

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

UBISOFT, INC. AND SQUARE ENIX, INC.,

Petitioners,

v.

UNILOC USA, INC. AND UNILOC LUXEMBOURG S.A.

Patent Owners

---

Case IPR2017-1290  
U.S. Patent 6,510,466

---

**DECLARATION OF DR. VAL DIÉULIIS**

JULY 27, 2017

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. QUALIFICATIONS.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3. COMPENSATION, TESTIMONY, AND PUBLICATIONS .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4. INFORMATION CONSIDERED .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>5. LEGAL STANDARDS.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>6. THE '466 PATENT .....</b>	<b>11</b>
6.1 Claims.....	21
<b>7. ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>8. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....</b>	<b>24</b>
8.1 “installing a plurality of application programs at the server” .....	25
8.2 Means-Plus-Function Terms (Claim 15) .....	29
8.2.1 “means for installing a plurality of application programs at the server” .....	31
<b>9. U.S. PATENT NO. 5,692,129 (“SONDEREGGER”).....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>10. NOVELL NETWARE DOCUMENTATION.....</b>	<b>42</b>
10.1 Novell’s Guide to Netware 4.1 Networks (“Hughes”).....	42
10.2 Novell Application Launcher 2.0 White Paper (“NAL White Paper”) .....	44
<b>11. SONDEREGGER COMBINED WITH HUGHES DOES NOT RENDER OBVIOUS THE '466 PATENT .....</b>	<b>45</b>
11.1 A POSITA would not have been motivated to combine Sonderegger and Hughes .....	47
11.2 Sonderegger combined with Hughes fails to make a prima facie case of obviousness regarding “installing a plurality of application programs at the server” .....	50
11.3 Sonderegger combined with the NAL White Paper fails to make a prima facie case of obviousness regarding “providing an instance of the selected one of the plurality	

of application programs to the client for execution  
responsive to the selection” .....54

11.4 Other Limitations That Recite “a plurality of application  
programs” .....58

I, Dr. Val DiEuliis, hereby declare and state as follows:

**1. Introduction**

1. My name is Val DiEuliis, and I have been retained by Uniloc, USA, Inc., and Uniloc Luxembourg S.A. (“Uniloc” or the “Patent Owner”). My client Uniloc and its associated counsel, Etheridge Law Group, have asked me to study U.S. Patent No. 6,510,466 (“the ’466 patent”), the Petition, and the proffered prior art in this case, in addition to other relevant documents. I document my findings in this declaration.

2. I have concluded that U.S. Patent No. 5,692,129 (Sonderegger; EX1002) combined with Hughes [EX1003], Franklin [EX1004], and the “NAL White Paper” [EX1005] does not render obvious any challenged claim of the patent at issue, the ’466 patent, at least because Sonderegger in view of Hughes fails to make a prima facie case of obviousness for the limitation “installing a plurality of application programs at the server” (Claim 1), “means for installing” (Claim 15), and “computer readable program code means for installing ...” (Claim 16).

3. In addition, I find that a POSITA would not have been motivated to combine Sonderegger with Hughes, and the Petitioner and

its expert, Dr. Madiseti, fail to demonstrate why a POSITA might have been so motivated.

4. The limited scope of my opinions and analysis in this declaration do not imply that I may not later express other opinions or report other results from other investigations concerning other issues raised by the Petitioners or their experts in this IPR.

## **2. Qualifications**

5. I am an electrical engineer with over 45 years of experience developing, programming, and analyzing computer algorithms and software. I am experienced with and able to create, read, and interpret firmware and software in C, C++, Java, assembly language, HTML, and other computer programming languages. I have served as an expert witness in multiple cases for which I analyzed computer source code in various languages and testified at ITC hearings and two jury trials concerning my results.

6. During my career, I have developed and managed projects for various applications, including sensors, controls, communications, user interfaces, device firmware, handheld devices, medical devices and systems, and test systems for optical and magnetic disk systems.

# 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.