UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FACEBOOK, INC., LINKEDIN CORP., and TWITTER, INC.
Petitioner

v.

SOFTWARE RIGHTS ARCHIVE, LLC
Patent Owner

Case IPR2013-00479
Patent 5,832,494

DECLARATION OF PAUL S. JACOBS

in Support of Patent Owner Response

EXHIBIT 2113
Facebook, Inc. et al.

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Qualifications, Background, and Experience 1

II. Status as an Independent Expert Witness 3

III. Proceedings to Date 4

IV. Materials Reviewed 6

V. Summary of Opinions 7

VI. The Claims of the '494 Patent 21

VII. Legal Principles Used in Analysis 24

VIII. A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Relevant Art 29

IX. Claim Interpretation 30

X. Opinions on Obviousness 35

A. The Cited References Do Not Teach and Would Not Have Suggested the Database and Object Limitations of the Claims 36

1. The Relied-upon Steps Pertaining to Numerical Representations Were Not Applied to Any Database of the Fox Papers 37

2. It is Incorrect to Rely Upon "The INGRES Database System" as the Claimed Database 47

3. One of Ordinary Skill Would Not Have Obviously Extended the Fox Methods to Include Additional Data, and Simply Inserting More Text Would Not Have Remedied the Deficiencies of the References or Rendered Obvious the Claims 48

4. The Tapper Papers Also Fail to Teach and Would Not Have Suggested the Database and Object Features 51

B. The Individual Fox Papers Do Not Disclose Generalized Techniques that Would Have Been Applied in Combination or Extended to Other Collections 53

1. The Petition Incorrectly Relies on Specialized Manual Data Preparation Steps 56

2. The Specialized Experiments Discussed in Fox Thesis Do Not Teach a General Search Method That Would be Applied to Other Collections 78

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

3. The Petition Relies on Regression Results, Which Are a Method of Data Analysis, Not a Generalizable Search Method 81

C. The Use of Indirect Relationships and Non-Semantic Searching Were Not Obvious Techniques that Would Yield Predictable Results at the Time of the Invention 90

1. The Use of Indirect Relationships In Searching Was Not Obvious 91

D. The Fox Papers do not Teach and Would Not Have Suggested the Specific Steps of the Claims 107

1. The Fox Papers do not Teach The Claimed First Numerical Representation 110

2. The Fox Papers do not Teach or Suggest the "Displaying" Step in Combination with the Other Steps of Claim 18 125

3. SRA Provided a Complete Image of the CACM Export File to the Patent Office During Reexamination of U.S. 5,544,352. 131

4. The Fox Papers Teach that Co-Citation and Bibliographic Coupling, the Alleged Second Numerical Representations, Degrade Search Results 134

5. The Fox Papers do not Teach or Suggest the Steps of Claim 19 149

6. The Fox Papers do not Teach or Suggest the Steps of Claim 20 157

7. The Fox Papers do not Teach or Suggest the Additional Features of Claim 48 159

8. The Fox Papers do not Teach or Suggest the Additional Features of Claim 49 160

9. One of ordinary skill in the art would have understood "some 90,000 source-cited document number pairs" to refer to co-citation relationships, and not direct relationships, in the ISI Collection 161

10. Fox SMART does not Teach a First Numerical Representation 183

11. Additional Reply and Explanation of the Fox Papers 189

E. The Tapper Papers do not Render Obvious Claims 18-20, 48, and 49 199

1. The Citation Vectors Discussed in the Tapper Papers are Not a Representation of *Direct* Relationships 205

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

2. Tapper's Citation Vectors are not a *Numerical* Representation 207

3. Tapper's Citation Vectors are not a Representation of Relationships *in the Database* 208

4. The Tapper Papers Fail To Disclose Generating and Storing a Second Numerical Representation as Claimed 210

5. The Tapper Papers Fail to Disclose the Remaining Steps of Claim 18 214

6. The Tapper Papers do not Teach and Would Not Have Suggested the Additional Features of Claims 19, 20, 48, or 40 216

F. Claims 45, 51, and 54 are Non-Obvious Over the Referenced Art.....222

1. The References Fail to Teach and Would not have Suggested the Limitations of Claims 45, 51 and 54 225

2. The Analysis of Hyperlinks Would Not Have Been Obvious at the Time of the Invention 234

3. The Analysis of Web-Based Links Was Not an Obvious Technique that Would Yield Predictable Results at the Time of the Invention.....238

XI. Conclusion 244

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

I, Paul S. Jacobs, declare as follows:

1. My name is Paul S. Jacobs. I am the Founder and President of Jake Technologies, Inc. My business address is 27 Logan Circle NW #14, Washington, DC 20005. I understand that my declaration is being submitted in connection with the above-referenced *Inter Partes* Review proceeding, Case IPR2013-00479.

I. Qualifications, Background, and Experience

2. I received a Bachelor of Science in Applied Mathematics from Harvard University in 1981, a Master of Science in Applied Mathematics from Harvard University in 1981, and a Ph.D. in Computer Science from the University of California at Berkeley in 1985.

3. I have authored or co-authored over 50 scientific and technical publications, I am listed as an inventor on two U.S. patents directed to computational lexicons, and I have over 30 years of experience in the computer and information retrieval industry.

4. I have served in numerous professional and scientific capacities, including one year as a visiting professor of computer science at the University of Pennsylvania and several years as a member of the executive committee of the Association for Computational Linguistics. Currently, I serve on the Public Policy Council of the Association for Computing Machinery (USACM) and the Intellectual Property Committee of that council. I also serve on the Patent Public

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

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.