

Filed on Behalf of NETWORK-1 TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

By: Charles R. Macedo (Reg. No. 32,781)
Brian A. Comack (Reg. No. 45,343)
Amster, Rothstein & Ebenstein LLP
90 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10016
Telephone: (212) 336-8074
cmacedo@arelaw.com
N1-Google-IPR@arelaw.com

Gregory Dovel (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Dovel & Luner, LLP
201 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 600
Santa Monica, CA 90401
Telephone: (310) 656-7066
greg@dovellaw.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE INC.
Petitioner

v.

NETWORK-1 TECHNOLOGIES
Patent Owner

Cases IPR2015-00343, IPR2015-00345, IPR2015-00347, and IPR2015-00348
Patents 8,640,179, 8,205,237, 8,010,988, and 8,656,441

DECLARATION OF DR. GEORGE KARYPIS

NETWORK-1 EXHIBIT 2005

Google Inc. v. Network-1 Technologies, Inc.

Table of Contents

I.	Background to my opinions in this Declaration.....	1
A.	Expertise.....	1
B.	Assignment.....	3
C.	Approach.....	4
D.	Understanding of the law.....	5
II.	Summary of the IPR Patents and asserted art.....	8
A.	The IPR Patents.....	8
1.	‘237 patent (Ex. 1001 ‘237 IPR).....	8
2.	‘988 patent (Ex. 1001 ‘988 IPR).....	10
3.	‘179 patent (Ex. 1001 ‘179 IPR).....	11
4.	‘441 patent (Ex. 1001 ‘441 IPR).....	13
B.	The asserted art.....	16
1.	Overview of Ghias—Ex. 1010 (addressed in the ‘237, ‘988, ‘179, and ‘441 IPRs).....	16
2.	Overview of Iwamura—Ex. 1012 (addressed in the ‘237 and ‘988 IPRs).....	19
3.	Overview of Conwell—Ex. 1009 (addressed in the ‘179 and ‘441 IPRs).....	22
4.	Overview of Philyaw—Ex. 1014 (addressed in the ‘179 and ‘441 IPRs as a secondary reference).....	24
5.	Overview of Chen—Ex. 1008 (addressed in the ‘237 IPR as a secondary reference).....	25
III.	General Findings.....	27
IV.	General concerns with the IPR Petitions and Dr. Moulin’s Declarations (Exs. 1004 in each IPR).....	30
V.	Claim Constructions.....	38
A.	sub-linear (‘237 patent).....	40
1.	the words used in the construction: “size of the dataset”.....	41
2.	‘237 specification.....	43
3.	Petitioner’s Declarant.....	47
B.	non-exhaustive search (‘237, ‘988, ‘179, and ‘441 patents).....	54

Declaration of George Karypis

1.	The Board’s preliminary construction of “non-exhaustive search” is consistent with the understanding of one of ordinary skill in the art: “a search that locates a match without a comparison of all possible matches.”	54
2.	The Board properly rejected Petitioner’s assertion that a “non-exhaustive search” should be construed as “a search that locates a match without conducting a brute force comparison of all possible matches, and all data within all possible matches.”	56
C.	neighbor search / identifying a neighbor / neighbor / near neighbor (‘237, ‘988, ‘179, and ‘441 patents).	58
D.	approximate nearest neighbor search (‘237 patent).	60
1.	“identifying a close match that is not necessarily the closest match”	61
2.	“sublinear”	62
VI.	‘237 patent.	65
A.	‘237 Ground 1: The instituted claims of the ‘237 patent are not anticipated by Iwamura.	65
1.	sub-linear time search (claims elements 1(b) and 5(b.2)).	66
2.	approximate nearest neighbor search (claim elements 9(b) and 13(b.2)).	85
3.	nonexhaustive search (claim element 25(b)).	95
4.	identify a neighbor / near neighbor (claims elements 1(b), 5(b), and 25(b)).	126
5.	sublinear approximate nearest neighbor search (claim element 33(b)).	132
B.	‘237 Ground 2: The instituted claims of the ‘237 patent are not anticipated by Ghias.	134
1.	sublinear time search (claim elements 1(b) and 5(b.2)).	134
2.	approximate nearest neighbor search (claim elements 9(b) and 13(b.2)).	155
C.	‘237 Ground 3: The instituted claims of the ‘237 patent are not obvious over Iwamura and Chen.	166
VII.	‘988 patent.	168
A.	‘998 Ground 1: The instituted claims of the ‘988 Patent are not anticipated by Ghias.	168

Declaration of George Karypis

1.	non-exhaustive search (claim element 15(b)).....	169
2.	search identifying a neighbor (claim element 15(b)).....	186
3.	determining an action based on the identification (claim element 15(c)).	190
B.	‘988 Ground 2: The instituted claims of the ‘998 patent are not obvious over Ghias.....	193
C.	‘988 Ground 3: The instituted claims of the ‘998 patent are not anticipated by Iwamura.	194
1.	non-exhaustive search (claim 15(b)).....	194
2.	identifying a neighbor (claim 15(b)).....	203
VIII.	‘179 patent.	204
A.	‘179 Ground 1: The instituted claims of the ‘179 patent are not anticipated by Conwell.....	204
1.	neighbor search (claims 1, 13, 25).....	205
2.	non-exhaustive search (claims 1, 13, 25).....	231
B.	‘179 Ground 2: The instituted claims of the ‘179 Patent are not obvious in view of Ghias and Philyaw.....	244
1.	non-exhaustive search (claims 1, 13, 25).....	245
2.	neighbor search (claims 1, 13, 25).....	251
IX.	‘441 Patent.	256
A.	‘441 Ground 1: The instituted claims of the ‘441 Patent are not anticipated by Conwell.....	256
1.	neighbor search (claims 1, 13, 25).....	256
2.	non-exhaustive search (claims 1, 13, 25).....	259
B.	‘441 Ground 2: The instituted claims of the ‘441 Patent are not obvious over Ghias and Philyaw.....	260
1.	non-exhaustive search (claims 1, 13, 25).....	261
2.	neighbor search (claims 1, 13, 25).....	264

IPR2015-00343, IPR2015-00345, IPR2015-00347, and IPR2015-00348
Declaration of George Karypis

I, George Karypis, declare:

I am making this Declaration at the request of Patent Owner Network-1 Technologies, Inc. in the following *Inter Partes* Reviews of U.S. Patent Nos. 8,205,237 ('237 patent), 8,010,988 ('988 patent), 8,640,179 ('179 patent), and 8,656,441 ('441 patent) (collectively the "IPR Patents"):

- IPR2015-00345 ('237 patent),
- IPR2015-00347 ('988 patent),
- IPR2015-00343 ('179 patent), and
- IPR2015-00348 ('441 patent),

(collectively the "IPRs"), all initiated by petitioner Google Inc. ("Petitioner").

I. Background to my opinions in this Declaration.

A. Expertise.

1. I am a Professor in the Department of Computer Science and Engineering at the University of Minnesota. I hold a Ph.D. in Computer Science from the University of Minnesota, granted in 1996. I began my post-graduate school career as a Research Associate in my current department. I became an Assistant Professor in 1999, an Associate Professor in 2004, and a Professor in 2009. I teach courses in Algorithms and Data Structures, Parallel Programming, and Data Mining, among other subjects.

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.