

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SERVICE NOW, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY,

Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2015-00717

U.S. Patent No. 7,027,411

**DECLARATION OF MICHAEL SHAMOS, Ph.D. REGARDING
CLAIMS 1 AND 3 OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,027,411**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. MATERIALS CONSIDERED 3

III. UNDERSTANDING OF THE LAW 4

 A. Obviousness 4

 B. Claim Construction 5

IV. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART..... 6

V. INSTITUTED GROUNDS 8

VI. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND 8

 A. Problem to be Solved..... 8

 B. Network Traffic 9

 C. Switching Technology 10

 D. Network Topology 10

 E. Devices of a Network 11

 F. Connections between Devices 11

VII. THE '411 PATENT 12

 A. Block Diagram of the System of the '411 Patent..... 17

 B. First List (List of Existing Tuples from an Existing Topology) and
 Second List (New List of a Plurality of Tuples for a Topology of the
 Network at a Current Time)..... 19

 C. The Connection Calculator Creates the Third List (New Tuples List
 that represent new nodal connections)..... 20

 D. First Weeding Phase 21

 E. Infrastructure Building Phase 23

F. Second Weeding Phase 24

G. Noise Reduction Phase 25

H. The “Look For” Phase 25

I. The Consolidation Phase 26

J. Receiving the Third List and Comparing the First List (List of Existing Tuples from an Existing Topology) and the Third List (New Tuples List that Represent New Nodal Connections) to Identify Changes to Topology 27

VIII. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS 31

IX. File History of the ’411 Patent 34

X. OVERVIEW OF THE CITED PRIOR ART REFERENCES 37

 A. Jones 37

 B. Tonelli 39

XI. THE CHALLENGED ’411 PATENT CLAIMS ARE NON-OBVIOUS BECAUSE AT LEAST TWO CLAIM LIMITATIONS ARE NOT TAUGHT OR SUGGESTED BY THE PRIOR ART 42

XII. JONES DOES NOT RENDER CLAIMS 1 OR 3 OBVIOUS 42

 A. Jones Does Not Disclose or Render Obvious “Receiving New Tuples List that Represent New Nodal Connections,” as Recited in Independent Claim 1 42

 B. Jones Does Not Disclose or Render Obvious “Comparing the List of Existing Tuples with the New tuples List to Identify Changes to the Topology,” as Recited in Independent Claim 1 43

 C. The Petition Characterizes Jones Incorrectly 44

XIII. TONELLI DOES NOT RENDER CLAIMS 1 OR 3 OBVIOUS 46

A. Tonelli Does Not Disclose or Render Obvious “Receiving New
Tuples List that Represent New Nodal Connections,” as Recited in
Independent Claim 1 46

B. Tonelli Does Not Disclose “Comparing the List of Existing Tuples
with the New Tuples List to Identify Changes to the Topology,” as
Recited in Independent Claim 1 48

XIV. CONCLUSION 49

XV. AVAILABILITY FOR CROSS-EXAMINATION 49

XVI. RIGHT TO SUPPLEMENT 50

I, Michael Shamos, declare as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I hold the title of Distinguished Career Professor in the School of Computer Science at Carnegie Mellon University in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. I was a founder and Co-Director of the Institute for eCommerce at Carnegie Mellon and I am now Director of the Master of Science in Information Technology degree program in eBusiness Technology.

2. I have an A.B. degree from Princeton University in Physics, an M.A. degree from Vassar College in Physics, an M.S. degree from American University in Technology of Management, an M.S. degree from Yale University in Computer Science, an M. Phil from Yale University in Computer Science, a Ph.D. from Yale University in Computer Science and a J.D. degree from Duquesne University. My C.V. is submitted herewith as Appendix A.

3. I have previously testified in a number of cases concerning computer systems, including patent, copyright and trade secret cases. My C.V. contains a list of cases in which I have testified in at least the past ten years. My C.V. also lists the relevant publications I have authored during the past 10 years.

4. I am currently Director of Carnegie Mellon's graduate degree program in eBusiness Technology. I currently teach graduate courses at Carnegie Mellon in Electronic Commerce, including Ubiquitous Computing, Electronic

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.