ 41.)

**C. Using Two Microphones and Differences in Signal Strength to Detect Speech Was Known.**

Although the system described in Holzrichter used a single microphone, similar systems that used two microphones were widely known. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 42.) For example, Takano, which published in 1999, disclosed a speech recognition system having **two microphones**. (*Id.*) Takano described placing these microphones in a headset with **microphone 1** located closer to a user’s mouth and **microphone 2** located farther away from the user’s mouth (*e.g.*, near the user’s ear). (Ex. 1005, [0022], [0050]-[0052]; Ex. 1002 ¶ 42.) An example is shown in Takano’s Figure 6:



(Ex. 1005, Fig. 6 (annotated); Ex. 1002 ¶ 42.)

Takano discloses using the spatial difference between microphones to detect speech. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 43.) Specifically, the system receives acoustic signals at each microphone and splits each signal into different frequency components. (Ex. 1005, [0009], [0023-0025], Figs. 7, 16, 17; Ex. 1002 ¶ 43.) For each frequency component, the system calculates a “level difference” between the two signals. (Ex. 1005, [0009], [0023-0025], Figs. 7, 16, 17; Ex. 1002 ¶ 43.) Because **microphone 1** is positioned closer to the user’s mouth, the “level difference in the outputs of the microphones 1 and 2 for a sound from the sound source of the target signal is large,” while the “the level difference in the outputs of the microphones 1 and 2 due to noise is zero or minimal.” (Ex. 1005, [0022], [0015]; Ex. 1002 ¶ 43.)

Takano teaches that the **level difference** can be compared against **a threshold** to identify a signal as speech or noise. (Ex. 1005, [0009] (“level difference for each frequency component is compared to a preset threshold value by a sound source frequency component selection means”), [0023-0025], Figs. 7, 17; Ex. 1002 ¶ 44.)

When the level difference exceeds **a threshold**, Takano identifies the signal as **speech**. (Ex. 1005, [0009], [0023-0025], Figs. 7, 17; Ex. 1002 ¶ 44.) If the level difference is lower than the threshold, Takano’s system identifies the signal as **noise**. (Ex. 1005, [0015] (“the output level difference between the two microphones arising due to the target signal is always larger than the level difference of the output level difference of the two microphones arising due to noise”), [0023-0025], Figs. 7, 17; Ex. 1002 ¶ 44.)

Takano further teaches that the threshold “can be determined experimentally.” (Ex. 1005, [0026]; Ex. 1002 ¶ 45.) Takano’s method of calculating the “level difference” and comparing it to a threshold to determine whether a signal is speech or noise is shown in Takano’s Figure 9:




FIG. 9

(Ex. 1005, Fig. 9 (annotated); Ex. 1002 ¶ 45.)

As another example, Torick—which published over 50 years ago—disclosed a system for detecting “speech sounds” using two microphones. (Ex. 1006, 169; Ex. 1002 ¶ 46.) One microphone is used to detect speech, while the other is “used to sense the ambient noise.” (Ex. 1006, 169; Ex. 1002 ¶ 46.)




Fig. 4. Crew member's amplifier and control unit.

(Ex. 1006, Fig. 4 (annotated); Ex. 1002 ¶ 46.)

“The noise-sensing microphone output is amplified and equalized to correspond to the far-field response of the noise-cancelling speech microphone. The outputs of both microphones are then continuously compared.” (Ex. 1006, 169; Ex. 1002 ¶ 47.) When the signals from the two microphones are equal, the system determines that no speech is occurring. (Ex. 1006, 169; Ex. 1002 ¶ 47.) However, when speech sounds occur at the speech microphone, the level between the two microphones is no longer equal and speech is detected. (Ex. 1006, 169; Ex. 1002 ¶ 47.) Torick explains that “this is analogous to the presence of a virtual threshold which rises and falls with corresponding changes in noise levels.” (Ex. 1006, 169; Ex. 1002 ¶ 47.)

Kaneda, which published in 1993, is another example. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 48.) Kaneda disclosed that speech can be distinguished from noise based on the “power P1 of the output from [a] first microphone” and the “power P2 of the output from [a] second microphone.” (Ex. 1007, 2:1-22, Fig. 3(a)-3(c); Ex. 1002 ¶ 48.) Kaneda explained that “a difference PD ( $=P1-P2$ ) between the short time powers P1 and P2 of the two signals is calculated. When the power difference PD is larger than a given threshold value Pth17, a corresponding time period 18 is detected as a speech period.” (Ex. 1007, 2:13-18; Ex. 1002 ¶ 48.) If the power difference is lower than the threshold, the period is identified as noise. (Ex. 1007, 1:51-68, 2:1-22, Fig. 3(a)-3(c); Ex. 1002 ¶ 48.)

As these references demonstrate, it was widely known in the art to calculate a difference in gain (power) between acoustic signals received at two microphones and identify the signal as speech when that difference exceeds a threshold and as noise when that difference is less than the threshold. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 49.)

## **II. THE '058 PATENT**

### **A. Overview**

Like Holzrichter, the '058 patent describes a system for detecting voiced and unvoiced speech using acoustic and non-acoustic (*e.g.*, physiological) sensors. (Ex. 1001, Abstract, Figs. 1, 3; Ex. 1002 ¶ 51.) The system includes a **processor (30)**

connected to **acoustic microphones 10 (MIC 1 and MIC 2)** and a **voicing sensor 20 (VAD)**:




Figure 1

(Ex. 1001, Fig. 1 (annotated); Ex. 1002 ¶ 51.) The **acoustic microphones 10 (MIC 1 and MIC 2)** receive acoustic signals ( $m_1(n)$  and  $m_2(n)$ ), while the **voicing sensor 20 (VAD)** receives physiological information associated with human voicing activity, such as vocal fold vibrations:




Figure 3

(Ex. 1001, Fig. 3 (annotated), 2:30-37, 3:64-4:13, 5:26-29; Ex. 1002 ¶ 51.) The **voicing sensor 20** may take several forms, including a radio frequency (radar) sensor. (Ex. 1001, 3:64-66; Ex. 1002 ¶ 51.) The **acoustic microphones 10** are placed in a headset with MIC 1 placed closer to the user's mouth and MIC 2 placed farther away from the user's mouth, as shown in Figure 7:




**Figure 7**

(Ex. 1001, Fig. 7, 7:52-67 (“the difference in signal strength in Mic 1 and Mic 2 ... will be proportional to both  $d_1$  and  $\Delta d$ ”), 8:16-17 (the gain increases when the user is speaking because “Mic 1 is closer to the mouth than Mic 2”); Ex. 1002 ¶ 51.)

**Processor 30** processes the signals in two ways. First, it generates cross correlation data correlating the physiological information from the **voicing sensor** and an acoustic signal received from one of the acoustic **microphones**. (Ex. 1001, 4:64-5:3, 5:11-25; Ex. 1002 ¶ 52.) **Processor 30** compares the cross correlation data to a threshold and, if the correlation data exceeds the threshold, the processor

identifies information in the acoustic signal as voiced speech. (Ex. 1001, 5:39-45; Ex. 1002 ¶ 52.)

Second, the processor generates difference parameters, which represent a relative difference in signal gain between the acoustic signals at the two microphones, by comparing portions of the acoustic signals. (Ex. 1001, 5:39-45, 7:52-67; Ex. 1002 ¶ 53.) The processor compares the difference parameters to a predetermined gain threshold and, if the difference parameters exceed the threshold, the processor identifies information in the acoustic signals as unvoiced speech. (Ex. 1001, 8:21-48, Fig. 4; Ex. 1002 ¶ 53.) If the difference parameters are less than the gain threshold, the processor identifies the acoustic signals as noise. (Ex. 1001, 8:41-43; Ex. 1002 ¶ 53.) The processor may then remove the identified noise (noise removal 340). (Ex. 1001, 7:18-19; Ex. 1002 ¶ 53.)

## **B. Prosecution History**

The application that issued as the '058 patent was filed on May 30, 2002. (Ex. 1014, 296-333.) After the PTO rejected all claims as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,590,241 (“Park”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,233,551 (“Cho”), the applicant argued that Park fails to disclose using two microphones and voicing activity detection. (*Id.*, 131.) The applicant further argued that Cho fails to disclose using two microphones and detecting voiced and unvoiced speech, as claimed. (*Id.*, 132.) The PTO maintained its rejection of claims 1-5, but withdrew the rejection of original claims

6 and 7 without any explanation. (*Id.*, 114-119.) However, the only feature that claim 6 added to claim 5 was the use of a voicing sensor to generate cross correlation data, which was well known in the art. Despite this, the '058 patent was issued on July 17, 2007 with the allowed claims and a few additional new dependent claims. (Ex. 1001.)

