

Filed on behalf of Petitioners

By: Todd R. Walters, Esq.

Roger H. Lee, Esq.

Jonathan R. Bowser, Esq.

Kyle K. Tsui, Esq.

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

1737 King Street, Suite 500

Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2727

Telephone (703) 836-6620

Facsimile (703) 836-2021

todd.walters@bipc.com

roger.lee@bipc.com

jon.bowser@bipc.com

kyle.tsui@bipc.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Corning Optical Communications RF LLC,
Corning Incorporated, and Corning Optical Communications LLC
Petitioners

v.

PPC Broadband, Inc.
Patent Owner

Case No.: To be assigned
Patent 8,075,338

**DECLARATION OF RONALD P. LOCATI
FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 8,075,338 (CLAIMS 5, 6, AND 8)
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	QUALIFICATIONS	6
III.	COMPENSATION AND PRIOR TESTIMONY	8
IV.	LEGAL STANDARDS	8
	A. Anticipation	9
	B. Obviousness.....	9
	C. A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	9
V.	TECHNICAL BACKGROUND	10
	A. The ‘338 Patent and the Prior Art	13
	1. The ‘338 Patent	13
	2. The Prior Art	15
	B. Summary of the Examination History of the ‘338 Patent.....	20
	1. This Declaration Relies on Connector Structure Disclosed by Bence Not Relied Upon by the Examiner During <i>ex parte</i> Prosecution	22
	2. The Reasoning of This Declaration is Distinct from the Reasoning During <i>ex parte</i> Prosecution	24
VI.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	24
	A. PPC’s Infringement Allegations in the Related Litigation	25
	B. Construction of “post”.....	28
	C. Construction of “a plurality of engagement fingers”	29
	D. Construction of “biased into a position of interference”	30

Declaration of Ronald P. Locati
Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,075,338

E.	Construction of “physical and electrical continuity”	31
F.	Construction of “axially aligned slots”	32
G.	Construction of “on”	32
VII.	Claims 5, 6, and 8 are Obvious Over Matthews in View of Aujla and Bence	34
A.	Reference to Where the Elements of Claims 5, 6, and 8 Are Found in the Prior Art	34
B.	Explanation of Why Claims 5, 6, and 8 Would Have Been Obvious.....	69
1.	Matthews discloses virtually all of the features recited in claim 5 of the ‘338 Patent	70
2.	The spring projections disclosed by Aujla constitute a plurality of engagement fingers that are spaced apart by axially aligned slots.....	72
3.	It would have been obvious to modify Matthews to have an axially slotted post with engagement fingers in view of Aujla and Bence.....	75
C.	Any Purported Secondary Considerations Evidence Does Not Overcome the Strong Evidence of the Obviousness	93
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	93

Declaration of Ronald P. Locati
Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,075,338

I, Ronald P. Locati, hereby state as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I have been retained by Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney PC to provide technical assistance related to the filing of a Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,075,338 (“Petition”). I am working as a private consultant on this matter and the opinions presented here are my own.

2. I have been asked to prepare a written report including comments related to the Petition regarding whether Claims 5, 6, and 8 of U.S. Patent No. 8,075,338 (“the ‘338 Patent”) (Ex. 1001) would have been obvious to the ordinarily skilled artisan over the cited prior art documents. I have reviewed the documents set forth in Table 1 below. This Declaration sets forth the basis and reasons for my opinion, including the additional materials and information relied upon in forming those opinions and conclusions.

EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION
1001	U.S. Patent No. 8,075,338, issued on December 13, 2011 to Noah Montena (“the ‘338 Patent”)
1002	U.S. Patent No. 7,114,990, issued on October 3, 2006 to Bruce D. Bence <i>et al.</i> (“Bence”)
1004	<i>Curriculum Vitae</i> of Ronald P. Locati

Declaration of Ronald P. Locati
Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,075,338

EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION
1005	Combined Decision in IPR2014-00440, IPR2014-00441 and IPR2014-00736 issued on August 18, 2015
1006	Complaint filed in <i>PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Optical Communications RF, LLC.</i> , 5:16-00162 (N.D.N.Y.) dated February 11, 2016
1007	Certified English Translation of Japanese Publication No. JP2000-40564 (“JP ‘564”)
1008	Japanese Publication No. JP2000-40564
1009	U.S. Patent No. 7,892,024, issued on February 22, 2011 to Han-Jung Chen (“the ‘024 Patent”)
1010	U.S. Patent No. 7,674,132, issued on March 9, 2010 to Yi-Hsiang Chen (“the ‘132 Patent”)
1011	U.S. Patent Application No. 12/906,503, filed on October 18, 2010 to Noah Montena (“the ‘503 Application”)
1012	Office Action in U.S. Patent Application No. 12/906,503, dated May 31, 2011
1013	U.S. Patent No. 4,979,911, issued on December 25, 1990 to Mark Spencer (“Spencer”)

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.