IPR2014-00206, IPR2014-00207, IPR2014-00208

August 7, 2014

DOCKET

Menasce, Ph.D., Daniel A.

1

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC., GOOGLE INC., and MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC

Petitioners,

v.

ARENDI S.A.R.L.

Patent Owner.

Cases:

IPR2014-00206 (Patent No. 7,496,854) IPR2014-00207 (Patent No. 7,496,854) IPR2014-00208 (Patent No. 7,917,843)

> Thursday, August 7, 2014 9:03 a.m.

DEPOSITION OF DANIEL A. MENASCÉ, Ph.D.

Henderson Legal Services. Inc.

A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

IPR2014-00206, IPR2014-00207, IPR2014-00208

August 7, 2014

 Menasce, Ph.D., Daniel A.

2 (Pages 2 to 5)

			2 (Pages 2 to 5
	2		4
1		1	
2		2	INDEX
3	Deposition of DANIEL A. MENASCÉ, Ph.D,	3	DANIEL A. MENASCÉ, Ph.D
4	taken by Patent Owner at the Offices of Morrison &	4	DIRECT EXAMINATION PAGE
5	Foerster LLP, 2000 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest,	5	By Mr. Asher 4
6	Washington, D.C. before Randi J. Garcia, Registered	6	
7	Professional Reporter, and Notary Public in and for	7	
8	the District of Columbia, beginning at approximately	8	***No exhibits were marked.
9	9:03 a.m., when were present on behalf of the	9	No exhibits were marked.
10	respective parties:	10	
11		11	
12		12	
13		13	
14		14	
15		15	
16		16	
17		17	
18		18	
19		19	
20		20	
21		21	
22		22	
	3		5
1	A P P E A R A N C E S:	1	Thereupon,
2	COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER APPLE, INC.	2	DANIEL A. MENASCÉ, Ph.D
3	ALEX S. YAP, ESQUIRE MEHRAN ARJOMAND, ESQUIRE	3	after having been first duly sworn, was
4	MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP	4	examined and testified as follows:
5	707 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 6000 Los Angeles, CA 90017-3543	5	EXAMINATION
6	(213) 892-5200 marjomand@mofo.com	6	BY MR. ASHER:
	ayap@mofo.com	7	Q Please state your full name for the
7 8	COUNSEL FOR	8	record.
9	PETITIONERS MOTOROLA MOBILITY, LLC AND GOOGLE,	9	A Daniel Alberto Menascé.
	INC.	10	Q I am going to show you a Notice of
10	JULIE TURNER, ESQUIRE TURNER BOYD LLP	11	Deposition of Daniel A. Menascé, Ph.D.
11	2570 W. El Camino Real, Suite 380 Mountain View, CA 94040	12	Are you the Daniel Menascé identified in
12	(650) 265-6109	13	this notice, which is paper number 11 in
	turner@turnerboyd.com	14	IPR2014206? It's paper number 11 in IPR2014207.
13			
	COUNSEL FOR PATENT OWNER, ARENDI S.A.R.L.	15	It's paper number 13 in IPR2014208.
14	COUNSEL FOR PATENT OWNER, ARENDI S.A.R.L. ROBERT M. ASHER, ESQUIRE JOHN J. STICKEVERS, ESQUIRE		It's paper number 13 in IPR2014208. A Yes, I am.
	COUNSEL FOR PATENT OWNER, ARENDI S.A.R.L. ROBERT M. ASHER, ESQUIRE JOHN J. STICKEVERS, ESQUIRE SUNSTEIN, KANN, MURPHY & TIMBERS LLP	15	
14	COUNSEL FOR PATENT OWNER, ARENDI S.A.R.L. ROBERT M. ASHER, ESQUIRE JOHN J. STICKEVERS, ESQUIRE SUNSTEIN, KANN, MURPHY & TIMBERS LLP 125 Summer Street, 11th Floor Boston, MA 02110-1618	15 16	A Yes, I am.
14 15 16 17	COUNSEL FOR PATENT OWNER, ARENDI S.A.R.L. ROBERT M. ASHER, ESQUIRE JOHN J. STICKEVERS, ESQUIRE SUNSTEIN, KANN, MURPHY & TIMBERS LLP 125 Summer Street, 11th Floor	15 16 17	A Yes, I am. MR. YAP: Counsel, are you going to label
14 15 16 17 18	COUNSEL FOR PATENT OWNER, ARENDI S.A.R.L. ROBERT M. ASHER, ESQUIRE JOHN J. STICKEVERS, ESQUIRE SUNSTEIN, KANN, MURPHY & TIMBERS LLP 125 Summer Street, 11th Floor Boston, MA 02110-1618 (617) 443-9292	15 16 17 18	A Yes, I am. MR. YAP: Counsel, are you going to label this at all as an exhibit? No?
14 15 16 17	COUNSEL FOR PATENT OWNER, ARENDI S.A.R.L. ROBERT M. ASHER, ESQUIRE JOHN J. STICKEVERS, ESQUIRE SUNSTEIN, KANN, MURPHY & TIMBERS LLP 125 Summer Street, 11th Floor Boston, MA 02110-1618 (617) 443-9292	15 16 17 18 19	 A Yes, I am. MR. YAP: Counsel, are you going to label this at all as an exhibit? No? MR. ASHER: I just identified it by its

Henderson Legal Services. Inc.

