EXHIBIT 7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

OAKLAND DIVISION

ATMEL CORPORATION, A DELAWARE CORPORATION; ATMEL SWITZERLAND, A CORPORATION; ATMEL FRANCE, A CORPORATION; AND ATMEL SARL, A CORPORATION,
Plaintiffs,

Case No. C 06-02138 CW

vs.

AUTHENTEC, INC.,
Defendant.
_____/

---o0o---

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF

ANIL JAIN, PH.D.

Monday, January 14, 2008

---o0o---

BIENENSTOCK COURT REPORTING & VIDEO
REPORTING FOR:
LiveNote World Service
221 Main Street, Suite 1250
San Francisco, California 94105
Phone: (415) 321-2311
Fax: (415) 321-2301

Reported by:
LEISA M. PASTOR, CSR, RPR, CRR
CSR No. 3500

1801fbff-cc17-4b44-baff-fd0c78246dbe

late of last week. In fact, as of Friday, I didn't even know whether the deposition would be held today or it would be held in the first week of February, so the date of the deposition was not decided as far as I know until this last Friday, two days ago, three days ago.

Q. When were you asked by Atmel to form opinions on claim construction?

A. On Friday, when I met with the Atmel attorneys in East Lansing on Friday and Saturday.

Q. So that's the first time that you were asked to form a claim construction --

A. Yes.

Q. -- opinion?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. So is it accurate that as of May of last year, May of 2006, you had not yet formed any opinions as to claim construction of the '114 or '804 patents?

A. That is correct.

Q. Okay. And it's correct that up until Friday of last week, January 11th, you had not formed any opinions regarding claim construction of the '114 or '804 patents; is that correct?

A. That is correct.

Q. Were you consulted about claim construction of the

1801fbff-cc17-4b44-baff-fd0c78246dbe

of this litigation?

MS. McKENZIE: Objection, vague and ambiguous as to document request.

A. No, they did not ask me to produce any -- any documents.

BY MS. DeMORY:

Q. Okay. So counsel for Atmel did not ask you to produce any documents for this deposition today; is that correct?

A. That -- except for this report.

Q. Let's go ahead and mark as Jain Exhibit Number 1, and I apologize that these are not -- the court reporter's going to need to mark it for you?

A. Oh, sure.

MARKED BY THE REPORTER:

DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NUMBER 1

9:36 a.m.

BY MS. DeMORY:

Q. So we've marked as Jain Exhibit Number 1 a letter from Sidley to you dated June 8th of 2006; do you recognize this letter?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And what is this letter?

A. I guess it is a letter to sort of retain my services in connection with Atmel vs. Authentec litigation.

1801fbff-cc17-4b44-baff-fd0c78246dbe

Q. Okay. And if you'd turn to the last page, AJ 3, is that your signature that appears on this page?
A. That is correct.
Q. And do you recall when you were first contacted to have your services retained with regard to the Atmel vs. Authentec litigation?
A. I think it was just -- I don't know exactly the date, but maybe it was May of 2006, counsel, Ms. McKenzie, called me on the phone and discussed this and then I agreed and this letter came.
Q. Okay. Do you recall what was discussed in that initial conversation with Ms. McKenzie?
A. I think it was just that I didn't -- that she just wanted to retain my services regarding this litigation, and I don't remember the exact nature of the -- of the conversation, and I don't remember whether at that time the patent numbers were mentioned or not, but she explained to me what the litigation was, but I don't remember the exact discussion which went on.
Q. Okay. Were you aware of the Atmel patents that are at issue in this litigation prior to the time of your initial contact with Ms. McKenzie?
A. No.
Q. Now, did you know Jean-Francois Mainguet prior to the

1801fbff-cc17-4b44-baff-fd0c78246dbe

claim construction.
BY MS. DeMORY:
Q. Okay. Have you been asked to formulate any opinions in this case other than claim construction opinions?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Did you review the file histories of the patents in suit?
A. No.
Q. Did you review any of the references cited in the file histories of the patents in suit?
A. I didn't see the file history.
Q. Did you consider the Mainguet deposition transcript in formulating your opinion in claim construction?
A. No.
Q. Have you reviewed the French patent application that was filed prior to the '114 patent application?
A. No.
Q. Have you used or inspected any of the Atmel devices alleged to embody the claims of the patents in suit in conjunction with forming an opinion on claim construction?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever used any of the accused products?
A. You -- do you mean --
Q. The Authentec products.

1801fbff-cc17-4b44-baff-fd0c78246dbe

fingerprint from said partial image from claim 1 of the '114 patent and means for reconstituting a total image of the fingerprint from said overlapping images from claim 17 of the '114 patent. Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. The next column over is Atmel's proposed construction, and for the function, Atmel's proposed construction is to reconstruct or constitute again the complete image of each fingerprint part that has been obtained from the series of partial images. Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you agree with that proposed claim construction?

