

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LG ELECTRONICS, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

UNILOC LUXEMBOURG S.A.,

Patent Owner

Case IPR2017-02087

U.S. Patent 8,995,433

DECLARATION OF DR. VAL DIÉULIIS

DECEMBER 19, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	4
2. QUALIFICATIONS.....	5
3. COMPENSATION, TESTIMONY, AND PUBLICATIONS	8
4. INFORMATION CONSIDERED	11
5. LEGAL STANDARDS.....	12
6. THE '433 PATENT	13
6.1 Claims.....	21
7. ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	22
8. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	23
8.1 “instant voice messaging application”	24
8.2 “client platform system”	31
9. INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION WO 01/11824 (“ZYDNEY”)	32
10. U.S. PATENT NO. 6,725,228 (“CLARK”).....	41
11. THE PROPOSED COMBINATION OF ZYDNEY AND CLARK FAILS TO RENDER OBVIOUS ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM OF THE 433 PATENT	46
11.1 The Modification of Zydney with Clark’s Database Renders Inoperative Zydney’s Teaching of Temporary Storage of Voice Messages	47
11.2 The Proposed Combination of Zydney and Clark Fails to Render Obvious “wherein the instant voice message application generates an audible or visual effect indicating receipt of an instant voice message” (Claim 8)	51
12. U.S. PATENT NO. 6,750,881 (“APPELMAN”).....	53

LGE v. Uniloc, IPR2017-02087
Uniloc’s Exhibit 2001
Declaration of Dr. Val DiEuliis, Page 2 of 63

13. THE PROPOSED COMBINATION OF ZYDNEY AND CLARK WITH APPELMAN FAILS TO RENDER OBVIOUS “WHEREIN THE INSTANT VOICE MESSAGING APPLICATION DISPLAYS AN INDICIA FOR EACH OF THE ONE OR MORE POTENTIAL RECIPIENTS INDICATING WHETHER THE POTENTIAL RECIPIENT IS CURRENTLY AVAILABLE TO RECEIVE AN INSTANT VOICE MESSAGE” (CLAIM 7)57

13.1 The Proposed Combination of Zydney and Appelman is Improper because the Combination of Zydney and Appelman would Render Zydney Unsatisfactory for an Intended Purpose of Zydney60

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. 8,995,433 (“the ’433 patent”), the Petition, the proffered prior art in this case, and other relevant documents. I document my findings in this declaration.

2. I have concluded that International Application WO 01/11824 (“Zydney”) [EX1003] combined with U.S. Patent No. 6,725,228 (“Clark”) [EX1008] and/or 6,750,881 (“Appelman”) [EX1004] do not render obvious any challenged claim of the patent at issue, the ’433 patent, at least for the following reasons:

- A POSITA would not have been motivated to modify Zydney with Clark because, if combined, neither Zydney nor Clark would operate according to their intended purposes. (Claims 1 and 6)
- A POSITA would not have been motivated to combine Zydney and Clark with Appelman because Zydney teaches away from Appelman and if combined, Zydney would have been rendered unsatisfactory for an intended purpose. (Claim 7)

LGE v. Uniloc, IPR2017-02087
Uniloc’s Exhibit 2001
Declaration of Dr. Val DiEuliis, Page 4 of 63

- The proposed combination of Zydney and Clark fails to render obvious “wherein the instant voice message application generates an audible or visual effect indicating receipt of an instant voice message.” (Claim 8)

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 Petitioners 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,

LGE v. Uniloc, IPR2017-02087
Uniloc’s Exhibit 2001
Declaration of Dr. Val DiEuliis, Page 5 of 63

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.