### III. STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED

#### A. Grounds

The Board should cancel the claims under § 103 as follows:

| Ground | Claims Challenged | References                                  |
|--------|-------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 1a     | 1-5               | Holzrichter, Takano, Kinsler                |
| 1b     | 3                 | Holzrichter, Takano, Kinsler, Lyons         |
| 2a     | 1, 2, 4, 5        | Holzrichter, Torick, Kaneda, Kinsler        |
| 2b     | 3                 | Holzrichter, Torick, Kaneda, Kinsler, Lyons |

#### B. The References Are Prior Art.

The '058 patent was filed May 30, 2002, claiming priority to ten U.S. provisional patent applications, the earliest of which is U.S. Provisional No. 60/294,383, filed May 30, 2001. (Ex. 1001; Ex. 1002 ¶ 55.) Thus, the earliest possible priority date for the '058 patent is May 30, 2001.<sup>2</sup> All of the references in

---

<sup>2</sup> Petitioner does not concede the claims are entitled to the claimed priority date.

the Grounds are prior art under pre-AIA § 102(b) because they published more than one year earlier:

- (1) Holzrichter published on December 21, 1999 (Ex. 1003);
- (2) Kinsler published in 1982 (Ex. 1004; Ex. 1019 ¶¶ 16-27);
- (3) Takano published on November 5, 1999 (Ex. 1005);
- (4) Torick published in December 1966 (Ex. 1006; Ex. 1019 ¶¶ 28-39);
- (5) Kaneda published on May 4, 1993 (Ex. 1007); and
- (6) Lyons published in 1997 (Ex. 1008; Ex. 1019 ¶¶ 40-55).

**C. The Asserted References Are Analogous Art.**

The references are analogous art because they are from the same field as the '058 patent, *e.g.*, processing audio signals. (Ex. 1002 ¶¶ 24, 57; Ex. 1001, 1:18-19); *Unwired Planet, LLC v. Google Inc.*, 841 F.3d 995, 1000 (Fed. Cir. 2016). They are also pertinent to a problem the inventor was focused on, *e.g.*, enhancing the quality of audio signals using signal processing techniques. (Ex. 1002 ¶¶ 24, 57; Ex. 1001, Abstract, 1:34-47.)

**IV. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL**

Based on the relevant factors, *In re GPAC Inc.*, 57 F.3d 1573, 1579 (Fed. Cir. 1995), a person of ordinary skill in the art (“POSITA”) would have had a minimum of a bachelor’s degree in computer engineering, computer science, electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, or a similar field, and approximately three

years of industry or academic experience in a field related to acoustics, speech recognition, speech detection, or signal processing. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 32.) Work experience can substitute for formal education and additional formal education can substitute for work experience. (*Id.*)

## V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

Although the parties may propose constructions for certain terms in the litigation for purposes of determining infringement, no claim terms require construction to resolve the obviousness challenges here.<sup>3</sup> *Nidec Motor Corp. v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co. Ltd.*, 868 F.3d 1013, 1017 (Fed. Cir. 2017); *Vivid Techs., Inc. v. Am. Sci. & Eng'g, Inc.*, 200 F.3d 795, 803 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

---

<sup>3</sup> In the litigation, the parties may dispute whether some challenged claims are invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 112. For purposes of this proceeding only, Petitioner assumes the claims are not invalid under § 112.

## **VI. GROUNDS FOR UNPATENTABILITY**

### **A. Ground 1a: Holzrichter, Takano, and Kinsler**

Holzrichter, Takano, and Kinsler render claims 1-5 obvious. (Ex. 1002 ¶¶ 59-114.)

#### **1. Claim 1**

##### **a. Preamble**

The preamble recites “a system for detecting voiced and unvoiced speech in acoustic signals having varying levels of background noise.” Holzrichter discloses such a system. (Ex. 1002 ¶¶ 60-62.)

Holzrichter discloses a system and method for detecting the “start of speech, end of speech, identification of voiced or unvoiced phoneme, presence of pause, and extraneous noise presence.” (Ex. 1003, 15:62-65, Fig. 19, 22:6-28, 31:8-14 (“Fig. 19 illustrates one method for determining the onset of speech, noise rejection, voiced-unvoiced speech, end of speech, and pauses using acoustic and non-acoustic information together.”), 34:41-67 (discussing a “voiced-unvoiced algorithm”), 52:66-53:2 (discussing a method for determining whether “voiced speech, or unvoiced speech, or speech or background noise” has occurred), Table II, Figs. 9A-9B; Ex. 1002 ¶¶ 61-62.)

##### **b. At Least Two Microphones**

Claim 1 recites “at least two microphones that receive the acoustic signals[.]” Holzrichter discloses using a microphone for receiving acoustic signals. (Ex. 1003,


31:15-17; Ex. 1002 ¶ 64.) However, it would have been obvious to improve Holzrichter's system by adding a second microphone as disclosed in Takano. (Ex. 1002 ¶¶ 63-78.) As described below, such a modification would improve Holzrichter's methods for classifying input signals as either noise or speech based on signal strength. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 64.)

Holzrichter discloses a microphone (70) for receiving acoustic signals. (Ex. 1003, 31:15-17 (“The acoustic information from microphone 70 is inputted into an acoustic speech sensor, A/D converter and 1 sec. memory 71.”), 8:50-9:3 (Holzrichter's systems can include “microphones against the human face and neck”), 31:67-32:4, Fig. 19; Ex. 1002 ¶ 65.) After receiving the acoustic signal, Holzrichter's system uses the strength of the signal to determine whether the signal is noise or speech. (*Id.*, 31:67-32:10, Fig. 19; Ex. 1002 ¶ 65.) Specifically, if the received “signal exceeds a preset threshold 73, but ... is less than a loud noise threshold 77,” then the system identifies the signal as speech. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 65.)

Holzrichter's Figure 19 illustrates this process. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 66.) As shown, sound is received by Holzrichter's **microphone 70**. (*Id.*, ¶ 66.) The system then checks the “acoustic energy” in the signal (**steps 73 and 77**) to determine whether



[0015], [0023-0025], [0029], [0049]-[0051], Figs. 1, 6, 7, 16, 17, 18A; Ex. 1002 ¶67.) Takano's Figure 6 shows these microphones, which are virtually identical to the two microphones described in the '058 patent (Ex. 1002 ¶ 68):



Ex. 1005 (Takano), Fig. 6




**Figure 7**

Ex. 1001 ('058 Patent), Fig. 7

Takano's system receives acoustic signals at these two microphones and then, as in Holzrichter, uses the acoustic energy of the signals received by the microphones to determine whether the system should further analyze the signals for speech. (Ex. 1005, [0009], [0023-0025], [0014]-[0015], [0029], [0040]-[0042], [0049]-[0051], Figs. 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 16, 17, 18A; Ex. 1002 ¶ 69.). Takano's Figure 9 illustrates this process.

First, at **step S02**, Takano receives acoustic signals at its two microphones. (Ex. 1005, [0023] (explaining step S02 in Figure 7); *see also id.*, [0027], [0030] (explaining that overlapping steps in Figures 8 and 9 operate in the same manner as in Figure 7); Ex. 1002 ¶ 70.)

Then, in **steps S03 and S04**, the system splits the signal into different portions based on frequency and calculates the “level difference” of the two signals. (Ex. 1005 at [0023-0025]; *see also id.*, [0009] (“respective output signals of the first and second microphones are converted to amplitude spectra and phase spectra by first and second spectrum conversion means, and a level difference is calculated by a level difference calculation means for the amplitude spectrum of each frequency component outputted from the first and second spectrum conversion means”), [0040]-[0042]; Ex. 1002 ¶ 71.)

Next, in steps **S05, S06, and S07**, if the level difference exceeds a threshold, Takano determines the “target signal” (speech) is “dominant.” (Ex. 1002 ¶ 72.) If the level difference is below the threshold “the target signal is not dominant.” (Ex. 1005, [0025]; *see also id.*, [0009]) (“This level difference for each frequency component is compared to a preset threshold value by a sound source frequency component selection means, and a frequency component for which the level difference is greater than the threshold value is determined by the sound source frequency component selection means to be a frequency component for which the target signal is dominant.”), [0040]-[0042]; Ex. 1002 ¶ 72.)




FIG. 9

(Ex. 1005, Fig. 9 (annotated).) Thus, like the '058 patent, Takano discloses using two microphones to receive acoustic signals and then comparing the difference in the gain of the two microphones against a pre-set threshold to determine whether the signals are speech. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 72.)

A POSITA would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Holzrichter and Takano, and to add a second microphone to Holzrichter's system, because doing so would allow a POSITA to replace Holzrichter's method of distinguishing speech from noise using a single microphone (*e.g.*, steps 73 and 77) with Takano's improved method of distinguishing speech from noise using the level difference between two microphones (*e.g.*, Takano steps S02-S07). (Ex. 1002 ¶¶ 73-78.) Because Holzrichter already recognizes that the strength of acoustic signals (acoustic energy) could be used to determine whether a signal is speech or noise (Ex. 1003, 31:67-32:10, Fig. 19), a POSITA reading Holzrichter would have been motivated to look for improved methods for classifying signals as noise or speech based on signal strength, such as the system of Takano. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 73.) Because Takano's system for classifying noise or speech relies on the use of two microphones, a POSITA would be motivated to add a second microphone to the system of Holzrichter to use the methods described in Takano. (*Id.*) Indeed, the methods described in Takano have many advantages.

