

Filed on behalf of Proxyconn, Inc.

By: Matthew L. Cutler (mcutler@hdp.com)  
Bryan K. Wheelock (bwheelock@hdp.com)  
Douglas A. Robinson (drobinson@hdp.com)  
Harness, Dickey & Pierce, PLC  
7700 Bonhomme Ave., Suite 400  
Clayton, MO 63105  
Tel: (314) 726-7500  
Fax: (314) 726-7501

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION

Petitioner

v.

PROXYCONN, INC.

Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2012-00026  
Case IPR2013-00109  
Patent 6,757,717 B1

---

**PROXYCONN, INC'S OPPOSITION TO MICROSOFT'S  
CORRECTED MOTION TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. Introduction..... 1

II. Relevant Facts.....2

    A. The Technology at Issue .....2

    B. Dr. Konchitsky’s Training and Experience.....3

III. Legal Standard .....4

IV. Dr. Konchitsky Provides Reliable, Relevant, and Helpful  
    Testimony .....5

    A. Dr. Konchitsky Appropriately Testified from the  
        Perspective of A Person Having Ordinary Skill in the Art.....5

    B. Dr.Konchitsky’s Specialized Knowledge Will Help the  
        Board Understand the Evidence and Determine Facts in  
        Issue.....8

    C. Dr. Konchitsky’s Declaration Testimony Also Meets the  
        Requirements of FRE 702(b)-(d) ..... 14

V. Conclusion ..... 15

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharms., Inc.</i> , 509 U.S. 579 (1993).....	1, 5
<i>Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael</i> , 526 U.S. 137 (1999).....	5
<i>Mytee Prods., Inc. v. Harris Research, Inc.</i> , 439 Fed. Appx. 882 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	8
<i>SEB S.A. v. Montgomery Ward &amp; Co.</i> , 594 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	7, 8
<i>Sundance, Inc. v. DeMonte Fabricating Ltd.</i> , 550 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	8
<b>Other Authorities</b>	
37 C.F.R. § 42.62 .....	4
Federal Rule of Evidence 702.....	<i>passim</i>

Patent Owner Proxyconn, Inc. (“Proxyconn”) submits this memorandum in opposition to “Microsoft Corporation’s Corrected Motion to Exclude Evidence” (Paper No. 56). Microsoft’s Motion requests exclusion of Proxyconn’s technical expert, Dr. Alon Konchitsky. Because Dr. Konchitsky has provided relevant, helpful, and reliable expert testimony in this proceeding—consistent with FRE 702 and *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharms., Inc.*, 509 U.S. 579 (1993)—Microsoft’s motion should be denied.

## **I. Introduction**

This proceeding concerns technology for addressing issues (particularly speed) involved when a client computer requests data for a remote computer. Based on the prior art selected by Microsoft, Patent Owner Proxyconn submitted the expert declaration of Dr. Alon Konchitsky. Dr. Konchitsky is well-versed in data communications networks, having (among other things) designed such systems for cellular communications networks. He holds a bachelor’s degree in Computer Science, is a Professional Engineer (Electrical Engineering), and holds a Ph.D. in Electrical Engineering. In 1997,<sup>1</sup> he wrote his thesis on Migration from central [cloud] computing to personal computing [pc].” Dr. Konchitsky is well-versed in the technology at issue, and offered cogent, reliable, and relevant testimony comparing the patent-in-suit to the prior art at issue in this proceeding.

---

<sup>1</sup> The ‘717 patent was filed on September 16, 1999.

Microsoft wishes to exclude Proxyconn's proffered expert for strategic reasons, but must resort to irrelevant side issues, and distort Dr. Konchitsky's testimony, to support its position. Indeed, Microsoft's argument is essentially that Dr. Konchitsky should be excluded because Microsoft's proffered technical expert, Dr. Darrell Long, says so. Specifically, Dr. Long presented a laundry list of trivia items that, he says, an expert "should" know but which Dr. Konchitsky allegedly does not. Microsoft's approach is flawed for multiple reasons. Specifically, Microsoft presents no corroborating evidence supporting its arguments. Rather, Microsoft relies on the *ipse dixit* of Dr. Long. Even with that, to make its arguments Microsoft is forced to amend its definition of a person of ordinary skill in the art (again unsupported by testimony) and distort Dr. Konchitsky's deposition testimony. These failings in Microsoft's motion are shown in detail below.

Microsoft's motion represents an effort to distract from the core issues of this case, on which Dr. Konchitsky is demonstrably qualified to provide expert testimony. Because Dr. Konchitsky meets the requirements of FRE 702, as shown below, Microsoft's motion should be denied.

## **II. Relevant Facts**

### **A. The Technology at Issue**

The '717 patent at issue in this proceeding is entitled "System and Method for Data Access." Ex. 1001, p. 1 at (54). According to its statement of the "Field

# 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.