

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CISCO SYSTEMS INC.,

Petitioner

- vs. -

FATPIPE NETWORKS PRIVATE LIMITED

Patent Owner

DECLARATION OF NARASIMHA REDDY, PHD, UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.68 IN

SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW

OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,775,235

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	5
II.	Background and Qualifications	7
III.	Understanding of Patent Law	11
IV.	The '235 Patent.....	13
V.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art.....	15
VI.	Broadest Reasonable Interpretation.....	17
	A. “parallel network configuration” / “parallel”	18
	B. “disparate networks”	18
	C. “private network”	19
	D. “independent...networks”	20
VII.	Detailed Invalidity Analysis	20
	A. Ground 1: Claims 5-6, 8, 10, 14, and 22 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 over <i>Guerin</i> and the Admitted Prior Art	24
	1. Prior Art References	24
	a) Background on <i>Guerin</i>	24
	b) Background on Admitted Prior Art	26
	2. Unpatentability Analysis of Claims 5-6, 8, 10, 14, and 22	27
	a) Claim 5.....	27
	b) Claim 6.....	42
	c) Claim 8.....	43
	d) Claim 10.....	44
	e) Claim 14.....	47

Declaration of Dr. Narasimha Reddy Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68 in Support of
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 6,775,235

f)	Claim 22.....	48
B.	Ground 2: Claim 7 is obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 over <i>Guerin</i> , the Admitted Prior Art, and <i>Monachello</i>	49
1.	Prior Art References	50
a)	Background on <i>Monachello</i>	50
2.	Unpatentability Analysis of Claim 7	50
a)	Claim 7.....	50
C.	Ground 3: Claims 4, 9, 19, and 24 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 over <i>Guerin</i> , the Admitted Prior Art, and <i>Bollapragada</i>	53
1.	Prior Art References	53
a)	Background on <i>Bollapragada</i>	53
2.	Unpatentability Analysis of Claims 4, 9, 19, and 24.....	53
a)	Claim 4.....	53
b)	Claim 9.....	74
c)	Claim 19.....	76
d)	Claim 24.....	82
D.	Ground 4: Claims 11-13 and 23 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 over <i>Guerin</i> , the Admitted Prior Art, <i>Bollapragada</i> , and <i>Smith</i>	82
1.	Prior Art References	82
a)	Background on <i>Smith</i>	82
2.	Unpatentability Analysis of Claims 11-13 and 23	83
a)	Claim 11.....	83
b)	Claim 12.....	85

Declaration of Dr. Narasimha Reddy Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68 in Support of
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 6,775,235

c)	Claim 13.....	87
d)	Claim 23.....	88
E.	Ground 5: Claim 20 is obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 over <i>Guerin</i>	88
1.	Unpatentability Analysis of Claim 20.....	88
a)	Claim 20.....	88
F.	Ground 6: Claim 21 is obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 over <i>Guerin</i> , the Admitted Prior Art, and <i>Fowler</i>	90
1.	Prior Art References.....	91
a)	Background on <i>Fowler</i>	91
2.	Unpatentability Analysis of Claim 21.....	91
a)	Claim 21.....	91
G.	Ground 7: Claims 1 and 15 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 over <i>Guerin</i> , the Admitted Prior Art, <i>Bollapragada</i> , and <i>Shaffer</i>	95
1.	Prior Art References.....	95
a)	Background on <i>Shaffer</i>	95
2.	Unpatentability Analysis of Claims 1 and 15.....	96
a)	Claim 1.....	96
b)	Claim 15.....	102
VIII.	Availability for cross-examination.....	102
IX.	Conclusion.....	103

Declaration of Dr. Narasimha Reddy Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68 in Support of
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 6,775,235

I, Narasimha Reddy, do hereby declare as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I have been retained by counsel for Cisco Systems Inc. (“Cisco”) as an independent expert witness for the above-captioned Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (“IPR”) of U.S. Patent No. 6,775,235 (“the ’235 Patent”). I am being compensated at my usual and customary rate for the time I spent in connection with this IPR. My compensation is not affected by the outcome of this IPR.

2. I have been asked to provide my opinions regarding whether claims 1, 4-15, and 19-24 (each a “Challenged Claim” and collectively the “Challenged Claims”) of the ’235 Patent are invalid as they would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art (“POSITA”) as of the earliest claimed priority date. It is my opinion that all of the Challenged Claims would have been obvious to a POSITA after reviewing the prior art discussed below.

3. In preparing this Declaration, I have reviewed:

- a) EX1001, the ’235 Patent;
- b) EX1002, the file history of the ’235 Patent;
- e) the prior art references discussed below:
 - US Patent 6,243,754 to Guerin et al. (“Guerin”) (EX1006);
 - U.S. Patent No. 6,748,439 to Monachello *et al.* (“Monachello”) (EX1007);

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.