A. Yes.

Q. In the context of the '114 and '804 patents, is it your opinion that the words reconstituting and reconstructing have the same meaning?

A. Yes.

Q. In the context of the '114 and '804 patents, is it your opinion that the words total, complete and global have the same meaning?

A. Yes.

Q. So is it correct that a total image is the same -- strike that.

Is it correct that a total image as

1801fbff-cc17-4b44-baff-fd0c78246dbe

A. Physical effects, yes.
Q. Okay. Now, this sentence that says that the -- uses the word fleeting, what's your understanding of what's meant by the word fleeting here?
A. I don't know the exact meaning of the word fleeting, but I think here it -- my understanding in reading that paragraph is that these particular effects some or -- several of these physical effects must be captured in -- rather quickly before the difference between ridges and valleys disappear.
Q. And is this a problem that the inventor of the '114 patent -- another problem that the inventor of the '114 patent was seeking to overcome?
MS. McKENZIE: Objection, vague and ambiguous, calls for speculation.
A. I think if you look into line 55, column 2, it talks about overcoming the drawbacks of the prior art, and the -- the two main drawbacks of the prior art are already identified in my report, surface area is large, sensor manufacturing cost is high for the solid-state sensors.
BY MS. DeMORY:
Q. So those are the two main drawbacks in your opinion as identified in the specification of the '114 patent?
A. For the -- for the technology available, solid-state

1801fbff-cc17-4b44-baff-fd0c78246dbe

sensors available at that time.
Q. So you don't believe that the fleeting problem described starting at column 2 on line 24 and continuing through line 40 and then starting again on line 45 and continuing through 53 was a main drawback that the inventor was seeking to overcome?
MS. McKENZIE: Objection, vague and ambiguous, calls for speculation.
BY MS. DeMORY:
Q. You can answer the question.
A. I don't know what was in the inventor's mind. Inventor identified drawbacks of the technology at that time and proposed an invention.
Q. So how did you identify the two -- the only two that you listed in your report as the main drawbacks?
A. Because those were the two main drawbacks of the solid-state sensing technology. Those are broad to apply to any area -- solid-state area sensors of the time.
Q. So that's just based on your understanding of the -- of the art of solid-state sensing at the time; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And you did not include in your report as a main drawback that the inventor was trying to overcome the

1801fbff-cc17-4b44-baff-fd0c78246dbe

effects of the disappearance of the image or this fleeting problem that's identified in column 2; is that correct?

A. If this invention also took care of that, which it probably did, which is -- that's fine, but the problem it addressed was the two major problems with the solid-state technology at that time.

Q. And what's the basis for that opinion?

A. Based on my knowledge as -- as somebody skilled in the art.

Q. Okay. Now, in column 2, and just so the record is clear here, in your report -- see if I can find it. Okay. So at the bottom of -- let's turn back to the bottom of page 4.

A. Of my report?

Q. Yeah.

A. Uh-huh.

Q. And the last paragraph says, the knowledge of one of skill in the art -- strike that. I read that wrong.

The last paragraph of page 4 says, the knowledge of one of skill in the pertinent art and the '114 patent specification also informs and supports my conclusion. Sensors having contact-sensitive elements were reasonably well-known and understood in the art at the time of the invention, and what's your basis

1801fbff-cc17-4b44-baff-fd0c78246dbe

Q. And just so that the record's also clear, in the context of the reconstruction algorithm the number of partial images would be one; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, we talked in column 2 about this disappearance of the image or this fleeting problem that's described. Do you recall generally talking about that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know if systems with excitation external to the sensor as described in column 2 have this problem?
MS. McKENZIE: Objection, vague and ambiguous, calls for speculation.
A. I'm not aware.
BY MS. DeMORY:
Q. Now, we talked generally earlier about that the contact-sensitive elements, the claim construction proposed of the contact-sensitive elements -- well, let me ask you this first. We've talked a little bit today about two phrases, physical parameters and physical effects. In your opinion in the context of the claim construction of the '114 and '804 patents are those two things the same or different?
MS. McKENZIE: Objection, vague and ambiguous.
A. Depends in what context it is used, so one place where

1801fbff-cc17-4b44-baff-fd0c78246dbe

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY

STATE OF MICHIGAN)
) SS
COUNTY OF MONROE)

I, LEISA M. PASTOR, a Notary Public in and for the above county and state, do hereby certify that the above deposition was taken before me at the time and place hereinbefore set forth; that the witness was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth, and nothing but the truth; that the foregoing questions asked and answers made by the witness were duly recorded by me stenographically and reduced to computer transcription; that this is a true, full and correct transcript of my stenographic notes so taken; and that I am not related to, nor of counsel to either party nor interested in the event of this cause.

_____

LEISA M. PASTOR, CSR #3500, CRR
Notary Public,
Monroe County, Michigan
My Commission expires: 9/7/13

1801fbff-cc17-4b44-baff-fd0c78246dbe