blacr@foster.com

Registration No.: 40514

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

_____

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

_____

ABB, INC.

Petitioner

v.

ROY-G-BIV CORPORATION

Patent Owner

_____

Trial No.: IPR2013-0062 (Pursuant to Joinder with IPR2013-00282)

U.S. Patent No. 6,516,236B1

MOTION CONTROL SYSTEMS

_____

SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION UNDER 37 CFR § 42.53

BY DAVID B. STEWART, Ph.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.   Introduction

1.   My name is David Bernard Stewart. I have personal knowledge of the facts contained in this Declaration, am of legal age, and am otherwise competent to testify. I have been retained as an expert by Roy-G-Biv Corporation ("Patent Owner") in connection with Inter Partes Review IPR2013-00282 (hereafter "IPR") of U.S. Patent No. 6,516,236B1 (hereafter the "Patent" or "the '236 Patent").

2.   Because this IPR2013-00282 has been joined with IPR2013-00062, this Supplemental Declaration incorporates by reference my previous Declaration dated July 18, 2013 filed in IPR2013-00062 as Exhibit 2010, and further supplements that declaration with respect to two of the new references relied upon in IPR2013-00282.

3.   In connection with my analysis, I have also reviewed: (a) Device Driver Adaptation Guide / Microsoft® Windows® Version 3.1 ("The DDAG Reference" or "DDAG"); and (b) Kraig Brockschmidt, Inside OLE 2 ("The Brockschmidt Reference" or "Brockschmidt").

4.   I have also reviewed the Petition filed in IPR2013-00282 ("Petition"). The Petition relies upon the Gertz Reference, the Stewart Reference, the Morrow Reference, the DDAG Reference, and the Brockschmidt Reference with respect to Claims 5 and 6. This Supplemental Declaration will address the DDAG and

Brockschmidt References only, and the combination of those references with Gertz. For discussion of the Gertz, Stewart, and Morrow References, please see the copy of my declaration previously filed July 18, 2013 as Exhibit 2010.

II. DDAG and Brockschmidt Do Not Teach the Limitations of Claims 5-6

5. Claim 5 recites, *inter alia*, "an extended function pointer table that *maps the non-supported extended driver functions to the combination of core driver functions employed to emulate the non-supported extended functions*"; and (2) "the *motion control component generates the control command*s further *based on* the contents of the *extended* function pointer table." '236 Patent at Exhibit 1001 (emphasis added).

6. The Petition relies upon the combination of the DDAG and Brockschmidt References as allegedly teaching a function pointer table that maps the non-supported extended driver functions to the combination of core driver functions employed to emulate the non-supported extended functions, as claimed. This is incorrect and the Petition does not identify any evidence that these references teach the specific function pointer table recited in Claim 5. Indeed, the Petition does not even assert that either the DDAG or Brockschmidt References teach "non-supported extended driver functions," or a "combination of core driver functions" or "non-supported extended functions" anywhere in the References.

2

Thus, the function pointer table in Brockschmidt, even if modified with the alleged disclosure in DDAG, cannot possibly "map" these functions (which are not taught in either reference) to one another.

7.   Moreover, the emphasized claim language above from Claim 5 recites features of the claimed function pointer table that provide functionality in the overall claimed system that is not accomplished by anything disclosed or suggested in either DDAG or Brockschmidt.

8.   In particular, Claim 5 does not merely add a limitation reciting a function pointer table generally. Rather, it recites a function pointer table that performs a specific kind of emulation as recited in the claim. The claim recites a specific mapping that the function pointer table performs. The Petition does not provide any plausible argument that DDAG or Brockschmidt teach such a function pointer table; instead, the Petition simply ignores the claimed attributes of the function pointer table.

9.   Claim 5 also recites that "the motion control component generates the control commands further based on the contents of the extended function pointer table." The Petition does not allege that the DDAG or Brockschmidt References teach a motion control component, much less that the generation of control

3

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.

fastcase®
Smarter legal research.