First, Takano explains that its two-microphone system assists in overcoming background noise and is more capable of distinguishing between a user's speech and noise. (Ex. 1005, [0001] ("The present invention relates to a sound collection device for suppressing ambient noise components in a sound source signal containing ambient noise and extracting a target signal, a voice recognition device which has

the sound collection function of the sound collection device and achieves a high recognition rate...”), [0008] (object of the invention is to have “a noise suppression processing function”), [0022]-[0029], [0059], Figs. 6A-6C; Ex. 1002 ¶ 74.) This would be particularly advantageous to Holzrichter’s system because it would allow Holzrichter’s system to perform additional processing only on audio samples that are more likely to be speech, thereby saving computing resources. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 74.)

Second, Takano discloses that using a second microphone provides better recovery of high-frequency components in voiced speech. (Ex. 1005, [0059]; Ex. 1002 ¶ 75.) A POSITA would have been motivated to include this improvement in Holzrichter because it would allow Holzrichter’s system to more accurately distinguish between speech and noise at high frequencies.

Third, the proposed combination represents nothing more than a predictable use of prior art elements according to established functions (*e.g.*, using two microphones to detect speech). (Ex. 1002 ¶ 76.)

Fourth, the combination represents nothing more than the simple addition of one known element (Takano’s second microphone) to another known element (Holzrichter’s system) to obtain predictable results. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 77); *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 417 (2007). Indeed, Takano’s second microphone would provide an improved method for something Holzrichter already contemplates, namely using the output strength of microphones to distinguish between noise and

speech. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 77.) Thus, the combination also reflects nothing more than a combination of known elements (microphones) to achieve an expected result (improved speech detection). (*Id.*)

A POSITA would have had reasonable expectation of success in combining Holzrichter and Takano because they relate to similar systems (systems for identifying acoustic signals such as speech or noise) and because the use of microphones to receive acoustic signals was well known in the art. (*Id.* ¶ 78.)

**c. Voicing Sensor That Receives Physiological Information Associated With Human Voicing Activity**

Claim 1 further recites “at least one voicing sensor that receives physiological information associated with human voicing activity[.]” Holzrichter discloses this limitation. (Ex. 1002 ¶¶ 79-80.)

Holzrichter discloses a radar sensor (EM sensor 68) that is used to detect voicing activity. (Ex. 1003, 32:31-35 (“An important example is that tongue and jaw motion EM sensors as shown in FIG. 4 (modules 21 and/or 22) and in FIG. 19 (modules 68, 83) can measure precursor motions of the tongue and/or jaw motion as they move to a position in preparation for the first sound”), Fig. 19, 9:23-54 (system uses “range gated EM Sensor (i.e., radar)”; *see also id.*, 8:25-49, , 10:50-65, 11:66-12:11, 31:17-18, Figs. 4, 5, 8A-C, 12, 13, 24A-B; Ex. 1002 ¶ 80.)

**d. Processor Coupled Among the Microphones and the Voicing Sensor**

Claim 1 next recites “at least one processor coupled among the microphones and the voicing sensor[.]” Holzrichter discloses this limitation. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 81.)

Holzrichter discloses a processor coupled to microphone 70 and EM sensors 68. (Ex. 1003, 31:15-20 (“The acoustic information from microphone 70 is inputted into an acoustic speech sensor, A/D converter and 1 sec. memory 71. Vocal fold motion information from EM sensor 69 is input into integrator and band pass filter 72. The processors make decisions as described below and as listed in Table I.”), 18:49-67, 9:55-10:14, 18:24-48, Figs. 5, 13; Ex. 1002 ¶ 82.) It would have been obvious to a POSITA that, when adding the second microphone of Takano to Holzrichter’s system, the microphone would be coupled to the processor to allow Holzrichter’s system to use the second microphone to identify noise and speech. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 82.) A POSITA would be motivated to do this for the reasons discussed above. (*Id.*; *supra* §VI.A.1.b.)

Claim 1 further recites that the processor performs five functions, each of which is addressed below.


**i. Generating Cross Correlation Data Between the Physiological Information and an Acoustic Signal**

Claim 1 recites that the processor “generates cross correlation data between the physiological information and an acoustic signal received at one of the two

microphones[.]” Holzrichter, alone or in combination with Kinsler, renders this limitation obvious. (Ex. 1002 ¶¶ 84-96.)





Holzrichter discloses that its system determines whether both speech and vocal fold motion are present within a certain speech frame based on the physiological information received at EM sensor 69 and an acoustic signal received at microphone 70. (Ex. 1003, 31:61-32:27 (“[T]he algorithm looks for vocal fold motion to occur within the same speech time period in box 79 .... If acoustics and vocal fold motion are present, then a voiced speech unit has occurred .... If satisfactory acoustics, but no vocal fold motion occurs in box 72, the sound in frame  $t_i$  is labeled as nonvoiced speech in box 79”), Figs. 19, 15A-15D; Ex. 1002 ¶ 85.) Figure 19 of Holzrichter illustrates this process.

In **step 72**, Holzrichter determines if vocal motion is occurring at the same time as the audio signal received by the microphone. (Ex. 1003, 31:61-32:27, Fig. 19; Ex. 1002 ¶ 86.) If vocal motion is present, Holzrichter identifies the acoustic signal as voiced speech (**step 78**). (Ex. 1003, 31:61-32:27, Fig. 19; Ex. 1002 ¶ 86.) If vocal motion is not present and Holzrichter previously identified the acoustic signal as speech, then Holzrichter identifies the acoustic signal as unvoiced speech (**step 79**). (Ex. 1003, 31:61-32:27, Fig. 19; Ex. 1002 ¶ 86.)



(Ex. 1003, Fig. 19 (annotated); Ex. 1002 ¶ 86.)

Holzrichter further discloses that the signal it receives from the EM throat sensor and the audio signal received by the microphone are closely correlated. (Ex. 1003, 26:44-27:4 (explaining “how easily” speech organ location information “can be correlated with simultaneous acoustic word signals from a microphone.”); *see also id.*, 17:4-23, 20:11-34, 26:44-27:4, 31:61-32:27; Ex. 1002 ¶ 87.) Holzrichter Figures 15A-D show the correlation between the two signals:



(Ex. 1003, Fig. 15A-D; Ex. 1002 ¶ 87.)

Although Holzrichter does not expressly state that the signals can be correlated using a cross correlation function, using such a function would have been obvious, particularly in view of Kinsler. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 88.)

Kinsler discloses that “the only way to decide if a signal is present” is to calculate an output  $A_1$  from a “detection system.” This output is then compared

against a “*threshold criterion*  $A_T$ ” such that “*if*  $A_I > A_T$  there is a signal present and if  $A_I < A_T$  there is no signal.” (Ex. 1004, 252, Ex. 1002 ¶ 89.) Kinsler then explains various types of detection systems and their application. (Ex. 1004, 255-257; Ex. 1002 ¶ 89.)

Kinsler discloses that the “optimum processing system” to search for a “known signal” (*e.g.*, the audio signal from a microphone) in a “received signal” (*e.g.*, the vocal movement signal from the EM sensor) is “cross correlation.” (Ex. 1004, 256; Ex. 1002 ¶ 90.) To use the cross-correlation method, first, a value (cross correlation data) is calculated using a cross correlation function,  $F(T)$ . (Ex. 1004, 256; Ex. 1002 ¶ 90.) The value can then be compared against the detection threshold (“DT”). (Ex. 1004, 252, 256-57; Ex. 1002 ¶ 90.) If the converted value meets or exceeds the threshold, then the two signals are correlated (*i.e.*, one signal is present in the other). (Ex. 1004, 252, 257, *see also id.*, 256 ( $F(T)$  “plays the role of the detection system output  $A$ ” for evaluating whether a signal is present); Ex. 1002 ¶ 90.)

A POSITA would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Holzrichter and Kinsler, and to use Kinsler’s “optimum processing system” to calculate cross correlation data using a cross correlation function to determine if the vocal movements detected by Holzrichter’s EM sensor correlate with the acoustic signal received by Holzrichter’s microphone. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 91.)

First, a POSITA would have been motivated by Holzrichter's disclosure that the vocal movements detected by Holzrichter's EM sensor are highly correlated with speech. (Ex. 1002 ¶¶ 91-96; Ex. 1003, 26:44-27:4 (explaining "how easily" speech organ location information "can be correlated with simultaneous acoustic word signals from a microphone."), 17:4-23, 20:11-34, 26:44-27:4, 31:61-32:27.) Based on this disclosure, a POSITA would have been motivated to look to other references, such as Kinsler, for methods of determining when two signals are correlated with each other so that the system of Holzrichter can detect when the signal received by Holzrichter's microphone is voiced speech. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 92.)

