

Declaration of Dr. Thomas F. La Porta in Support of Petitioners' Reply
IPR 2016-01261
U.S. Patent No. 8,457,113

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Bright House Networks, LLC,
WideOpenWest Finance, LLC,
Knology of Florida, Inc.
Birch Communications, Inc.
Petitioners

v.

Focal IP, LLC,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-01261
U.S. Patent No. 8,457,113

**DECLARATION OF THOMAS F. LA PORTA IN SUPPORT OF
PETITIONERS' REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS	1
A.	Engagement Overview	1
B.	Summary of Opinions	2
C.	Materials Considered.....	3
II.	LEGAL PRINCIPLES USED IN THE ANALYSIS	5
A.	Legal Standards for Obviousness.....	5
B.	Legal Standards for Claim Interpretation.....	10
III.	THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE OBVIOUS OVER ARCHER (GROUND 1) AND OVER ARCHER IN VIEW OF CHANG (GROUND 2).....	11
A.	Archer Discloses a Gateway Interconnecting a “Web-enabled Processing System” on an IP Network to a Tandem Switch in the PSTN	12
B.	A POSA Understood that an IP Network Converging with the PSTN Could Be Connected to Either a PSTN Tandem Switch or PSTN Edge Switch and Without any Technical Differences	16
C.	Archer in view of Chang (Ground 2) Discloses a Gateway Interconnecting a Controller on an IP Network to a Tandem Switch in the PSTN	23
D.	Archer Discloses a Controller Establishing the Voice Communication Between the Calling Party and the Called Party After the Call is Completed.....	26
E.	Conclusion - Grounds 1 and 2 Disclose All of the Limitations of the Challenged Claims Even Under Patent Owner’s Constructions.....	28
IV.	THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE OBVIOUS OVER GROUND 1 AND GROUND 2 UNDER THE BROADEST REASONABLE INTERPRETATION OF THE CLAIMS IN VIEW OF THE SPECIFICATION.....	29
A.	The Term “Switching Facility” Was Introduced for the First Time During Prosecution of the ‘777 Patent.....	29

B.	Mr. Bates’s Alleged Evidence of Disclaimer in the Specification Refers to “Preferred” Embodiments or Systems Rather Than “the Invention” or the “Present Invention”	30
C.	A POSA Would Understand that the Applicant Broadly Defined “Switching Facilities” During Prosecution and Explicitly Varied the Location and Function of “Switching Facilities” Between Different Claims	33
D.	The Broadest Reasonable Interpretation of “Switching Facility” / “Tandem Switch” is Not “PSTN Tandem Switch”	38
E.	The Broadest Reasonable Interpretation of “Coupled To” is Not “Connected to Without an Intervening Edge Switch”	39
F.	The Broadest Reasonable Interpretation of “Tandem Access Controller” is Not “A Controller Connected to a PSTN Tandem Switch Without an Intervening Edge Switch”	40
V.	CONCLUSION.....	41

1. I, Thomas F. La Porta, declare as follows:

2. 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.

I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS

A. Engagement Overview

3. I have been retained by counsel for Bright House Networks, LLC, WideOpenWest Finance, LLC, Knology of Florida, Inc., and Birch Communications, Inc. (“Petitioners”) in this case as an expert in the relevant art. I previously provided a declaration in this case in support of the Petition setting forth my opinions regarding the state of the art and invalidity of the challenged claims. I am being compensated for my work at the rate of \$550 per hour. No part of my compensation is contingent upon the outcome of this petition.

4. I was asked to study the Patent Owner’s April 3, 2017 Response to Petitioners’ Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,457,113 (“the ‘113 patent”), and its exhibits including the declaration of Regis J. “Bud” Bates dated April 1, 2017 (Ex. 2022), and to render opinions based on the testimony of Mr. Bates contained in his declaration (*Id.*) and in the transcripts of Mr. Bates’s deposition taken on May 8-9, 2017 (Ex. 1059; Ex. 1060).

5. After studying the Response, its exhibits including the declaration of Mr. Bates (Ex. 2022), the transcripts of his deposition (Ex. 2059; Ex. 2060), the ‘113

patent (Ex. 1001), its file history (Ex. 1009) and the file history of related U.S. Patent No. 7,764,777 (“the ‘777 patent”) (Ex. 1010), the prior art, and considering the subject matter of the claims of the ‘113 patent in light of the state of technical advancement in the area of telephony in circuit-switched and packet-switched networks in May 2000, I reached the conclusions discussed herein.

6. This declaration, and the conclusions and opinions herein, provide support for the Reply to Patent Owner’s Response filed by Petitioners in this case. I have reviewed the Reply in its entirety as well as its corresponding exhibits.

B. Summary of Opinions

7. As set forth in my June 24, 2016 Declaration in this case, it is my opinion that claims 1, 2, 8, 11, 15-19, 94, 95, 102, 109-113, 128, 163, 164, 166-168, 175, 179, 180, 181 of the ‘113 patent are obvious over Ground 1 (Archer in view of the knowledge of a POSA). As also set forth in my June 24, 2016 Declaration, it is also my opinion that claims 1, 2, 8, 11, 15-19, 94, 95, 102, 109-113, 128, and 168 of the ‘113 patent are obvious over Ground 2 (Archer in view of Chang and the knowledge of a POSA)¹. My opinions are unchanged.

¹ In my declaration, I collectively refer to the claims challenged in the Petition as the “Challenged Claims”.

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.