

DOCKET NO.: 2211726-00145

Filed on behalf of Unified Patents Inc.

By: David L. Cavanaugh, Reg. No. 36,476  
Daniel V. Williams, Reg. No. 45,221  
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP  
1875 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
Tel: (202) 663-6000  
Email: David.Cavanaugh@wilmerhale.com  
Email: Daniel.Williams@wilmerhale.com

Roshan Mansighani, Reg. No. 62,429  
Jonathan Stroud, Reg. No. 72,518  
Unified Patents Inc.  
1875 Connecticut Ave. NW, Floor 10  
Washington, DC, 20009  
Tel: (202) 805-8931  
Email: Jonathan@unifiedpatents.com  
Email: Roshan@unifiedpatents.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

UNIFIED PATENTS INC.  
Petitioner

v.

PLECTRUM LLC  
Patent Owner

IPR2017-01430  
Patent 5,978,951

**DECLARATION OF DR. SRINIVASAN SESHAN**

**US PATENT 5,978,951 – CLAIMS 1-6, 8, 11-14, AND 21-24**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. QUALIFICATIONS .....	3
III. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND.....	8
IV. OVERVIEW OF THE '951 PATENT .....	14
A. Summary of the Alleged Invention .....	14
B. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	20
C. Prosecution History .....	20
D. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	23
E. Understanding of the Law .....	23
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	26
A. “code generator,” (claim 1), “coded address,” (claim 1), and “encoding” (claim 2) .....	26
VI. SUMMARY OF OPINIONS.....	28
A. Ground I: Claims 1, 2, and 21 are rendered obvious by <i>Cheriton</i> in view of ordinary skill in the art .....	28
1. Overview of <i>Cheriton</i> .....	28
2. Claim 1 is obvious in view of <i>Cheriton</i> and ordinary skill .....	31
3. Claim 2 is obvious in view of <i>Cheriton</i> .....	44
4. Claim 21 is obvious in view of <i>Cheriton</i> .....	52
B. Ground II: Claims 3, 5, and 6 are rendered obvious by <i>Cheriton</i> in view of <i>Kessler</i> .....	61
1. Overview of <i>Kessler</i> .....	61
2. Claim 3 is obvious in view of <i>Cheriton</i> and <i>Kessler</i> .....	62
3. Claim 5 is obvious in view of <i>Cheriton</i> and <i>Kessler</i> .....	64
4. Claim 6 is obvious in view of <i>Cheriton</i> and <i>Kessler</i> .....	66
C. Ground III: Claims 4, 22, 23, and 24 are rendered obvious by <i>Cheriton</i> in view of <i>Kessler</i> in view of <i>Jain</i> .....	67

1.	Overview of <i>Jain</i> .....	67
2.	Claim 4 is obvious in view of <i>Cheriton, Kessler, and Jain</i> .....	68
3.	Claim 22 is obvious in view of <i>Cheriton and Jain</i> .....	69
4.	Claim 23 is obvious over <i>Cheriton and Jain</i> .....	70
5.	Claim 24 is obvious over <i>Cheriton, Kessler, and Jain</i> .....	71
D.	Ground IV: Claims 8 and 11-14 are rendered obvious by <i>Cheriton</i> in view of <i>Jain</i> .....	72
1.	Claim 8 is obvious in view of <i>Cheriton and Jain</i> .....	72
2.	Claim 11 is obvious in view of <i>Cheriton and Jain</i> .....	80
3.	Claim 12 is obvious in view of <i>Cheriton and Jain</i> .....	81
4.	Claim 13 is obvious in view of <i>Cheriton and Jain</i> .....	82
5.	Claim 14 is obvious in view of <i>Cheriton and Jain</i> .....	82
VII.	AVAILABILITY FOR CROSS-EXAMINATION .....	83
VIII.	RIGHT TO SUPPLEMENT .....	84
IX.	JURAT .....	84

I, Srinivasan Seshan, declare as follows:

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

1. I have been retained by Unified Patents Inc. (“Unified” or “Petitioner”) as an independent expert consultant in this proceeding before the United States Patent and Trademark Office.
2. I understand that this proceeding involves US Patent No. 5,978,951 to Christopher P. Lawler et al. (the “’951 patent”), (attached as EX1001 to Unified’s petition). I have reviewed the specification, file history and claims of the ’951 patent.
3. I understand that the application for the ’951 patent was filed on September 11, 1997. I also understand that the ’951 patent is currently assigned to Plectrum LLC.
4. I have been asked to consider whether certain references disclose or suggest the features recited in the claims of the ’951 patent.
5. I have also been asked to consider the state of the art and the prior art available as of September 11, 1997. In particular, I have been asked to consider the network related aspects in the ’951 patent and compare those to the prior art available as of September 11, 1997. My opinions are provided below.
6. I have reviewed and understand US Patent 6,091,725 (“Cheriton”) (EX1002).

7. I have reviewed and understand European Patent Application No. EP0522743A1 (“Jain”) (EX1003).
8. I have reviewed and understand Kessler et al., “Inexpensive Implementations of Set-Associativity”, 17:3 ACM SIGARCH Computer Architecture News – Special Issue: Proceedings of the 16th annual international symposium on Computer Architecture 131 (“Kessler”) (EX1004).
9. I have reviewed every document cited in this declaration.
10. I have been retained by Petitioner Unified Patents Inc. as an expert in networks, and more particularly, network switching and routing devices.
11. I am being compensated at my normal consulting rate for my work. My compensation is not dependent on and in no way affects the substance of my statements in this declaration.
12. To the best of my knowledge, I have no financial interest in Petitioner. Petitioner’s counsel has informed me that Plectrum LLC (“Plectrum”) purports to own the ’951 patent. To the best of my knowledge, I have no financial interest in Plectrum, and I have had no contact with Plectrum. To the best of my knowledge, I similarly have no financial interest in the ’951 patent. To the extent any mutual funds or other investments I own have a financial interest in the Petitioner, Unified Patents Inc., or the ’951 patent, I do not knowingly have any financial interest that would affect or bias my judgment.

# 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.