Second, a POSITA would have been motivated by Kinsler's disclosure that its method is the "optimum processing system" for determining if two signals are correlated. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 93.) Indeed, the cross-correlation function disclosed by Kinsler is a well-known method of determining whether signals are correlated. (*Id.*; Ex. 1015, 113-116; Ex. 1002 ¶ 93.) A POSITA would have understood that Kinsler's methods would have been a more accurate way of determining that two signals were correlated than Holzrichter's determination that the audio and vocal movement signals occurred at the same time. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 93.) For example, using Kinsler's methods would prevent Holzrichter's system from identifying sound from Holzrichter's microphone that occurred at the same time as some non-voicing vocal movements (such as swallowing) as voice speech. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 93.) Thus, a POSITA

would have used Kinsler's teachings to improve Holzrichter's method of correlating signals. (*Id.*)

Third, the proposed combination represents nothing more than a predictable use of prior art elements according to established functions (*e.g.*, determining if an audio signal and a vocal movement signal are correlated using a cross-correlation function). (Ex. 1002 ¶ 94.)

Fourth, the combination represents nothing more than the simple addition of one known element (Kinsler's cross-correlation methods) to another known element (Holzrichter's system) to obtain predictable results (identifying when an acoustic signal and a vocal movement signal are correlated). (Ex. 1002 ¶ 95); *KSR*, 550 U.S. at 417. Indeed, the addition of Kinsler's methods to Holzrichter would simply improve what Holzrichter already contemplates—correlating an acoustic signal and a vocal movement signal. (Ex. 1002 ¶95.) Thus, the combination also reflects nothing more than a combination of known elements to achieve an expected result. (*Id.*)


A POSITA would have had a reasonable expectation of success in combining Holzrichter and Kinsler because Holzrichter expressly recognizes that the signals could be “easily” correlated (Ex. 1003, 26:44-27:4; Ex. 1002 ¶ 96) and because the cross-correlation function was widely known and used by those of skill in the art (Ex. 1002 ¶ 96; *see also* Ex. 1013, 231-237). Additionally, processors, like those in

Holzrichter, commonly perform mathematical functions like cross correlation on audio signals. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 96.) Thus, a POSITA would reasonable expect that Holzrichter's system could perform cross correlation. (*Id.*)

## ii. Identifying Information as Voiced Speech

Claim 1 recites that the processor "identifies information of the acoustic signals as voiced speech when the cross correlation data corresponding to a portion of the acoustic signal received at the one receiver exceeds a correlation threshold[.]" Holzrichter combined with Kinsler discloses this limitation. (Ex. 1002 ¶¶ 97-99.)

Holzrichter discloses that its system identifies information in the acoustic signal as voiced speech when it determines that the vocal motion signal is correlated to the acoustic signal. (Ex. 1003, 31:61-32:27, Figs. 19, 15A-15D; Ex. 1002 ¶ 98.)



(Ex. 1003, Fig. 19 (annotated); Ex. 1002 ¶ 98.) Kinsler discloses that the optimum way to determine whether two signals are correlated is to calculate a value (cross correlation data) using a cross correlation function  $F(T)$  and then compare it against a threshold DT. (Ex. 1004, 252, 256-257; Ex. 1002 ¶ 98.) If the value exceeds the threshold, then the two signals are correlated (*i.e.*, one signal is present in the other). (Ex. 1004, 252, 257; Ex. 1002 ¶ 98.)

Thus, Holzrichter combined with Kinsler discloses that identifying information in the acoustic signal as voiced speech when the cross correlation data (the value of  $F(t)$ ) exceeds a threshold (DT). (Ex. 1002 ¶ 99.) A POSITA would be motivated to combine Kinsler and Holzrichter, and to use Kinsler's cross correlation analysis, for the reasons discussed above. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 99; *supra* §VI.A.1.d.1.)

**iii. Generating Difference Parameters  
Between the Acoustic Signals Received at  
Each of the Two Receivers**

Claim 1 recites that the processor “generates difference parameters between the acoustic signals received at each of the two receivers, wherein the difference parameters are representative of the relative difference in signal gain between portions of the received acoustic signals[.]” Holzrichter combined with Takano discloses this limitation. (Ex. 1002 ¶¶ 100-102.)

Takano discloses calculating a “level difference” (difference parameters) for each frequency component of the signals it receives at its two microphones (portions

of the received acoustic signals). (Ex. 1005, [0009], [0023]-[0024], [0014]-[0015], [0029], [0040]-[0042] [0049]-[0051], Figs. 1, 6, 7, 16, 17, 18A; Ex. 1002 ¶ 101.) This “level difference” is calculated based on the difference in “amplitude spectrum components” (*i.e.*, gain) of the two signals. (*Id.*) Thus, the level differences calculated by Takano are difference parameters that are representative of the relative difference in signal gain between portions of the received acoustic signals. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 101.)


As explained above, *supra* §VI.A.1.b., a POSITA would have been motivated to incorporate the second microphone of Takano and Takano’s associated methods into Holzrichter to allow Holzrichter to more accurately identify an acoustic signal as speech for further processing. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 102.)

**iv. Identifying Information as Unvoiced  
Speech When the Difference Parameters  
Exceed a Gain Threshold**

Claim 1 recites that the processor “identifies information of the acoustic signals as unvoiced speech when the difference parameters exceed a gain threshold[.]” Holzrichter combined with Takano discloses this limitation. (Ex. 1002 ¶¶ 103-106.)

Holzrichter discloses that the strength of the output signal can be used to determine whether the signal is noise or speech. (Ex. 1003, 31:67-32, Fig. 19; Ex. 1002 ¶ 104.) Specifically, Holzrichter identifies information of the acoustic signals

as unvoiced speech when the strength of the received acoustic signal “exceeds a preset threshold 73” and no vocal motion is present. (Ex. 1003, 31:61-32:27; Ex. 1002 ¶ 104.) Holzrichter illustrates this process in Figure 19, where Holzrichter’s system identifies speech as unvoiced speech (**step 79**) if it determines the strength of the output signal from the microphone is adequate (**steps 73 and 77**). (Ex. 1002 ¶ 104.)



(Ex. 1003, Fig. 19 (annotated); Ex. 1002 ¶ 104.)

As discussed above, Holzrichter does not disclose the use of a second microphone or the claimed difference parameters. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 105.) But Takano does. (*Id.*) Takano discloses that the “level difference  $\Delta LR(\omega_i)$ ” (difference

parameter) is compared against a threshold “Th( $\omega_i$ ).” (Ex. 1005, [0009], [0023]-[0025]; *see also id.*, [0014]-[0015], [0029], [0040]-[0042] [0049]-[0051], Figs. 1, 6, 7, 16, 17, 18A; Ex. 1002 ¶ 105.) If the level difference exceeds the threshold, “the target signal is dominant,” meaning that the signal is identified as speech. (Ex. 1005, [0025]; *see also id.*, [0014]-[0015], [0029], [0040]-[0042] [0049]-[0051], Figs. 1, 6, 7, 16, 17, 18A; Ex. 1002 ¶ 105.) Takano’s Figure 9 shows this process:




FIG. 9

(Ex. 1005, Fig. 9 (annotated); Ex. 1002 ¶ 105.)

As explained above, *supra* §VI.A.1.b., a POSITA would have been motivated to use the two microphone system of Takano in place of the single microphone system of Holzrichter to determine if an acoustic signal is noise or speech. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 106.) In such a combination, a POSITA would have replaced Holzrichter's evaluation of the output strength of a single microphone (*e.g.*, Holzrichter steps 73 and 77) with Takano's improved evaluation of the level difference between two microphones (*e.g.*, Takano steps S04-S07). (*Id.*) The combined system would identify a signal as unvoiced speech only when the level difference of the two microphones exceeds a threshold. (*Id.*) Thus, a POSITA would have understood that the combined system would identify information of the acoustic signals as unvoiced speech when the difference parameters exceed a gain threshold. (*Id.*)

**v. Identifying Information as Noise When  
the Difference Parameters Are Less Than  
the Gain Threshold**

Claim 1 recites that the processor “identifies information of the acoustic signals as noise when the difference parameters are less than the gain threshold.” Holzrichter combined with Takano discloses this limitation. (Ex. 1002 ¶¶ 107-108.) Takano discloses that, when the level difference is lower than the threshold, “the target signal is not dominant,” meaning that the signal is identified as noise instead of speech. (Ex. 1005, [0025], [0022] (“the level difference in the outputs

from the microphones 1 and 2 due to noise is zero or minimal”), [0014]-[0015], [0029], [0040]-[0042] [0049]-[0051], Figs. 1, 6, 7, 16, 17, 18A; Ex. 1002 ¶ 108.) As discussed above, *supra* §VI.A.1.b., it would have been obvious to a POSITA to incorporate this feature of Takano into Holzrichter’s system. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 108.)