IPR2014-00206, IPR2014-00207, IPR2014-00208

August 7, 2014

DOCKE.

Α

Menasce, Ph.D., Daniel A.

3 (Pages 6 to 9)

	6		8
1	A Right. I may not have a nice good	1	litigation cases I have been deposed several
2	identification of those numbers. It will be	2	times.
3	easier if you talk about the '843 patent and	3	Q So I will quickly run through some
4	'854, and I used to refer to the '854 inserting;	4	reminders. I will be asking the questions and
5	'854 performing. So it would make life easier	5	the court reporter needs to take down everything
6	for me, you know, unless, you know, you allow me	6	that both of us say.
7	to do some kind of small table here mapping	7	We should not speak over one another,
8	those numbers. So, otherwise, we are going to	8	because it makes it difficult for her to write
9	get in trouble.	9	everything down.
10	Q Are you the Daniel Menascé who filed the	10	Do you understand?
11	declaration in the IPRs with respect to the '843	11	A Ido.
12	patent and with respect to the '854 patent?	12	Q When I am asking a question, please wait
13	A Yes, I am.	13	for me to finish before responding. I will do
14	Q And there were two declarations for the	14	the same. If I pause, please wait for me to
15	'854 patent, one in each of the IPRs, is that	15	finish asking the question.
16	correct?	16	A Sure.
17	A That is correct.	17	Q Please answer the questions aloud and do
18	Q Do you understand that today's testimony	18	not nod or shake your head, as the court
19	will be used as cross examination of your	19	reporter cannot write that down.
20	declarations for use in these three inter partes	20	A I will do it.
21	reviews?	21	Q If you do not if you don't understand
22	A Ido.	22	the question, please make me aware of it. I
	7		9
1	Q Have you ever been deposed before?	1	will rephrase the question.
2	A Yes.	2	A I will do that.
3	Q About how many times?	3	Q Your attorney may want to object to
4	A Maybe eight or nine times.	4	certain questions. The way that will work is I
5	Q What sort of cases have you been deposed	5	will ask a question; your attorney might object.
6	in?	6	Then there will be an answer. Under the federal
7	A The majority most of them were patent	7	rules and the Patent Trial and Appeal Board
8	infringement cases. There was only one trade	8	rules you will need to answer the question
9	secret, misappropriation case.	9	unless your attorney instructs you not to
10	Q When was the most recent time you have	10	answer.
11	been deposed?	11	A I understand that.
12	A It was this year. I don't remember the	12	Q We will take periodic breaks during the
13	exact date. It was the first semester of this	13	day for convenience and comfort. There will be
14	year.	14	a lunch break as well. It is my practice that
15	Q Who was your who were you hired by	15	there are no breaks while there is a question
16 17	for that deposition?	16	pending. Only following an answer. If you need
18	A I was hired by Oracle. The law firm was Wilmer Hale.	17 18	a break, please bring that to my attention.
18 19		18 19	A I will do that.
20	Q So are you generally familiar with the procedure for conducting depositions?	20	Q According to the now, this is with respect to the inter partes review according
20	A Yes, I am. I should say that this is	20	to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board practice
22	the first deposition for an IPR case, but for	22	from here on out you may not discuss the
		~~~	nom here on out you may not discuss the

# Henderson Legal Services. Inc.

IPR2014-00206, IPR2014-00207, IPR2014-00208 August 7, 2014

Menasce, Ph.D., Daniel A.

# 4 (Pages 10 to 13)

	10		12
1	substance of the inter partes review proceedings	1	A Four times.
2	and the patents at any time with your counsel	2	Q Which cases were those?
3	until after the deposition has been completed.	3	A One case was the case I referred to, the
4	Is that understood?	4	trade secret, misappropriation case. The other
5	MS. TURNER: I don't think that is an	5	three cases were cases related to patent
6	accurate statement of the rule. I think it's	6	infringement.
7	while cross examination is continuing.	7	Q What was the technical subject matter
8	We could obviously talk about that	8	involved in those three patent infringement
9	later, since I don't anticipate you will	9	cases?
10	finish cross examination within the next	10	A Okay. Let me try to remember, because I
11	hour.	11	the first one, I believe, was a case
12	MR. ASHER: What I was going to point out	12	involving CollegeNet. And the technology was
13	next is exactly from the appendix of the Patent	13	technology for applying to college online or
14	Office Trial Practice Guide it reads as	14	online applications.
15	follows, so we can all understand: "Once the	15	Q To call what?
16	cross examination of a witness has commenced,	16	A When you apply for college, they have an
17	and until cross examination of the witness has	17	online system for doing that. So that was the
18	concluded, counsel offering the witness on	18	technology.
19	direct examination shall not consult or confer	19	The second time was the ePlus case, was
20	with the witness regarding the substance of the	20	a electronic sourcing technology. The other one
21	witness' testimony already given or anticipated	21	the other case was a case of the multivariate
