

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BROADSIGN INTERNATIONAL, LLC
Petitioners

v.

T-REX PROPERTY AB,
Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 7,382,334

Inter Partes Review Case No. 2017-00006

**DECLARATION OF ZAYDOON JAWADI
IN SUPPORT OF PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)**

Broadsign International, LLC v. T-Rex
Property AB, IPR2017-00006

EXHIBIT

TREX2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS	1
III.	BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS	1
IV.	MATERIALS REVIEWED	4
V.	FIELD OF THE INVENTION	4
A.	Digital Signage	4
B.	Person of Skill in the Art at the Time of the Invention	6
C.	Background of the Technology	7
VI.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	8
A.	“update said exposure list in real time with control instruction fields via dynamic booking of information in time for exposure from mediators” and “update an exposure list having control instruction fields, via dynamic booking of display information from mediators”	8
VII.	GROUND 1 – ALLEGED ANTICIPATION BY NAKAMURA	13
A.	Nakamura does not disclose “update said exposure list in real time with control instruction fields via dynamic booking of information in time for exposure from mediators” or “update an exposure list having control instruction fields, via dynamic booking of display information from mediators.”	13
VIII.	GROUND 2 – ALLEGED OBVIOUSNESS OVER NAKAMURA IN VIEW OF REILLY	23
A.	The Nakamura-Reilly combination in Petitioners’ theory for claims 4-6, 15-17, 25-27, and 36-38 does not practice “update said exposure list in real time with control instruction fields via dynamic booking of information in time for exposure from mediators” or “update an exposure list having control instruction	

	fields, via dynamic booking of display information from mediators.”	23
IX.	GROUND 3 – ALLEGED OBVIOUSNESS OVER NAKAMURA AND REILLY IN FURTHER VIEW OF OHRAN.....	24
A.	The Nakamura-Reilly-Ohran combination in Petitioners’ theory for claims 7, 8, 28, and 39 does not practice “update said exposure list in real time with control instruction fields via dynamic booking of information in time for exposure from mediators” or “update an exposure list having control instruction fields, via dynamic booking of display information from mediators.”	24
X.	GROUND 4 – ALLEGED OBVIOUSNESS OVER NAKAMURA IN VIEW OF RAVAKY.....	25
A.	The Nakamura-Ravaky combination in Petitioners’ theory for claims 9, 20, 30, and 41 does not practice “update said exposure list in real time with control instruction fields via dynamic booking of information in time for exposure from mediators” or “update an exposure list having control instruction fields, via dynamic booking of display information from mediators.”	25
XI.	GROUND 5 – ALLEGED OBVIOUSNESS OVER NAKAMURA IN VIEW OF HOLTEY.....	27
A.	The Nakamura-Holtey combination in Petitioners’ theory for claims 10, 21, 31, and 42 does not practice “update said exposure list in real time with control instruction fields via dynamic booking of information in time for exposure from mediators” or “update an exposure list having control instruction fields, via dynamic booking of display information from mediators.”	27
XII.	CONCLUSION.....	28

I, Zaydoon Jawadi, hereby declare as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I have been retained by T-Rex Property AB, in this action. My credentials are described in my CV, which is Exhibit 2002. I offer this report on the technology at issue in U.S. Patent No. 7,382,334 in response to the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review, Case No. 2017-00006, filed by Petitioner BroadSign International, LLC.

2. I have been asked by T-Rex's counsel to offer technical opinions relating to U.S. Patent No. 7,382,334 and the alleged prior art and arguments presented by the Petitioners and their expert. I am being compensated for my work. My compensation is not related to the outcome of this case.

II. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

3. As a result of performing the analysis described herein, and applying the standards outlined below in Section IV, I have determined that, in my opinion, none of Petitioners' proposed Grounds 1-3 provide a basis for concluding that any of the claims of the '334 Patent should be found invalid. My opinion is supported by the evidence in the patent specification, figures and claims, as well as the disclosures of the alleged prior art and the other documents cited below.

III. BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS

4. As shown in my CV (Exhibit 2002), I have a Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering from Mosul University, a Master of Science in Computer

Science from Columbia University, and over 35 years of experience in software development, engineering, consulting, and management in the fields of computing systems, Internet, web technologies, data storage, data networking, software applications, telephony, and telecommunication.

5. In 2010, I cofounded and am the President of Rate Speeches, Inc., an Internet company providing online communication rating and evaluation services.

6. From 2001 to 2006, I was President and cofounder of CoAssure, Inc., a provider of automated web-based telecommunication test services.

7. From 1999 to 2001, I was CEO, Chairman, and founder of Can Do, Inc. an Internet eCommerce and community company.

8. From 1992 to 1996, I was President and founder of Zadian Technologies, Inc., a supplier of data storage test systems, with over 50,000 units installed worldwide.

9. In 1996, Zadian Technologies was acquired by Xyratex International LTD (NASDAQ: XRTX, which was acquired by Seagate, NASDAQ: STX, in 2014). Following Zadian's acquisition by Xyratex, I became a general manager at Xyratex until 1998. At Xyratex, I was responsible for a data networking analysis tools business unit, which designed and built Gigabit Ethernet network protocol analysis and monitoring products, which were sold, under OEM agreement, by the largest network protocol analysis and monitoring products supplier.

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.