## **2. Claim 2**

Independent claim 2 is similar to claim 1, except it is a method claim. Thus, claim 2 is obvious for the same reasons as claim 1. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 109; *supra* §VI.A.1.)

## **3. Claim 3**

Claim 3 depends from claim 2 but adds the step of “generating the gain threshold using standard deviations corresponding to the generation of the difference parameters.” Holzrichter combined with Takano discloses or renders obvious this limitation. (Ex. 1002 ¶¶ 110-111.)

Takano teaches that its threshold “can be determined experimentally.” (Ex. 1005, [0026]; Ex. 1002 ¶ 111.) A POSITA would have known that one way of determining the threshold empirically is to measure the “level difference” generated by Takano in various circumstances and then calculate the threshold based on standard deviations corresponding to those level differences. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 111.) Standard deviation is one of a finite number of statistical methods (mean, variance, and standard deviation) for analyzing signals, like audio signals, that contain “random noise.” (Ex. 1008, 477; Ex. 1002 ¶ 111.) Standard deviation is also


commonly used to compare and evaluate statistics like the difference in levels between two microphones. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 111.) Indeed, the 058 patent recognizes that determining the threshold based on standard deviation is one of the “standard signal processing techniques” that could be used to determine the threshold. (Ex. 1001, 8:41-48; *see also* Ex. 1016, 2:22-34 (explaining that the standard deviation of the peak values of a signal is a statistical characteristic that can be used to determine if a signal is voiced or unvoiced); Ex. 1002 ¶ 111.) Accordingly, this limitation would have been obvious to a POSITA in view of Hozlrichter and Takano. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 111.)

#### 4. Claim 4

Claim 4 depends from claim 2 and adds the step of “performing denoising on the identified noise.”

Holzrichter discloses this limitation. (Ex. 1002 ¶¶ 112-113.) Holzrichter teaches a “method for determining the onset of speech, ***noise rejection***, voiced-unvoiced speech, end of speech, and pauses using acoustic and non-acoustic information together.” (Ex. 1003, 31:9-12 (emphasis added); Ex. 1002 ¶ 113.) Holzrichter explains that, when its system identifies a portion of the acoustics signal as noise, that portion is removed and is not subsequently processed. (Ex. 1003, 33:39-34:7, Fig. 19; *see also id.*, 31:8-14, 33:20-34:7 (“The algorithm in FIG. 19 illustrated by boxes 67, 73, 77, 80, 81 detects the unusual noise event, removes the

frame information, and marks the frame as ‘damaged’ for subsequent processing.’),  
50:59-51:9, Table 1; Ex. 1002 ¶ 113.)



(Ex. 1003, Fig. 19 (annotated); Ex. 1002 ¶ 113.)

## 5. Claim 5

Claim 5 depends from claim 2 and recites that “the voicing sensor includes at least one detector selected from a group including radio frequency devices, electroglottographs, ultrasound devices, acoustic throat microphones, and airflow detectors.”

Holzrichter discloses that its EM sensor is a “radar” (radio frequency) sensor.  
(Ex. 1003, 8:1-24, claim 42 (“The apparatus of claim 41 wherein each EM wave

generating, transmitting and receiving unit is a RF, microwave, millimeter wave, infrared, or visible wave radar.”), 9:23-54 (system uses “range gated EM sensor (*i.e.*, radar)”); Ex. 1002 ¶¶ 114-115.)

**B. Ground 1b: Holzrichter, Takano, Kinsler, and Lyons**

**1. Claim 3**

Claim 3 recites the additional step of “generating the gain threshold using standard deviations corresponding to the generation of the difference parameters.”

As discussed above, Takano teaches that its threshold “can be determined empirically.” (Ex. 1005, [0026]; Ex. 1002 ¶ 118.) Although it would have been obvious to a POSITA to generate the gain threshold using standard deviations as discussed above (*supra* §VI.A.3), it also would have been obvious in further view of Lyons. (Ex. 1002 ¶¶ 117-127.)

Lyons discloses averaging digital signals using “statistical measures known as the mean, variance, and standard deviation” to minimize effects from “unwanted random disturbances” (noise) when measuring a parameter. (Ex. 1008, 319, *see also id.*, 476; Ex. 1002 ¶ 119.) Lyons teaches that the standard deviation of digital signals is defined as the positive square root of the variance:

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{n=1}^N [x(n) - x_{ave}]^2}.$$

(Ex. 1008, 320; Ex. 1002 ¶ 119.) “If the sequence  $x(n)$  represents a time series of signal samples, we can say that  $x_{ave}$  specifies the constant, or DC, value of the signal, [and] the standard deviation  $\sigma$  reflects the amount of the fluctuating, or AC, component of the signal[.]” (Ex. 1008, 320, *see also id.*, 479; Ex. 1002 ¶ 119.)

Lyons discloses that its digital signal processing has many applications, including “voice recognition [and] data communication” (Ex. 1008, 1; Ex. 1002 ¶ 120), and cites to more than 20 publications directed to digital signal processing used in speech recognition (Ex. 1008, 21, 47, 127, 128, 155, 156, 217, 218, 295, 317, 318, 441, 442; Ex. 1002 ¶ 120).

It would have been obvious to a POSITA in view of Lyons that one way to determine the threshold empirically (as taught by Takano) would be to measure Takano’s “level difference” in various circumstances where Takano’s microphones are receiving noise. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 121.) A POSITA could then calculate the standard deviation (as taught by Lyons) of the different level differences, which would represent an upper bound for how high Takano’s level difference could reach when receiving noise. (*Id.*) A POSITA would then use this upper bound as the threshold for Takano to determine when it is receiving noise instead of speech. (*Id.*)

A POSITA would have been motivated to generate the gain threshold in Takano using standard deviations as taught by Lyons for several reasons. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 122.)

First, POSITA would have understood, based on Lyons, that calculating the gain threshold using standard deviations corresponding to generation of the difference parameters would ensure that the gain threshold is meaningful. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 123.)

Second, it was well known at the time that standard deviation is a common statistical measure to calculate an average deviation of input digital signals and to minimize the effects of noise in measuring the true value of a parameter. (*Id.* ¶ 124; Ex. 1008, 319, 476.) A POSITA would have understood that the standard deviation is applicable to the processing of speech signals disclosed in Takano because they are a type of digital signal. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 124.) Indeed, standard deviation is also commonly used to compare and evaluate statistics like the difference in levels between two microphones. (*Id.*) In fact, the '058 patent recognizes that determining the threshold based on standard deviation is one of the “standard signal processing techniques” that could be used to determine the threshold. (Ex. 1001, 8:41-48; *see also* Ex. 1016, 2:22-34 (explaining that the standard deviation of the peak values of a signal is a statistical characteristic that can be used to determine if a signal is voiced or unvoiced); Ex. 1002 ¶ 124.)

Third, Lyons cites to over 20 publications related to speech signal processing, demonstrating that Lyons’ digital processing techniques, including the standard deviation calculation, are applicable to speech processing methods such as Takano’s.

(Ex. 1008, 21, 47, 127, 128, 155, 156, 217, 218, 295, 317, 318, 441, 442; Ex. 1002 ¶ 125.)

Fourth, a POSITA would have been motivated to use, and would have had a reasonable expectation of success in using, standard deviation to calculate Takano's threshold because doing so would have been combining prior art elements (difference parameters and a standard deviation) according to known methods (calculating standard deviations) to yield predictable results (standard deviation of the speech signals to generate a gain threshold). (Ex. 1002 ¶ 126.)

Fifth, it would have been obvious to try using standard deviations to generate Takano's gain threshold because standard deviation is one of a finite number of statistical methods (mean, variance, and standard deviation) for analyzing signals, like audio signals, that contain "random noise." (Ex. 1002 ¶ 127.) Indeed, the '058 patent recognizes that determining the threshold based on standard deviation is one of the "standard signal processing techniques" that could be used to determine the threshold. (Ex. 1001, 8:41-48; *see also* Ex. 1016, 2:22-34 (explaining that the standard deviation of the peak values of a signal is a statistical characteristic that can be used to determine if a signal is voiced or unvoiced); Ex. 1002 ¶ 127.) Therefore, generating a gain threshold using standard deviations corresponding to the generation of the difference parameters would reflect merely a choice from a finite

number of identified, predictable solutions, with a reasonable expectation of success.

(Ex. 1002 ¶ 127.)

**C. Ground 2a: Holzrichter, Torick, Kaneda, and Kinsler**

**1. Claim 1**

The preamble, the voicing sensor, processor, and first two processor functionality limitations (generating cross correlation data and identifying information as voiced speech when the cross correlation data exceeds a correlation threshold) of claim 1 are disclosed by the combination of Holzrichter and Kinsler as discussed above. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 129; *supra* §§VI.A.1.a, VI.A.1.c; VI.A.1.d; VI.A.1.d.i.-ii.) The remaining limitations of claim 1 are discussed below.

