

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

GOOGLE INC.  
Petitioner

v.

BLACKBERRY LTD.  
Patent Owner

---

Patent No. 8,713,466

---

**DECLARATION OF DR. DAN R. OLSEN JR.**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION .....1

II. BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS .....1

III. SUMMARY OF OPINIONS .....4

IV. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....5

V. TECHNICAL BACKGROUND .....6

VI. OVERVIEW OF THE '466 PATENT .....8

VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....9

VIII. OVERVIEW OF THE PRIOR ART .....10

    A. Cadiz.....10

    B. Hawkins.....16

    C. Siedlikowski .....17

    D. Yamadera.....18

IX. THE PRIOR ART DISCLOSES OR SUGGESTS ALL OF THE  
    FEATURES OF CLAIMS 1-26 OF THE '466 PATENT.....19

    A. Cadiz Discloses or Suggests the Features of Claims 1, 4, 6, 12-  
        14, 17, 22, and 24 .....19

        1. Claim 1 .....20

        2. Claim 4.....65

        3. Claim 6.....68

        4. Claim 12.....69

        5. Claim 13 .....73

        6. Claim 14.....75

        7. Claim 17.....80

        8. Claim 22.....80

        9. Claim 24.....84

    B. Cadiz in view of Hawkins Discloses or Suggests the Feature of  
        Claims 2, 3, 15, and 23 .....85

1.	Claim 2 .....	85
2.	Claim 3 .....	89
3.	Claim 15 .....	91
4.	Claim 23 .....	92
C.	Cadiz in view of Siedlikowski Discloses or Suggests the Features of Claims 7-9, 18, 19, and 25 .....	93
1.	Claim 7 .....	93
2.	Claim 8 .....	99
3.	Claim 9 .....	100
4.	Claim 18 .....	103
5.	Claim 19 .....	104
6.	Claim 25 .....	105
D.	Cadiz in view of Yamadera Discloses or Suggests the Features of Claims 5, 10, 11, 16, 20, 21, and 26 .....	106
1.	Claim 5 .....	106
2.	Claim 10 .....	109
3.	Claim 11 .....	116
4.	Claim 16 .....	117
5.	Claim 20 .....	118
6.	Claim 21 .....	119
7.	Claim 26 .....	120
X.	CONCLUSION.....	122

I, Dr. Dan R. Olsen Jr., declare as follows:

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

1. I have been retained by Google Inc. (“Petitioner”) as an independent expert consultant in this proceeding before the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“PTO”) regarding U.S. Patent No. 8,713,466 (“the ’466 patent”) (Ex. 1001). I have been asked to consider whether certain references disclose or suggest the features recited in claims 1-26 (“the challenged claims”) of the ’466 patent. My opinions are set forth below.

2. I am being compensated at my rate of \$500 per hour for the time I spend on this matter. My compensation is in no way contingent on the nature of my findings, the presentation of my findings in testimony, or the outcome of this or any other proceeding. I have no other interest in this proceeding.

## **II. BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS**

3. I have more than 35 years of experience in computer science and human-computer interaction (HCI). I hold a doctorate in Computing and Information from the University of Pennsylvania. For 3 ½ years I was an Assistant Professor of Computer Science at Arizona State University. I then served for 30 years on the faculty of Brigham Young University, retiring as a full professor in 2015. During that time at BYU, I also served as the chair of the Department of Computer Science. I took leave from BYU in 1996 to become the founding

director of the Human Computer Interaction Institute in the School of Computer Science at Carnegie Mellon University. I returned to BYU in 1998. I am currently the CEO of a software startup in educational technology (SparxTeq, Inc).

4. During the course of my academic career, I authored over 70 papers in the field of computer science. The topics on which I have published papers are:

- User Interface Management Systems
- Syntactic representations of user interfaces
- Multi-user interaction across networks
- Induction of interaction behavior from pictures
- Novel interaction techniques using speech and laser pointers
- Interactive machine learning
- Interactive robotics
- Interactive television

5. I currently hold 4 patents in human-computer interaction. I have authored 3 textbooks on the techniques of software design for human-computer interaction.

6. I have had extensive involvement in professional societies, such as the Association for Computing Machinery (ACM), the premiere society in computing. I have served in many offices of ACM's Special Interest Group on Computer

# 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.