

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the *Inter Partes* Review of:

Trial Number: To Be Assigned

U.S. Patent No. 8,478,799

Filed: June 25, 2010

Issued: July 2, 2013

Inventor(s): Arthur J. Beaverson, Paul
Bowden

Assignee: Hewlett Packard Enterprise
Development, LP

Title: Namespace File System
Accessing an Object Store

Panel: To Be Assigned

Mail Stop *Inter Partes* Review
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**DECLARATION OF PRASHANT SHENOY, PhD, UNDER
37 C.F.R. § 1.68 IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR
INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,478,799**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	4
II.	Background and Qualifications	6
III.	Understanding of Patent Law	8
IV.	Background OF Technology	11
	A. Computer Storage Systems, and Their Evolution.....	11
	B. Cryptographic Hash	20
V.	'799 Patent	22
	A. Background of the '799 Patent	22
	B. Summary of the '799 Patent	22
	C. Prosecution History of the '799 Patent.....	29
	D. Other IPR Proceedings Against '799 Patent.....	32
	E. Representative Claim	33
VI.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art.....	34
VII.	Broadest Reasonable Interpretation.....	36
	A. “namespace file system”	37
	B. “object”	39
	C. “program code means which, when executed by a process, performs the steps of method claim 19”	40
VIII.	CHALLENGES	42
	A. Background on Prior Art References.....	43
	1. Muthitacharoen	43
	2. Dabek	55

Declaration of Prashant Shenoy Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68 in Support of
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,478,799

3. Agrawal	59
4. Bondurant	61
5. McKusick	62
6. Bunte	65
B. Claims 1-4, 7-9, 11-14, 17-22, 27, 28, and 30-35 are obvious over Muthitacharoen and Dabek	69
1. Reasons to Combine Muthitacharoen and Dabek	69
C. Claims 5 and 6 are Obvious over Muthitacharoen, Dabek, and Agrawal	72
1. Reasons to Combine Muthitacharoen and Dabek with Agrawal ...	72
D. Claims 10, 15, and 26 are Obvious over Muthitacharoen, Dabek, and McKusick	75
1. Reasons to Combine Muthitacharoen and Dabek with McKusick	75
E. Claims 29 and 30 are Obvious over Muthitacharoen, Dabek, and Bunte	77
1. Reasons to Combine Muthitacharoen and Dabek with Bunte	77
F. Claims 16 and 36 are Obvious over Muthitacharoen, Dabek, and Bondurant	80
1. Reasons to Combine Muthitacharoen and Dabek with Bondurant	81
IX. DETAILED CLAIM ANALYSIS	84
X. Conclusion	196

I, Prashant Shenoy, do hereby declare as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I have been retained as an independent expert witness on behalf of Cisco Systems, Inc. (“Cisco”) for the above-captioned Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (“IPR”) of U.S. Patent No. 8,478,799 (“the ’799 patent”). I am being compensated at my usual and customary rate for the time I spend 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 1-22 and 26-36 (“the Challenged Claims”) of the ’799 patent are invalid, either because they were anticipated or because they would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art (“POSITA”) at the time of the alleged invention. It is my opinion that all of the limitations of claims 1-22 and 26-36 would have been obvious to a POSITA after reviewing Muthitacharoen, Dabek, Agrawal, Bondurant, McKusick, and Bunte.

3. The ’799 patent issued on July 2, 2013, from U.S. Patent Appl. No. 12/823,922 (“the ’922 Application”), filed on June 25, 2010. The ’922 Application is a continuation-in-part of U.S. Patent Appl. No. 12/823,452 (“the ’452 Application”), also filed June 25, 2010, and which issued as U.S. Patent No. 8,880,544 (“the ’544 Patent”) on November 4, 2014. Both, the ’922 Application

and the '452 Application claim priority to U.S. Provisional Application No. 61/269,633 (“the '633 Provisional Application”) filed on June 26, 2009.

4. The '799 patent names Arthur J. Beaverson and Paul Bowden as the purported inventors. Further, the '799 patent identifies SimpliVity Corporation as the initial assignee of the '799 patent.

5. In preparing this Declaration, I have reviewed, among other things, the '799 patent, the file history of the '799 patent, numerous prior art and technical references from the time of the alleged invention, and documents from two other IPR proceedings (i.e., IPR2016-01779 and IPR2016-01780) which were initiated against the '799 patent.

6. I understand that claims in an IPR are given their broadest reasonable interpretation in view of the patent specification and the understandings of a POSITA. I further understand that this is not the same claim construction standard as one would use in a District Court proceeding.

7. In forming the opinions expressed in this Declaration, I relied upon my education and experience in the relevant field of art, and have considered the viewpoint of a POSITA, as of June 26, 2009. My opinions are based, at least in part, on the following:

- “Muthitacharoen”: Athicha Muthitacharoen, *et al.*, “Ivy: A Read/Write Peer-to-Peer File System,” Proceedings of the 5th

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.