

Declaration of Tal Lavian, Ph.D. in Support of
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of
U.S. Patent No. 7,392,300

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ServiceNow, Inc.
Petitioner

v.

Hewlett-Packard Company
Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 7,392,300
Filing Date: January 8, 2004
Issue Date: June 24, 2008

TITLE: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR MODELLING A COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK

DECLARATION OF TAL LAVIAN, Ph.D.

Inter Partes Review No. 2015-__

Table of Contents

	Page
I. BRIEF SUMMARY OF MY OPINIONS	1
II. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS	2
A. Qualifications and Experience	2
B. Materials Considered.....	7
III. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.....	8
IV. RELEVANT TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND.....	9
A. Computer Networks and Network Management Systems	10
B. Structured Data and the Extensible Markup Language (XML).....	15
V. THE PATENT’S TECHNIQUE FOR MODELING COMMUNICATION NETWORKS	19
A. The Specification	19
B. The Claims of the ’300 Patent.....	22
C. Claim Construction	23
1. “Network Representation”	24
2. “Network Model”	26
3. “Network Event”	26
VI. APPLICATION OF THE PRIOR ART TO THE CLAIMS OF THE ’300 PATENT	28
A. Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 21 and 22 Are Obvious Over Matheny in view of XML in a Nutshell, Hamner and Arrouye	34
1. Each Limitation of Claim 1 is Disclosed by Matheny, XML in a Nutshell, Hamner and Arrouye	34
(a) “generating a network representation using computer-readable code, the computer-readable code representing structured information”	34
(b) “parsing the network representation”	38

Table of Contents
(continued)

	Page
(c) “generating a network model using the parsed network representation, the network model including a plurality of network objects and relationships between the plurality of network objects”	43
(d) “storing the network model in memory”	46
(e) “processing a network event using the network model, wherein the processing includes identifying one or more network objects of the plurality of network objects...”	47
(f) “...and the processing further includes determining an order of operation on the one or more network objects”	57
2. Each Limitation of Claim 7 is Disclosed by Matheny, XML in a Nutshell, Hamner and Arrouye	64
3. Each Limitation of Claim 8 is Disclosed by Matheny, XML in a Nutshell, Hamner and Arrouye	64
4. Each Limitation of Claim 10 is Disclosed by Matheny, XML in a Nutshell, Hamner and Arrouye	66
5. Each Limitation of Claim 21 is Disclosed by Matheny, XML in a Nutshell, Hamner and Arrouye	67
6. Each Limitation of Claim 22 is Disclosed by Matheny, XML in a Nutshell, Hamner and Arrouye	70
B. Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 21 and 22 Are Obvious Over Matheny in view of XML in a Nutshell, Hamner and Pitt	71
VII. CONCLUSION	77

Declaration of Tal Lavian, Ph.D. in Support of
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of
U.S. Patent No. 7,392,300

I, Tal Lavian, Ph.D., declare as follows:

1. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated in this declaration, and could and would testify to these facts under oath if called upon to do so.

2. I have been retained by counsel for ServiceNow, Inc. (Petitioner) in this case as an expert in the relevant art. I have been asked to provide my opinions relating to claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 21 and 22 of U.S. Patent No. 7,392,300 by Raghu Ananthrangachar et al. (“300 patent”), which I understand is assigned to Hewlett-Packard Company.

I. BRIEF SUMMARY OF MY OPINIONS

3. Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 21 and 22 purport to disclose a method, system and computer program for modelling a computer network. The alleged invention of these claims is, at a high level, straightforward and easy to understand. The claims require generation of a “network representation” that describes the devices in a network. This “network representation” must comprise eXtensible Markup Language (XML) or some other form of “structured information.” This network representation, once generated, is parsed and then used to generate a “network model,” which in turn is used to process network events.

Declaration of Tal Lavian, Ph.D. in Support of
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of
U.S. Patent No. 7,392,300

4. Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 21 and 22 do not describe anything that was new or non-obvious by the time the application for the '300 patent was filed in January 2004. The generation and use of a “network representation” in XML – the feature to which the majority of the specification is devoted – was disclosed by Matheny. Matheny not only discloses the claimed “network representation,” but does so using language remarkably similar to the challenged claims. The remaining limitations in the challenged claims, including the creation of a “network model” and using it to process network events, recite basic functionality found of network management systems that predate the patent by nearly a decade, as shown by the prior art references below including Hamner.

5. Because each element of the challenged claims is disclosed or suggested by the prior art I describe in my Declaration, and a person of ordinary skill in the art would have had ample motivation to combine, each challenged claim is obvious. The bases for my opinions are set forth in detail below.

II. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS

A. Qualifications and Experience

6. I possess the knowledge, skills, experience, training and the education to form an expert opinion and testimony in this case. A detailed record

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.