

EXHIBIT 4

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Google Inc.
Petitioner

v.

Network-1 Technologies, Inc.
Patent Owner

Trial No: Not Assigned
Patent No. 8,904,464

DECLARATION OF PIERRE MOULIN

Contents

I.	Introduction.....	3
II.	Qualifications	4
III.	Materials Reviewed	5
IV.	Person Having Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	5
V.	General Background	6
VI.	Overview of the '464 Patent	8
VII.	Claim Construction	13
	A. “near neighbor”/“neighbor”	14
	B. “tag”	16
VIII.	Comparison of References to Claims of '464 Patent.....	26
	A. <i>Ferris</i> in combination with <i>Lambert</i> and <i>Gionis</i>	26
	1. Implementation of <i>Ferris</i> ' Broadcaster 402	30
	2. Implementation of <i>Ferris</i> ' Comparison	32
	B. <i>Ferris</i> in combination with <i>Lambert</i> , <i>Gionis</i> , and <i>Philyan</i>	58
	C. <i>Ferris</i> in combination with <i>Lambert</i> , <i>Gionis</i> , and <i>Goldstein</i>	61
IX.	Conclusion	66

automated systems to recognize audio, video, and/or image content by analyzing the intrinsic features of a video work.

16. The second technology is at issue in this proceeding. Computer-automated systems for recognizing audio, video, and/or image content universally relied on two widely known technologies: feature extraction and neighbor searching in a database.

17. Feature extraction refers to quantifying a media work in a form that—unlike a raw video feed—admits a compact representation and is easily parsed by a computer. Being compact means that they occupy less memory on a computer than the corresponding video file did. Furthermore, extracted features are typically structured in a format that facilitates efficient search. In the context of a content identification system, each set of extracted features corresponding to a given media work is stored as an entry in a database. Within such a database, entries are typically organized to facilitate efficient search. Such organization is sometimes known as “preprocessing.”

18. Neighbor searching refers to algorithms for comparing a first set of extracted features with one or more additional sets of extracted features to locate a close, but not necessarily exact, match. Because neighbor searching is computationally intensive for large feature sets, content recognition schemes typically employed search algorithms that increased efficiency by intelligently searching only a subset of potential matches (i.e., “non-exhaustive” algorithms).

example, early computers utilized primitive processors to generate data, and stored and retrieved data on punch cards, drum memory, or other primitive storage devices.

24. Based on my understanding, the only technical sounding feature in any of the claims – “correlating . . . using a non-exhaustive, near neighbor search,” as recited in claims 1 and 18 – is not novel or unobvious.

25. I understand that the Patent Owner has argued that “non-exhaustive search” is defined as “search using an algorithm designed to locate a match without requiring the query to be compared to every record in the reference data set being searched until a match is identified.” *See* Ex. 1004 at 3. I do not agree that this is the broadest reasonable definition of non-exhaustive. However, the analysis presented herein is valid under this narrow definition and any broader definition.

26. Non-exhaustive, near neighbor searches were well-known to those of skill in 2000. For example, a paper by Aristides Gionis, published in 1999 and entitled “Similarity Search in High Dimensions via Hashing,” discusses a method for approximate similarity searching in high-dimensional data such as image and video databases, pattern recognition, and other data having a large number of relevant features. Ex. 1008 at 518. *Gionis* discloses preprocessing a set of objects (‘P’) “so as to efficiently answer queries by finding the point in P closest to a query point q.” Ex. 1008 at 520.

27. *Gionis* contrasts its algorithm with those in the prior art by “introduc[ing] a new indexing method for approximate nearest neighbor.” *Id.* at 519, col. 1, ¶ 3. The

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.