UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner

v.

SMARTFLASH LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case CBM2014-00108[1]
Patent 8,061,598

DECLARATION OF JONATHAN KATZ, PH.D. IN SUPPORT OF PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION

[1] Case CBM2014-00109 has been consolidated with the instant proceeding.

I, Jonathan Katz, hereby declare:

1. I am currently a Professor in the Department of Computer Science at the University of Maryland where, among other things, I teach classes in the area of cybersecurity, conduct research in this field, and supervise graduate-student research. I am also currently the Director of the Maryland Cybersecurity Center (MC2), as part of which I interact regularly with the cybersecurity industry and oversee faculty conducting research in various sub-fields of cybersecurity including cryptography, network security, and mobile-phone security. I received my Ph.D. (with distinction) in Computer Science from Columbia University in 2002.

2. My curriculum vitae is attached hereto as Appendix A, and the list of cases in which I have been an expert in the last five years is attached hereto as Appendix B. I additionally have experience in computer programming.

3. I have been retained by Smartflash LLC to provide an expert opinion in CBM2014-00102, -00106, -00108 and -00112.

4. I have reviewed the material shown in Appendix C in preparing this declaration.

I. Grounds for Review

5. I understand that on September 30, 2014 the Patent and Trial Appeal Board (PTAB) of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) issued a Decision to institute a Covered Business Method (CBM) Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,061,598 (the '598 patent). Decision at 1. The PTAB further consolidated the proceedings of CBM2014-00108 and CBM2014-00109 into the current proceeding. Decision at 26.

6. I understand that the PTAB only instituted a review of claim 26. I understand that the PTAB held that the Petition (hereinafter "the 00108 Petition") in CBM2014-00108 had shown that it was more likely than not that claim 26 was unpatentable, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103, over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,530,235 ("Stefik '235") and U.S. Patent No. 5,629,980 ("Stefik '980"). Decision at 24. I understand that the PTAB held that the Petition (hereinafter "the 00109 Petition") in CBM2014-00109 had shown that it was more likely than not that claim 26 was unpatentable, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103, over U.S. Patent No. 5,915,019 ("Ginter"). Decision at 24. I also understand that the Petition raised a number of other grounds of unpatentability, but that "all other grounds raised in the CBM2014-00108 and CBM2014-00109 Petitions are *denied* for the reasons

discussed above." Decision at 24. My opinions in this declaration are limited to the instituted grounds.

II. Legal Standards

7. It has been explained to me that the standard for patentability under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is that of "obviousness" and that obviousness is a question of law based on underlying factual findings, including: (1) the scope and content of the prior art; (2) the differences between the claims and the prior art; (3) the level of ordinary skill in the art; and (4) objective considerations of nonobviousness. I further understand that examples of objective considerations of nonobviousness (or "secondary considerations") include: (1) the invention's commercial success, (2) long felt but unresolved needs, (3) the failure of others, (4) skepticism by experts, (5) praise by others, (6) teaching away by others, (7) recognition of a problem, and (8) copying of the invention by competitors.

8. I understand that in interpreting the claims of the patent the PTAB uses a "broadest reasonable interpretation" standard. I have done so in coming to the opinions set forth herein. I also understand that the PTAB uses the "preponderance of the evidence" standard, such that a Petition must show that any claim asserted to be unpatenable is proven to be unpatentable

by a "preponderance of the evidence." I take that to mean that the 00108 and 00109 Petitions must prove that it is more likely than not that each challenged claim is unpatentable.

9. I understand that the factors considered in determining the ordinary level of skill in the art include the level of education and experience of persons working in the field; the types of problems encountered in the field; and the sophistication of the technology. I believe that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a bachelor's degree in electrical engineering or its equivalent, or at least 5 years of experience in manufacturing or engineering, with significant exposure to the digital content distribution and/or e-commerce industries.

10. Based on my industry and teaching experience, and based on my review of the state of the art at the time of the filing of the patent, I believe that I would qualify as an expert in the area of data storage and access systems such that I am qualified to opine on what those of ordinary skill in the art would have understood at the time of the filing of the patent and what he/she would or would not have been motivated to do.

DOCKET ALARM

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.