**a. At Least Two Microphones**

Holzrichter discloses using the strength of the output signal of a microphone to determine if a signal is speech or noise. (Ex. 1002 ¶¶ 130-139; *supra* VI.A.1.b.) Torick discloses a system for detecting “speech sounds” using two microphones. (Ex. 1006, 169; Ex. 1002 ¶ 131.) One microphone is used to detect speech, while the other is “used to sense the ambient noise.” (Ex. 1006, 169; Ex. 1002 ¶ 131.)




Fig. 4. Crew member's amplifier and control unit.

(Ex. 1006, Fig. 4 (annotated); Ex. 1002 ¶ 131.)

Torick uses these two microphones to implement “voice actuated switching” and “eliminate the press-to-talk switch” for microphone-based systems. (Ex. 1006, 168; Ex. 1002 ¶ 132.). To accomplish this, Torick explains that “[t]he noise-sensing microphone output is amplified and equalized to correspond to the far-field response of the noise-cancelling speech microphone. The outputs of both microphones are then continuously compared.” (Ex. 1006, 169; Ex. 1002 ¶ 132.) When the signals from the two microphones are equal, the system determines that no speech is occurring. (Ex. 1006, 169; Ex. 1002 ¶ 132.) However, when speech sounds occur at the speech microphone, the level between the two microphones is no longer equal and speech is detected. (Ex. 1006, 169; Ex. 1002 ¶ 132.) Torick explains that “the

method is analogous to the presence of a virtual threshold which rises and falls with corresponding changes in noise levels.” (Ex. 1006, 169; Ex. 1002 ¶ 132.) Torick’s system allows for voice-actuated switching even in “high noise” environments. (Ex. 1006, 169; Ex. 1002 ¶ 132.)

A POSITA would have understood that the second microphone of Torick could be added to Holzrichter’s system so that a POSITA could replace Holzrichter’s method of distinguishing speech from noise using a single microphone (*e.g.* steps 73 and 77) with Torick’s improved method of distinguishing speech from noise by comparing the outputs two microphones. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 133.)

A POSITA would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Holzrichter and Torick, and to add a second microphone to Holzrichter’s system, for several reasons. (*Id.* ¶¶ 134-139.)

First, because Holzrichter recognizes the strength of acoustic signals could be used to determine noise or speech (Ex. 1003, 31:67-32:4; Ex. 1002 ¶ 135), a POSITA reading Holzrichter would have been motivated to look for other methods for classifying signals as noise or speech based on signal strength. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 135.) Torick discloses such as a system. (*Id.*)

Second, adding a second microphone as taught by Torick would have improved the system’s performance because Torick’s two-microphone system allows for the accurate identification of speech even in “high noise environments.”

(Ex. 1006, 169; Ex. 1002 ¶ 136.) This would be particularly advantageous to the Holzrichter system because it would allow Holzrichter's system to perform additional processing only on audio samples that are more likely to be speech, thereby saving computing resources. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 136.)

Third, the proposed combination represents nothing more than a predictable use of prior art elements according to established functions (*i.e.*, using two microphones to detect speech). (Ex. 1002 ¶ 137.)

Fourth, the combination represents nothing more than the simple addition of a known element (Torick's second microphone) to another known element (Holzrichter's system) to obtain predictable results. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 138); *KSR*, 550 U.S. at 417. Indeed, adding Torick's second microphone would enable Holzrichter's system to improve a function that it already contemplates (using the output strength of microphones to distinguish between noise and speech). (Ex. 1002 ¶ 138.) Thus, the combination also reflects nothing more than a combination of known elements (microphone) to achieve an expected result (improved speech detection). (*Id.*)

A POSITA would have had a reasonable expectation of success in combining Holzrichter and Torick because they relate to similar systems (systems for identifying acoustic signals as speech or noise) and because the use of microphones to receive acoustic signals was well known in the art. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 139.)

**b. Generating Difference Parameters Between the Acoustic Signals Received at Each of the Two Receivers**

Holzrichter combined with Torick in light of Kaneda discloses this limitation. (Ex. 1002 ¶¶ 140-144.) As explained above, *supra* VI.C.1.a, a POSITA would have been motivated to incorporate the second microphone of Torick and Torick's associated methods into Holzrichter to allow Holzrichter's system to more accurately identify an acoustic signal as speech for further processing. (*Id.*)

Torick discloses that its "noise-sensing microphone output is amplified and equalized to correspond to the far-field response of the noise-cancelling speech microphone." (Ex. 1006, 169; Ex. 1002 ¶ 141.) "The outputs of both microphones are then continuously compared." (*Id.*) When the signals from the two microphones are equal, the system determines that no speech is occurring. (*Id.*) However, when speech sounds occur at the speech microphone, the level between the two microphones is no longer equal and speech is detected. (*Id.*)

It would have been obvious to a POSITA reading Torick that, in order for the system to function properly, there should be some tolerance or range within which Torick would consider the outputs of two microphones to be equal and outside of which Torick would consider the outputs to not be equal, thereby detecting speech. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 142.) Thus, a POSITA would look for methods to compare the outputs

of the two signals and determine whether the two signals are within a certain range of each other. (*Id.*)

Kaneda teaches that one way to compare the outputs of two microphones is to calculate a “power difference PD” (difference parameters) by subtracting the power of one microphone from the other. (Ex. 1007, 2:1-22, Fig. 3(a)-3(c); Ex. 1002 ¶ 143.) Thus, Torick in light of Kaneda discloses generating difference parameters between the acoustic signals received at each of the two receivers, wherein the difference parameters are representative of the relative difference in signal gain between portions of the received acoustic signals. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 143.)

It would have been obvious to compare the outputs of Torick’s microphones in the manner taught by Kaneda because subtracting one signal from another is a standard technique for comparing two signals. (*Id.* ¶ 144.) Further, a POSITA would have been motivated to combine Kaneda’s method with Torick because it would allow a POSITA to add sufficient tolerance to Torick’s system to allow the system to operate. (*Id.*) Indeed, the proposed modification represents nothing more than the simple addition of one known element (Kaneda’s subtraction) to another known element (Torick’s microphones) to obtain predictable the predictable result of comparing the two signals from Torick’s microphones. (*Id.*); *KSR*, 550 U.S.at 417.

**c. Identifying Information as Unvoiced Speech When the Difference Parameters Exceed a Gain Threshold**

Torick further discloses that it “detects speech sounds” when the output of the speech microphone is greater than the noise sensing microphone, which is “analogous to the presence of a virtual threshold which rises and falls with corresponding changes in noise levels.” (Ex. 1006, 169; Ex. 1002 ¶ 146.) Kaneda discloses identifying a portion of a signal as speech when “[w]hen the power difference PD is larger than a given threshold value Pth17.” (Ex. 1007, 2:13-18; Ex. 1002 ¶ 146.) As discussed, *supra* IV.C.1.b, it would be obvious to use the mathematical methods disclosed in Kaneda to detect speech using the microphones of Torick. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 146.)

Further, as explained previously, *supra* VI.A.1.d.iv., Holzrichter discloses that, when its system identifies a signal as speech, it further analyzes the signal to determine if the acoustic signal is voiced or unvoiced speech. (Ex. 1007, 2:13-18; Ex. 1002 ¶ 147.) Holzrichter discloses that it will only identify the signal as unvoiced speech when no vocal motion is present **and** the output of signal is sufficient to identify the signal as speech. (Ex. 1003, 31:61-32:27; Ex. 1002 ¶ 147.)

As explained above, *supra* § IV.C.1.a, a POSITA would have been motivated to use Torick’s two-microphone system in place of Holzrichter’s single-microphone system to determine if an acoustic signal is noise or speech. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 148.) In such a combination, a POSITA would replace Holzrichter’s use of an output signal

from a single microphone to determine if a signal is noise (*e.g.*, Holzrichter steps 73 and 77) with Torick's improved evaluation of the difference in the outputs between two microphones to determine if a signal is noise. (*Id.*) Accordingly, the combined system would identify a signal as unvoiced speech only when there is no vocal motion present **and** when the difference in outputs between Torick's two microphones exceeds a threshold. (*Id.*) Thus, a POSITA would understand that the combined system identifies information of the acoustic signals as unvoiced speech when the difference parameters exceed a gain threshold. (*Id.* ¶¶ 145-148)

**d. Identifying Information as Noise When the Difference Parameters Are Less Than the Gain Threshold**

Torick further discloses that it does not “detect[] speech sounds” (*i.e.*, it detects noise) when the output of the speech microphone is the same as the noise sensing microphone. (Ex. 1006, 169; Ex. 1002 ¶ 150.) Kaneda similarly discloses identify a portion of a signal as noise when the power difference PD is lower than a threshold. (*See* Ex. 1007, 1:51-68, 2:1-22, Fig. 3(a)-3(c); Ex. 1002 ¶ 150.) As discussed, *supra* IV.C.1.b, it would be obvious to use the mathematical methods disclosed in Kaneda to detect speech using the microphones of Torick. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 150.)