22	to be given except for the purposes of	22	negotiation system.
	11		13
1	conferring on whether to assert the privilege	1	Q So have you been engaged as an expert
2	against testifying or on how to comply with the	2	witness in this case?
3	court order, or suggest to the witness the	3	A In this case?
4	manner in which any questions should be	4	Q In this case.
5	answered."	5	A Well, in this IPR?
6	So do you understand that guideline?	6	Q Yes.
7	THE WITNESS: I do. I mean, I will leave	7	A Well, yes. I believe that's I really
8	that to the attorneys to figure out what is the	8	want to make sure that I am giving you the right
9	whatever you tell me, you know, it's the	9	answer, because typically expert witness are for
10	right way to do it, I will.	10	the litigations. I don't know if I am also
11	Q I guess you're right, until cross	11	called an expert witness. I guess I am.
12	examination is concluded.	12	Q Who contacted you to work on these
13	What is your address?	13	cases?
14	A 6477 Wishbone Terrace, Cabin John,	14	A Well, I was contacted by a expert
15	Maryland 20818.	15	witness placement firm. They put me in touch
16	Q Have you ever been involved in a	16	with the attorneys for the case.
17	litigation as a plaintiff or defendant?	17	Q Which attorneys were they were you
18	A As a plaintiff, no, no. Just as an	18	put in touch with?
19	expert witness.	19	A Mr. Alex Yap was the first one I talked
20	Q Have you testified at trial in the past?	20	to.
21	A Yes.	21	Q And what was your assignment in this
22	Q How many times?	22	case?

# Henderson Legal Services. Inc.

DOCKET

Α

IPR2014-00206, IPR2014-00207, IPR2014-00208 August 7, 2014

#### Menasce, Ph.D., Daniel A.

#### 5 (Pages 14 to 17)

1			
	14		16
1	MR. YAP: Objection to the extent it calls	1	science at the same place. And then I got a
2	for work product information.	2	Ph.D in computer science at UCLA.
3	You may answer.	3	Q What was your field of specialty at
4	THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, my assignment,	4	UCLA?
5	what I was told they were filing these	5	A My dissertation dealt with the issue of
6	petitions, and there was a need for a	6	distributed databases. At that time networking,
7	declaration from my part. And from that point	7	computer networking was really starting to
8	on, you know, I started doing the work and	8	become ubiquitous. So there was an issue
9	interacting with them, reading the patents,	9	whereby databases that were replicated over many
10	studying them, studying the prior art, the	10	different nodes of a computer network had to be
11	usual thing.	11	synchronized. When you updated one node you had
12	Q Who prepared your declaration?	12	to make sure that the replicas of the data were
13	A I did.	13	synchronized with the other nodes in light of
14	Q What role did the attorneys play?	14	network of failures, node crashes and so on. So
15	A Well, they gave me feedback. They had	15	these distributed algorithms were really
16	interactions, but it was my declaration.	16	challenging, and my dissertation solved those
17	Q This is a portion of Exhibit 1002 in	17	problems.
18	both IPRs, the 206 and 207. Do you recognize	18	Q I hand you what is marked as Exhibit
19	the document?	19	1002. It comes from IPR2014-00207.
20	A It seems to be my CV.	20	Is this your declaration?
21	Q And was the same CV submitted in all	21	A Yes. It seems to be.
22	three IPRs?	22	Q Do you have an understanding of the
	15		17
1		1	
2	A The same CV, yes. Q Are there any corrections you believe	2	meaning of a person of ordinary skill in the art?
3	Q Are there any corrections you believe should be made to the CV?	3	A Ido.
4	A No. There were some additions. Since	4	Q Is your understanding set forth in
5	December of last year to now, you know, there	5	paragraph 28 of this declaration?
6		6	
7	Q Is the CV a true and accurate account of	7	<ul><li>A Yes. It is set forth in this paragraph.</li><li>Q Do you have experience working with</li></ul>
8	your work experience and accomplishments?	8	people of ordinary skill in the art?
9	A This is a true account up to December of	9	A I do.
10	2013, yes.	10	Q What is your experience in that respect?
11	Q Where did you go to college for your	11	A I have been in academia as a professor
12	undergraduate degree?	12	in computer science since 1978. I have been
13	A The Catholic University in Rio de	13	teaching at all levels, Bachelor's, Master's,
14	Janeiro, Brazil.	14	Ph.D. I was the advisor of 23 Ph.D students, 52
15	Q What was your field of study?	15	Master students. I taught close to 100 courses
16	A Electrical engineering.	16	over my career. So I deal with people of
17	Q What degree did you obtain?	17	ordinary skill all the time.
18	A Bachelor's, BS in electrical	18	Q Can we agree that when I refer to a
19	engineering.	19	person of ordinary skill in the art or one of
20	Q Did you go on to get any further college	20	ordinary skill in the art I am referring to a
20	degrees?	21	person having experience described in your
22	A Yes. I also got a Master's in computer	22	paragraph 28 of your declaration at the time of
	A res. raise get a master sin computer		paragraph zo or your accidiation at the time of

# Henderson Legal Services. Inc.

DOCKET

ALARM

# DOCKET A L A R M



# 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.