

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BITDEFENDER, INC.

Petitioner,

v.

UNILOC USA, INC.

Patent Owner

Case IPR2017-01315

U.S. Patent 6,510,466

DECLARATION OF DR. VAL DI EULIIS

AUGUST 2, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	4
2. QUALIFICATIONS.....	5
3. COMPENSATION, TESTIMONY, AND PUBLICATIONS	8
4. INFORMATION CONSIDERED	9
5. LEGAL STANDARDS.....	10
6. THE '466 PATENT	11
6.1 Claims.....	22
6.2 Ordinary Skill in the Art	25
6.3 Claim Construction	26
6.3.1 “means for installing a plurality of application programs at the server”	28
6.3.2 “means for receiving at the server a login request from a user at the client”	29
6.3.3 “means for establishing a user desktop interface at the client associated with the user responsive to the login request from the user, the desktop interface including a plurality of display regions associated with a set of the plurality of application programs installed at the server for which the user is authorized”	30
6.3.4 “means for receiving at the server a selection of one of the plurality of application programs from the user desktop interface”	31
6.3.5 “means for providing an instance of the selected one of the plurality of application programs to the client for execution responsive to the selection”	32
6.3.6 “means for maintaining application management information for the plurality of applications at the server”	33
7. U.S. PATENT NO. 5,832,505 (“KASSO”).....	34
8. U.S. PATENT NO. 6,338,138 (“RADUCHEL”).....	39
9. U.S. PATENT NO. 5,615,367(“BENNETT”)	40

10. KASSO COMBINED WITH RADUCHEL DOES NOT RENDER OBVIOUS ANY CLAIM OF THE '466 PATENT	41
10.1 A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Modify Kasso to Practice Any Claim of the '466 Patent.....	43
10.1.1 Kasso Leads Away From Consolidating Servers	46
10.2 A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Modify Kasso with Raduchel	51
10.3 The Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate Kasso combined with Raduchel renders obvious the limitation “receiving at the server a login request from a user at a client”	53
10.3.1 A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Modify Kasso’s Distributed Server System to a Single-Server System	53
10.3.2 A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Modify Kasso to Receive Login Requests at the HTTP Server	55
10.4 The Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate Kasso combined with Raduchel renders obvious the limitation “establishing a user desktop interface ... responsive to the login request from the user, the desktop interface including a plurality of display regions associated with a set of the plurality of application programs installed at the server for which the user is authorized”	56
11. THE PETITIONER FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE KASSO OR KASSO COMBINED WITH RADUCHEL AND BENNETT RENDERS OBVIOUS THE LIMITATION “MAINTAINING APPLICATION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION FOR THE PLURALITY OF APPLICATIONS AT THE SERVER”	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. 5,832,505 (Kasso; EX1009) combined with U.S. Patent No. 6,338,138 (Raduchel; EX1010) does not render obvious any challenged claim of the patent at issue, the ’466 patent, for at least the reasons that the Petitioner fails to make a prima facie case of obviousness for several claim limitations in the independent claims. In addition, in my opinion, a POSITA would not have been motivated to apply Kasso’s teachings in a way that would lead to the ’466 patent or to combine Kasso with Raduchel.

3. 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 Petitioner or their experts in this IPR.

2. Qualifications

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. I have designed, developed, and implemented hardware and software for digital communication networks, including factory networks and document capture and distribution networks; and communications links for various applications. See DiEuliis CV (See e.g., Website

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.