

NETAPP V. REALTIME

IPR2017-01660

EXHIBIT 2010

(Declaration of Dr. Kenneth Zeger, previously
filed in IPR2016-00373 as Exhibit 2022)

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ORACLE AMERICA, INC.
Petitioner

v.

REALTIME DATA LLC
Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-00373
Patent No. 7,378,992 B2

**DECLARATION OF KENNETH A. ZEGER, PH.D., IN SUPPORT OF
PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION**

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
A.	Engagement	1
B.	Background and Qualifications	1
II.	MATERIALS CONSIDERED	5
III.	OVERVIEW OF THE LAW USED FOR THIS DECLARATION	9
A.	The Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	9
B.	Obviousness Law	10
IV.	INSTITUTED GROUNDS	13
V.	OVERVIEW OF THE '992 PATENT	13
A.	Background	13
B.	Specification.....	16
C.	Challenged Claim.....	17
VI.	APPLIED REFERENCES	19
A.	Hsu	19
B.	Franaszek.....	25
C.	Sebastian.....	31
VII.	ANALYSIS OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS AND THE ASSERTED REFERENCES	34
A.	Hsu alone fails to teach a default encoder because the Lempel- Ziv compression algorithm by itself does not implicitly teach the claimed default encoder. (All Grounds)	34
B.	Oracle's alleged modification of Hsu's content dependent technique to classify data blocks as unidentified or unrecognized data types would fundamentally alter how Hsu operates and therefore, the combination of Hsu and Franaszek or Hsu and Sebastian are not obvious. (All Grounds).....	40
1.	Hsu's fundamental operation is a content dependent technique, and not a default encoder, that classifies each data block as one of ten possible data types using a "most applicable" data type classification technique and selects and applies a compression algorithm based on the	

classified data type and the determined redundancy metrics.....	42
2. The modification of Hsu’s content dependent technique, and not a default encoder, that relies on the “most applicable” data type classification to classify data blocks as unidentified or unrecognized data types would alter how Hsu operates and would require substantial modifications.....	46
3. Hsu cannot and does not teach that its “most applicable” data type classification technique can classify data blocks as unidentified or unrecognized data types.....	49
C. Oracle’s rationales to combine Hsu and Franaszek are inadequate. (Ground 1).....	52
1. Oracle’s rationale that it would have been easy to modify Hsu with Franaszek and accordingly, modify Hsu to compress unknown data types is contrary to Hsu’s teachings and lacks adequate explanation.....	54
a) Hsu does not allow for compression of unrecognized or unidentified data types.....	55
b) Adding an entry to Hsu’s Table I and extending Hsu’s block analysis routines do not explain how and why Hsu could be modified to compress unrecognized data types.....	59
c) Hsu’s teaching that its database could be updated and block analysis routines extended do not expressly or implicitly explain how Hsu could be modified to compress unrecognized data types.....	61
2. Oracle’s rationale that a POSA would have combined Hsu with Franaszek because they are similar is generic and is insufficient to explain why a POSA would have combined these specific portions of Hsu and Franaszek to arrive at the claimed invention.....	62
3. Oracle’s rationale that the Hsu/Franaszek combination would have been optimal is vague and inadequate to explain why a POSA would have combined Hsu’s two-pass compression method with Franaszek’s block-by-	

	block analysis and compression system to arrive at the claimed invention.	67
4.	Oracle never explains how the combination of Hsu and Franaszek would operate to teach the invention as claimed and instead merely characterizes and quotes specific out-of-context teachings of Hsu and Franaszek.	72
5.	Dr. Storer’s book does not suggest claimed default encoder.	73
D.	Hsu teaches away from Franaszek because Hsu specifically teaches that Franaszek’s compression and analysis on a block-by-block basis would lead to an undesirable result where additional storage savings would be dominated by overhead. (Ground 1)	75
E.	Oracle’s rationales to combine Hsu and Sebastian are inadequate. (Ground 2).....	82
1.	Oracle’s rationale that it would have been easy to modify Hsu with Sebastian and accordingly, modify Hsu to compress unknown data types is contrary to Hsu’s teachings and lacks adequate explanation.....	83
2.	Oracle’s rationale that a POSA would have combined Hsu with Sebastian because they are similar is generic and is insufficient to explain why a POSA would have combined these specific portions of Hsu and Franaszek to arrive at the claimed invention.....	86
3.	Oracle’s rationale that the Hsu/Sebastian combination would have been optimal is not only generic but also vague and is inadequate to explain why a POSA would have combined Hsu’s two-pass compression method with Sebastian’s generic filter and compression system to arrive at the claimed invention.....	89
4.	Oracle never explains how the combination of Hsu and Franaszek would operate to teach the invention as claimed and instead merely characterizes and quotes specific out-of-context teachings of Hsu and Sebastian.	91
5.	Dr. Storer’s book does not suggest claimed default encoder.	92

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.