Further, as discussed above, *supra* VI.C.1.a, it would have been obvious to a POSITA to incorporate this feature of Torick into the system of Holzrichter. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 151.) Indeed, Holzrichter similarly discloses identifying a signal as noise

when it “exceeds a preset threshold 73, but when it is less than a loud noise threshold 77.” (Ex. 1003, 31:61-32:27; Ex. 1002 ¶ 151.) Based on these disclosures, a POSITA would have found it obvious that the system could identify acoustic signals as noise when the difference parameters are less than the gain threshold. (Ex. 1002 ¶¶ 149-151.)

**2. Claim 2**

Claim 2 is a method claim that is substantially similar to the system claimed in claim 1. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 152.) The combination of Holzrichter, Torick, and Kinsler would have rendered this claim obvious for the same reasons as claim 1. (*Id.*)

**3. Claim 4**

Holzrichter discloses the additional limitations of claim 4. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 153; *supra* §VI.A.4.)

**4. Claim 5**

Holzrichter discloses the additional limitations of claim 5. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 154; *supra* §VI.A.5.)

**D. Ground 2b: Holzrichter, Torick, Kaneda, Kinsler, and Lyons**

**1. Claim 3**

Claim 3 recites the additional step of “generating the gain threshold using standard deviations corresponding to the generation of the difference parameters.”

As explained *supra* Section VI.B.1, Lyons teaches that the standard deviation of a signal “is an indication of the magnitude of the fluctuating component of the

signal.” (Ex. 1008, 479; Ex. 1002 ¶ 157.) Thus, it would have been obvious to a POSITA in view of Lyons that one way to determine the threshold taught by Torick and Kaneda would be to measure the power differences received by Torick’s microphones in various circumstances when Torick is receiving noise. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 157.) A POSITA could then calculate the standard deviation of the different power differences, which would represent an upper bound for how high the power difference could reach when receiving noise. (*Id.*) A POSITA would then use this upper bound as the threshold for Takano to determine when it is receiving noise instead of speech. (*Id.*) A POSITA would have been motivated to do this for the same reasons as discussed in Section IV.B.1. (*Id.*)

## **VII. SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NONOBVIOUSNESS**

Secondary considerations should be considered but do not control the obviousness conclusion. *Newell Cos. v. Kenney Mfg. Co.*, 864 F.2d 757, 768 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Where a strong *prima facie* obviousness showing exists, even relevant secondary considerations supported by substantial evidence may not dislodge obviousness conclusion. *Leapfrog Enters. v. Fisher-Price, Inc.*, 485 F.3d 1157, 1162 (Fed. Cir. 2007). Petitioner is aware of no evidence supporting a claim for secondary considerations. (Ex. 1002 ¶ 158.)

## **VIII. DISCRETIONARY DENIAL UNDER § 314(a) IS NOT APPROPRIATE.**

The Board should decline to exercise its discretion under § 314(a) because efficiency, fairness, and the merits support institution. *Apple v. Fintiv*, IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 20, 2020) (“*Fintiv*”). Each *Fintiv* factor is addressed below.

**A. Factor 1: Potential Stay**

On February 28, 2023, PO sued Petitioner for infringement of the ’058 Patent in *Jawbone Innovations, LLC v. LG Electronics Inc.*, No. 2:23-cv-00078-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.), and no scheduling conference has yet been held. Petitioner will move to stay the co-pending litigation pending resolution of this and related IPRs. *See Google LLC v. Jawbone Innovations, LLC*, IPR2022-00623, Paper 12 (PTAB Oct. 31, 2022); *Amazon.com, Inc. v. Jawbone Innovations, LLC*, IPR2023-00222, Paper 7 (PTAB May 24, 2023) (instituting IPRs involving ’058 patent).

The EDTX considers the following factors in determining whether to grant a stay pending IPR: “(1) whether the stay will unduly prejudice the nonmoving party, (2) whether the proceedings before the court have reached an advanced stage, including whether discovery is complete and a trial date has been set, and (3) whether the stay will likely result in simplifying the case before the court.” *Uniloc 2017 LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc.*, No. 2:19-cv-00259-JRG-RSP, 2020 WL 1433960, at \*2 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 24, 2020). In this instance, because multiple IPRs have already been instituted on this patent, prejudice to PO due to staying the related litigation

pending resolution of the IPRs is minimal. Similarly, the related litigation is still in the pleading stages, no discovery has been conducted, and no trial date has been set. Finally, a stay pending resolution of the IPRs against the '058 Patent would simplify the issues before the court in the related litigation. Since all factors considered by the EDTX in evaluating a motion to stay weigh in favor of granting such a motion, a stay is appropriate in this instance. Thus, this factor weighs against discretionary denial.

**B. Factor 2: Proximity of Trial to FWD**

The EDTX has not set a trial date. Indeed, no case management conference has been scheduled. Thus, this factor weighs against discretionary denial. *See, e.g., Global Tel\*Link Corp. v. HLFIP Holding, Inc.*, IPR 2021-00444, Paper 14 at 16-19 (P.T.A.B. Jul. 22, 2021) (“The lack of a scheduled trial date . . . typically weighs against exercising discretion to deny the Petition.”); *GAF Materials LLC v. Kirsch Research and Dev., LLC*, IPR2021-00192, Paper 14 at 12-13 (P.T.A.B. May 25, 2021) (finding that the second *Fintiv* factor “weighs against exercise of [the Board’s] discretion to deny institution” when no trial date has been set); *Skechers U.S.A., Inc. v. Nike, Inc.*, IPR2021-00160, Paper 10 at 9-11 (P.T.A.B. May 19, 2021) (granting institution and finding that this factor weighs against the Board exercising discretion because “there is no trial date set in the California action” and “without a trial date we cannot objectively determine that the District Court will address validity issues

before our final written decision”); *Snap, Inc. v. SRK Tech. LLC*, IPR2020-00819, Paper 15 at 9 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 21, 2020) (finding that “consideration of the second *Fintiv* factor [] does not weigh in favor of exercising discretion” where parallel district court proceeding was stayed and no trial date was set); *Qualcomm Inc. v. UNM Rainforest Innovations*, IPR2021-00582, Paper 11 at 11 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 27, 2021) (finding “the considerations of the second *Fintiv* factor weigh against discretionary denial” where the trial date was “removed from the calendar [following a stay] in the parallel District Court proceeding”).

**C. Factor 3: Investment in Parallel Proceeding**

PO served its complaint on February 28, 2023, and has not yet served any contentions or conducted any discovery. Petitioner has not yet answered the complaint, served any contentions, or conducted any discovery. The parties have thus invested very little in the district court action. The parties have not briefed claim construction. No expert reports have been served.

The EDTX has not established a case schedule. However, even if the EDTX imposes certain deadlines over the next 6 months (*e.g.*, fact discovery, claim construction proceedings, etc.), any investment in those activities does not weigh in favor of discretionary denial. Much work will still remain, including expert reports, expert discovery, dispositive motions, pretrial motions, and trial. The “remaining investment and Petitioner’s diligence” in filing the petition outweigh any

investments made. *Samsung Elec. Am. Inc. v. Snik LLC*, IPR2020-01428, Paper 10 at 11 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 9, 2021); *Huawei Techs. Co. v. WSOU Investments, LLC*, IPR2021-00226, Paper 10 at 13-14 (P.T.A.B. June 10, 2021); *Google*, IPR2022-00630, Paper 13 at 15.

**D. Factor 4: Overlapping Issues**

If this IPR is instituted and the litigation is stayed pending a final decision in this IPR, then Petitioner would not be able to pursue in the district court any invalidity ground that is raised or that could have been reasonably raised in this IPR. *Cal. Inst. of Tech. v. Broadcom Ltd.*, 25 F.4th 976 (Fed. Cir. 2022). Thus, there is little concern of duplicative efforts or conflicting decisions.

If the co-pending litigation is not stayed, then Petitioner hereby stipulates not to argue in the co-pending litigation invalidity based on the grounds advanced in this IPR petition. This factor therefore weighs against discretionary denial. *Sand Revolution II, LLC v. Cont'l Intermodal Group-Trucking LLC*, IPR2019-01393, Paper 24 at 11-12 (PTAB June 16, 2020) (informative) (“*Sand Revolution*”); *Google*, IPR2022-00630, Paper 13 at 16-17.

**E. Factor 5: The Parties**

The parties are the same in both proceedings, but it is unlikely that the district court case will go to trial before a final written decision is entered in this IPR. Thus, this factor is neutral. *See Google*, IPR2022-00630, Paper 13 at 17.

**F. Factor 6: Other Circumstances**

The prior art here discloses a system using a voicing sensor and microphones to detect voiced and unvoiced speech. Further, Kinsler, Takano, Kaneda, Lyons and Torick have never been considered by the PTO, any court, or any jury. The petition's merits are particularly strong, which favors institution. *Fintiv*, Paper 11 at 18. Moreover, denying institution would negate Congress's intent in providing a one-year period to file petitions and would encourage forum shopping as patent owners look to shield their patents from PTAB scrutiny by seeking judges with aggressive trial schedules.

