

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PRONG, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

YEOSHUA SORIAS,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-01317
Patent 8,712,486 B2

**DECLARATION OF MR. JOSEPH C. McALEXANDER III
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.68 IN SUPPORT OF
PATENT OWNER SORIAS' RESPONSE**

Date: March 18, 2016

Respectfully submitted,


Mr. Joseph C. McAlexander III

CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Qualifications	6
III.	Understanding of Applicable Legal Standards.....	8
	A. Level of Ordinary Skill	8
	B. Claim Construction.....	8
	C. Invalidity Based on Anticipation Under 35 U.S.C. § 102	11
	D. Invalidity Based on Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. § 103	11
IV.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art.....	12
V.	Broadest Reasonable Interpretation.....	13
	A. “connection structure”	14
	B. “charger plug”	17
	C. “physically integrated with”	18
VI.	The ‘486 Patent	20
	A. Background of the Field Relevant to the ‘486 Patent Invention.....	20
	B. Summary of the ‘486 Patent Inventions.....	21
VII.	Detailed Invalidity Analysis	21
	A. Prior Art References	21
	1. Lanni (U.S. Patent Number 5,838,554)	21
	2. Chung (U.S. Design Patent D543,541 S).....	29
	3. Steiert (U.S. Patent Number 6,585,530)	30

Case IPR2015-01317, U.S. Patent No. 8,712,486 B2
Declaration of Mr. Joseph McAlexander III Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68
in Support of Patent Owner Sorias' Response

4.	Tsang (U.S. Patent Number 5,780,993).....	32
5.	Garcia (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2008/0157712 A1)	33
B.	Challenged Claims	34
C.	None of the Proposed Prior Art Combinations Identify All of the Required Claim Elements of Any of the '486 Patent Challenged Claims 1-8, 10, 11-12, 15, and 16.....	39
1.	The Proposed Prior Art Combinations of Lanni in View of Chung, Steiert, and Tsang do not Identify All of the Required Claim Elements of any of the Challenged Claims 1-8, 11-12, and 15	42
2.	The Proposed Prior Art Combinations of Lanni in View of Chung and Steiert do not Identify All of the Required Claim Elements of Challenged Claim 10 - “the AC Prongs Lie Flat with Their Respective Main Bodies being Flush with an Outer Surface of a Back Side of the Main Body of the Charger”	50
3.	The Proposed Prior Art Combinations of Lanni in View of Chung, Steiert, and Tsang do not Identify All of the Required Claim Elements Required by Dependent Challenged Claim 16.....	51
VIII.	CONCLUSION	51

Case IPR2015-01317, U.S. Patent No. 8,712,486 B2
Declaration of Mr. Joseph McAlexander III Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68
in Support of Patent Owner Sorias' Response

I, Joseph C. McAlexander III, do hereby declare as follows:

I. Introduction

1. I have been retained by Gottlieb, Rackman & Reisman, P.C., counsel for Patent Owner Yeoshua Sorias (“Sorias”) in the above captioned *Inter Partes* Review (“IPR”) to provide my opinion regarding the validity of claims 1-12, 15, and 16 (“the Challenged Claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 8,712,486 B2 (the “’486 Patent”). Specifically, I have been asked to analyze whether the Challenged Claims are rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, based on the art cited by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“Board”) in its Decision to Institute the IPR, entered December 9, 2015.¹ The Board determined “there is a reasonable likelihood that Petitioner would prevail in challenging claims 1-12, 15, and 16”² and instituted the IPR “for the following grounds of unpatentability:”³

¹ Decision, Institution of *Inter Partes* Review, 37 C.F.R. § 42.108, December 9, 2015 (“Institution Decision”).

² *Id.* at 37.

³ *Id.* at 38.

Case IPR2015-01317, U.S. Patent No. 8,712,486 B2
Declaration of Mr. Joseph McAlexander III Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68
in Support of Patent Owner Sorias' Response

References	Basis	Challenged Claim(s)
Lanni, Chung, Steiert, and Tsang	§ 103	1-9, 11, 12, 15
Lanni, Chung, and Steiert	§ 103	10
Lanni, Chung, Steiert, Tsang, and Garcia	§ 103	16

Table 1⁴

2. The '486 Patent, titled "Detachably Integrated Battery Charger for Mobile Cell Phones and Like Devices," was filed on January 11, 2012 and issued on April 29, 2014.⁵ The '486 Patent names Yeoshua Sorias and Max Moskowitz as the inventors and lists Yeoshua Sorias as the assignee.⁶ The '486 Patent claims priority to U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 61/432,050 (the "'050 Application"), filed on January 12, 2011.⁷ That Provisional application is incorporated by reference in its entirety into the '486 Patent.⁸

3. I understand that, on April 29, 2014, Petitioner Prong, Inc., filed a Petition for *Inter Partes* Review ("Petition") of claims 1-16 of the '486 Patent,

⁴ References: Lanni (U.S. Patent Number 5,838,554); Chung (U.S. Design Patent D543,541 S); Steiert (U.S. Patent Number 6,585,530); Tsang (U.S. Patent Number 5,780,993); and Garcia (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2008/0157712 A1).

⁵ '486 Patent.

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ *Id.* at 1:8-13.

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.