

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Inventor: Racz et al.	§	Attorney Docket No.:
United States Patent No.: 8,118,221	§	104677-5008-823
Formerly Application No.: 12/943,872	§	Customer No. 28120
Issue Date: February 21, 2012	§	
Filing Date: November 10, 2010	§	Petitioner: Apple Inc.
Former Group Art Unit: 2887	§	
Former Examiner: Thien M. Le	§	

For: Data Storage and Access Systems

MAIL STOP PATENT BOARD  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Post Office Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

**DECLARATION OF MICHAEL P. DUFFEY IN SUPPORT OF PETITION  
FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT REVIEW OF  
UNITED STATES PATENT NO. 8,118,221  
PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 321, 37 C.F.R. § 42.304**

I, Michael P. Duffey, make the following Declaration pursuant to  
28 U.S.C. § 1746:

1. I am a Litigation Paralegal Specialist at the law firm of  
Ropes & Gray LLP.

2. I provide this Declaration in connection with the above-identified  
Covered Business Method Patent Review proceeding that is being requested at the  
United States Patent and Trademark Office by Apple Inc. under 35 U.S.C. § 321, 37

C.F.R. § 42.304. Unless otherwise stated, the facts stated in this Declaration are based on my personal knowledge.

3. Exhibit 1001 hereto is a true and correct copy of United States Patent No. 8,118,221 to Patrick Racz and Hermenard Hulst, which I downloaded on January 31, 2014 from the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) Patent Application Information Retrieval (“PAIR”) website and which is a record of the USPTO to which all parties have access. An exhibit label on the first page and pages numbers on all pages have been added to the bottom of this document but no other alterations have been made.

4. Exhibit 1002 hereto is a true and correct copy of Plaintiffs’ First Amended Complaint for Patent Infringement (“Amended Complaint”), filed in *Smartflash LLC, et al. v. Apple Inc., et al.*, Civil Action No. 6:13-cv-447, before the District Court of the Eastern District of Texas, which I downloaded on February 24, 2014 from the Public Access to Court Electronic Records (“PACER”) website and is a record of the aforementioned District Court (Dkt. No. 72) to which all parties have access. The Amended Complaint contains markings at the top of each page indicating the PACER filing information. An exhibit label on the first page and pages numbers on all pages have been added to the bottom of this document but no other alterations have been made.

5. Exhibit 1003 hereto is a true and correct copy of the file history for United States Patent No. 8,061,598 to Patrick Racz and Hermen-ard Hulst, which I downloaded on January 29, 2014 from the USPTO PAIR website and which is a record of the USPTO to which all parties have access. An exhibit label on the first page and pages numbers on all pages have been added to the bottom of this document but no other alterations have been made.

6. Exhibit 1004 hereto is a true and correct copy of the file history for United States Patent No. 8,336,772 to Patrick Racz and Hermen-ard Hulst, which I downloaded on January 29, 2014 from the USPTO PAIR website and which is a record of the USPTO to which all parties have access. An exhibit label on the first page and pages numbers on all pages have been added to the bottom of this document but no other alterations have been made.

7. Exhibit 1005 hereto is a true and correct copy of United States Patent No. 5,675,734 to Arthur R. Hair, which I downloaded on February 3, 2014 from the USPTO PAIR website and which is a record of the USPTO to which all parties have access. An exhibit label on the first page and pages numbers on all pages have been added to the bottom of this document but no other alterations have been made.

8. Exhibit 1006 hereto is a true and correct copy of United States Patent No. 4,999,806 to Fred Chernow and Randy J. Peterson, which I downloaded on February 3, 2014 from the USPTO PAIR website and which is a record of the

USPTO to which all parties have access. An exhibit label on the first page and pages numbers on all pages have been added to the bottom of this document but no other alterations have been made.

9. Exhibit 1007 hereto is a true and correct copy of United States Patent No. 4,878,245 to Graham C. Bradley, Alton O. Stretten, John P. Stretten, and Rex B. Wentzel, which I downloaded on February 3, 2014 from the USPTO PAIR website and which is a record of the USPTO to which all parties have access. An exhibit label on the first page and pages numbers on all pages have been added to the bottom of this document but no other alterations have been made.

10. Exhibit 1008 hereto is a true and correct copy of United States Patent No. 7,334,720 to Hermen-ard Hulst and Patrick Sander Racz, which I downloaded on January 31, 2014 from the USPTO PAIR website and which is a record of the USPTO to which all parties have access. An exhibit label on the first page and pages numbers on all pages have been added to the bottom of this document but no other alterations have been made.

11. Exhibit 1009 hereto is a true and correct copy of United States Patent No. 7,942,317 to Patrick Racz and Hermen-ard Hulst, which I downloaded on January 31, 2014 from the USPTO PAIR website and which is a record of the USPTO to which all parties have access. An exhibit label on the first page and pages

numbers on all pages have been added to the bottom of this document but no other alterations have been made.

12. Exhibit 1011 hereto is a true and correct copy of the file history for United States Patent No. 8,118,221 to Patrick Racz and Hermen-ard Hulst, which I downloaded on January 29, 2014 from the USPTO PAIR website and which is a record of the USPTO to which all parties have access. An exhibit label on the first page and pages numbers on all pages have been added to the bottom of this document but no other alterations have been made.

13. Exhibit 1012 hereto is a true and correct copy of United States Patent No. 5,103,392 to Ryoichi Mori, which I downloaded on March 10, 2014 from the USPTO PAIR website and which is a record of the USPTO to which all parties have access. An exhibit label on the first page and pages numbers on all pages have been added to the bottom of this document but no other alterations have been made.

14. Exhibit 1013 hereto is a true and correct copy of United States Patent No. 5,530,235 to Mark J. Stefik, Daniel G. Bobrow, Stuart K. Card, Michalene M. Casey, Richard J. Goldstein, Michael G. Lamming, Jock D. Mackinlay, Roy Want, George G. Robertson, Mark D. Weiser, and Daniel M. Russell, which I downloaded on February 24, 2014 from the USPTO PAIR website and which is a record of the USPTO to which all parties have access. An exhibit label on the first page and pages

# 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.