Additionally, the PTAB has already instituted IPRs of the '058 patent. *Google*, IPR2022-00623, Paper 12; *Amazon*, IPR2023-00222, Paper 7. Thus, the PTAB will be intimately familiar with the patent and claims as well as the relevant technology. Judicial efficiency therefore favors having the same panel consider the validity of the claims in view of the additional prior art references that Petitioner has identified.

For the above reasons, the *Fintiv* analysis favors institution and the Board should not deny institution under §314(a).

**IX. DISCRETIONARY DENIAL UNDER § 325(d) IS NOT APPROPRIATE.**

The Board may deny institution if the Office previously considered “the same or substantially the same prior art or arguments[.]” 35 U.S.C. § 325(d). Here, all

grounds rely on one or more of Kinsler, Takano, Kaneda, Lyons, and Torick, which the Examiner never considered. Nor did the Examiner consider “substantially the same prior art or arguments.” 35 U.S.C. § 325(d). The Examiner allowed the claims during examination because the art he relied on did not disclose generating cross-correlation data. The prior art references relied on herein disclose that feature. Further, the Board has not considered any IPR petition based on the Grounds presented herein, other than the previously instituted IPRs alleging the same grounds, which this petition seeks to join. Accordingly, they are not—and could not be—cumulative of previously-considered references. *See PNC Bank, N.A., v. United Services Auto. Ass’n*, IPR2022-00075, Paper 21 at 9-12 (June 13, 2022) (instituting IPR when one out of eight references was not previously considered by PTO); *Haliburton Energy Servs., Inc., v. U.S. Well Servs., LLC*, IPR2021-01036, Paper 12 at 15-16 (Jan. 19, 2022) (instituting IPR when primary references were previously considered by the Patent Office but secondary references were not).

## **X. MANDATORY NOTICES**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1), the mandatory notices identified in 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b) are provided below as part of this Petition.

### **A. Real Party-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))**

LG Electronics Inc. is the real party-in-interest.

### **B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2))**

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,246,058

To the best knowledge of Petitioner, the '058 patent is or has been involved in the following district court litigations and petitions for *inter partes* review:

| Name                                                                                                | Number        | Court     | Filed                                                         |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Jawbone Innovations, LLC v. LG Electronics Inc.</i>                                              | 2:23-cv-00078 | E.D. Tex. | Feb. 28, 2023                                                 |
| <i>Jawbone Innovations, LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i>                                                 | 5:22-cv-06727 | N.D. Cal. | Nov. 29, 2021<br>(transferred from E.D. Tex. on Nov. 1, 2022) |
| <i>Jawbone Innovations, LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i>                                                 | 2:21-cv-00435 | E.D. Tex. | Nov. 29, 2021                                                 |
| <i>Jawbone Innovations, LLC v. Apple Inc.</i>                                                       | 6:21-cv-00984 | W.D. Tex. | Sept. 23, 2021                                                |
| <i>Jawbone Innovations, LLC v. Google LLC</i>                                                       | 6:21-cv-00985 | W.D. Tex. | Sept. 23, 2021                                                |
| <i>Jawbone Innovations, LLC v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.</i>                                    | 2:21-cv-00186 | E.D. Tex. | May 27, 2021                                                  |
| <i>Jawbone Innovations, LLC v. Sony Electronics, Inc.</i>                                           | 2:23-cv-01161 | D.N.J.    | Feb. 28, 2023                                                 |
| <i>Jawbone Innovations, LLC v. HTC Corporation</i>                                                  | 2:23-cv-00077 | E.D. Tex. | Feb. 28, 2023                                                 |
| <i>Jawbone Innovations, LLC v. Guangdong Oppo Mobile Telecommunications Corp., Ltd., d/b/a OPPO</i> | 2:23-cv-00079 | E.D. Tex. | Feb. 28, 2023                                                 |
| <i>Jawbone Innovations, LLC v. Panasonic Holdings Corporation</i>                                   | 2:23-cv-00081 | E.D. Tex. | Feb. 28, 2023                                                 |

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,246,058

|                                                                    |               |           |               |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-----------|---------------|
| <i>Jawbone Innovations, LLC v. ZTE Corporation</i>                 | 2:23-cv-00082 | E.D. Tex. | Feb. 28, 2023 |
| <i>Jawbone Innovations, LLC v. Meta Platforms, Inc. d/b/a Meta</i> | 6:23-cv-00158 | W.D. Tex. | Feb. 28, 2023 |
| <i>Jawbone Innovations, LLC v. Google LLC</i>                      | 3:23-cv-00466 | N.D. Cal. | Feb. 1, 2023  |
| Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review                            | IPR2023-00222 | PTAB      | Nov. 17, 2022 |
| Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review                            | IPR2022-00623 | PTAB      | March 8, 2022 |
| Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review                            | IPR2022-01021 | PTAB      | May 16, 2022  |

**C. Lead and Backup Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3))**

Petitioner provides the following designation of counsel:

| <b>Lead Counsel</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | <b>Back-up Counsel</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Indranil Mukerji (Reg. No. 46,944)<br>imukerji@willkie.com<br>LG_Jawbone_IPR_WFG@willkie.com<br><br><u>Postal and Hand-Delivery Address:</u><br>Willkie Farr & Gallagher LLP<br>1875 K Street, N.W.<br>Washington, DC 20006-1238<br>Telephone: (202) 303-1190<br>Facsimile: (212) 728-8111 | John C. Moulder (Reg. No. 70,490)<br>cmoulder@willkie.com<br><br><u>Postal and Hand-Delivery Address:</u><br>Willkie Farr & Gallagher LLP<br>1875 K Street, N.W.<br>Washington, DC 20006-1238<br>Telephone: (202) 303-1069<br>Facsimile: (202) 303 2000 |

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b), a Power of Attorney accompanies this Petition. The above identified Lead and Back-up Counsel are registered practitioners associated with the firm listed in that Power of Attorney.

**D. Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4))**

Service information for lead and back-up counsel is provided in the designation of lead and back-up counsel above. Petitioner hereby consents to service by email at the following email address: LG\_Jawbone\_IPR\_WFG@willkie.com.

**E. Payment of Fees Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.103**

The fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 42.15(a) for this petition has been paid. The undersigned further authorizes payment for any additional fees that may be due in connection with this petition to be charged to Deposit Account 232405.

**F. Grounds for Standing Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)**

Petitioner certifies that the '058 patent is available for IPR and that Petitioner is not barred or estopped from requesting IPR. This petition is being filed within one year of service of the original complaint against Petitioner in the district court litigation.

**CONCLUSION**

Petitioner respectfully requests institution of this IPR and cancellation of the challenged claims.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER LLP

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,246,058

Dated: June 23, 2023

/Indranil Mukerji/

Indranil Mukerji (Reg. No. 46,944)

John C. Moulder (Reg. No. 70,490)

Attorneys for Petitioner  
LG ELECTRONICS INC.

**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

This document complies with the type-volume limitation of 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(a)(1)(i). This Petition contains 11,671 words, excluding the parts of the document exempted by 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(a)(1).

Respectfully submitted,

WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER LLP

Dated: June 23, 2023

/Indranil Mukerji/

Indranil Mukerji (Reg. No. 46,944)

John C. Moulder (Reg. No. 70,490)

Attorneys for Petitioner  
LG ELECTRONICS INC.

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that true and correct copies of the foregoing **PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,246,058 AND EXHIBITS 1001-1019** are being served on June 23, 2023, via FedEx Priority Overnight on counsel of record for U.S. Pat. 7,246,058 patent owner Jawbone Innovations, LLC at the address below:

Mark Leonardo  
Nutter McClennen & Fish  
LLP Seaport West  
155 Seaport Blvd.  
Boston, MA 02210-2604

A courtesy copy is also being served on counsel for the patent holder in the pending litigation *Jawbone Innovations, LLC v. LG Electronics Inc.*, 2:23-cv-00078-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex. filed February 28, 2023):

Alfred R. Fabricant  
Peter Lambrianakos  
Vincent J. Rubino, III  
Richard M. Cowell  
Jacob D. Ostling  
**FABRICANT LLP**  
411 Theodore Fremd Avenue,  
Suite 206 South  
Rye, New York 10580  
Telephone: (212) 257-5797  
Facsimile: (212) 257-5796  
Email: ffabricant@fabricantllp.com  
Email: plambrianakos@fabricantllp.com  
Email: vrubino@fabricantllp.com  
Email: jostling@fabricantllp.com

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,246,058

Email: rcowell@fabricantllp.com

Email: jawbone@fabricantllp.com

WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER LLP

Dated: June 23, 2023

/Indranil Mukerji/

Counsel for Petitioner,

LG ELECTRONICS INC.