

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

VIPTELA, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

FATPIPE NETWORKS PRIVATE LIMITED,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-00684
Patent U.S. 6,775,235

DECLARATION OF JOEL WILLIAMS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Qualifications and Experience.....	2
	A. Education and work experience	2
	B. Compensation.....	4
	C. Documents and other materials relied upon.....	5
III.	Statement of Legal Principles.....	5
	A. Anticipation.....	5
	B. Obviousness.....	6
IV.	Claim Construction.....	8
V.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	9
VI.	The '235 patent.....	10
VII.	Overview of Karol.....	14
VIII.	Claims 6 and 22-24 are not anticipated by Karol.....	20
	A. The item to be modified is the final destination IP address in the incoming packet.	20
	B. Protocol and header conversions do not require modifications to the destination IP address.....	21
	C. The actual destination IP address in the incoming packet in is not modified in the protocol conversion process of Karol.....	26
IX.	Claims 6 and 22-24 are not obvious over Karol.....	36
X.	Claim 6 is patentable over Karol in view of Stallings.....	37
XI.	Claims 5-6 and 22-24 are not anticipated by Karol or obvious over Karol alone or in view of Stallings.....	40

A.	Claims 5 and 22 are patentable over Karol alone or in view of Stallings.	40
B.	Karol does not anticipate claim 5 or 22.	41
C.	Karol does not render obvious claims 5 and 22.	43
D.	Karol in view of Stallings does not render obvious claims 5 and 22.	44
XII.	Conclusion	47

I. Introduction

1. My name is Joel Williams.

2. I have been engaged by the Exclusive Licensee FatPipe, Inc. (“FatPipe”) to investigate and opine on certain issues relating to U.S. Patent No. 6,775,235 B2 (“the ’235 patent”) in connection with FatPipe’s Response to Petition for *Inter Partes* Review in IPR2017-00684.

3. I understand that FatPipe has asserted the ’235 patent against Viptela in an on-going patent infringement lawsuit, *FatPipe, Inc. v. Viptela, Inc.*, which was originally filed as Case No. DED-1-16-cv-00182 in the United States District Court for Delaware.

4. In this declaration, I will first discuss the technology background related to the ’235 patent and then provide my analyses and opinions on claims 6 and 22-24 for the ’235 patent.

5. This declaration is based on the information currently available to me. To the extent that additional information becomes available, I reserve the right to continue my investigation and study, which may include a review of documents and information that may be produced, as well as testimony from depositions that may not yet be taken.

6. In forming my opinions, I have relied on information and evidence identified in this declaration, including the ’235 patent, the prosecution history, and

prior art references listed in the Grounds of Petitioner's challenges, and the declarations submitted by Dr. Forys.

II. Qualifications and Experience

A. Education and work experience

7. Attached as Exhibit A to this declaration is a copy of my curriculum vitae, which provides a substantially complete list of my education, experience and publications that are relevant to the subject matter of this report.

8. I received a B.S. in Computer Science from the Ohio State University in 1978.

9. I have worked on the design of numerous network routers and other network devices for a number of major Silicon Valley companies, including HP, Cisco, Space Systems Loral, and a number of small start-up companies.

10. I worked for Bell Telephone Laboratories from 1970 to 1978. As an Associate Member of the Technical Staff, I participated in the development of network management systems and central office interfaces.

11. While working for Bell Telephone Laboratories, I attended Ohio State University, receiving a Bachelor of Science in Computer Science in 1978.

12. From 1978 to 1982, I worked at the Vidar Division of TRW as a Supervisor of Software Engineering, where I was responsible for the design and implementation of telephone central office switching and transmission equipment.

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.