

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

UNIFIED PATENTS INC.
Petitioner

v.

VILOX TECHNOLOGIES LLC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2018-00044
Patent No. 7,302,423

DECLARATION OF WESLEY W. CHU, PH.D.
July 9, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	4
II. QUALIFICATIONS AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE	4
III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART AND RELEVANT LEGAL STANDARDS	11
IV. U.S. PATENT 7,302,423 (THE '423 PATENT), EXHIBIT 1001.....	14
A. Specification and Prosecution History	15
1. Specification	15
2. Prosecution History	17
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	20
A. Determining a Database Schema for a Database.....	21
B. Determining a Number of Characters in Each Entry of the Selected Database Field	23
C. Performing a Truncation.....	25
D. Displaying a Portion of Each Entry in the Selected Database Field, wherein a Number of Characters Displayed in Each Portion is Less Than or Equal to the Specified Amount of Characters	26
E. Each Entry from the Selected Data Field is Displayed on a Terminal	27
VI. REFERENCES RELIED ON BY THE PETITIONER	28
A. U.S. Patent 5,701,453 to Maloney (<i>Maloney</i> , Exhibit 1006).....	28
1. <i>Maloney</i> Does Not Disclose Determining a Database Schema	28
2. <i>Maloney</i> Discloses and Requires an Explicit Naming Convention	34
B. <i>Excel 2000 Bible</i> and <i>Excel</i> (Exhibit 1009)	39
C. U.S. Patent 7,168,039 to Bertram (<i>Bertram</i> , Exhibit 1007)	55
D. U.S. Patent 6,300,947 TO Kanevsky (<i>Kanevsky</i> , Exhibit 1008)	70
VII. NONE OF PETITIONER'S ASSERTED CHALLENGES ESTABLISH OBVIOUSNESS	76
A. Claim 1 is Not Obvious over <i>Maloney</i> in view of <i>Bertram</i>	77
1. <i>Maloney</i> in View of <i>Bertram</i> Does Not Disclose or Suggest All Claim 1 Limitations	77
2. There Can Be No Motivation to Combine <i>Maloney</i> and <i>Bertram</i>	83
B. Claim 2 is Not Obvious over <i>Maloney</i> in View of <i>Bertram</i>	87

C.	Claim 1 Is Not Obvious over <i>Excel</i> in View of <i>Bertram</i>	89
1.	<i>Excel</i> in View of <i>Bertram</i> Does Not Disclose or Suggest All Claim 1 Limitations	89
2.	There Can Be No Motivation to Combine <i>Excel</i> and <i>Bertram</i>	91
D.	Claim 3 is Not Obvious over <i>Maloney</i> in View of <i>Bertram</i>	100
1.	<i>Maloney</i> in View of <i>Bertram</i> Does Not Disclose or Suggest All Claim 3 Limitations	101
2.	There Can Be No Motivation to Combine <i>Maloney</i> and <i>Bertram</i> Because Any Combination of <i>Maloney</i> and <i>Bertram</i> Would Render Critical Features of <i>Maloney</i> Inoperative	102
E.	Claim 3 is Not Obvious over <i>Excel</i> in View of <i>Bertram</i>	106
1.	<i>Excel</i> in View of <i>Bertram</i> Does Not Disclose or Suggest All Claim 3 Limitations	106
2.	There Can Be No Motivation to Combine <i>Excel</i> and <i>Bertram</i>	106
F.	Claim 6 is not obvious over <i>Maloney</i> in View of <i>Bertram</i> and <i>Kanevsky</i> .114	
1.	The Combination of <i>Maloney</i> , <i>Bertram</i> , and <i>Kanevsky</i> Does Not Disclose or Suggest the Claim 6 Limitations	114
2.	There Can Be No Motivation to Combine <i>Maloney</i> , <i>Bertram</i> , and <i>Kanevsky</i> 115	
G.	Claim 6 is Not Obvious over <i>Excel</i> in View of <i>Bertram</i> and <i>Kanevsky</i>	117
1.	There Can Be No Motivation to Combine <i>Excel</i> , <i>Bertram</i> , and <i>Kanevsky</i> 117	
VIII.	CLAIMS 1, 3, AND 6, AS AMENDED, ARE VALID	123
A.	CLAIM 1/24	123
B.	CLAIM 3/25	124
C.	CLAIM 6/26	125
IX.	CONCLUSION	126

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I have prepared this Declaration at the request of Vilox Technologies, LLC stating my opinions as an independent expert regarding issues raised in the matter of Petition IPR2018-00044 (“Petition”) and the April 19, 2018 Decision on Institution of *Inter Partes* Review (“Decision”).

2. I am being compensated for this work, and my compensation is not dependent on the outcome of this matter.

3. In preparation for this Declaration, I studied Exhibits 1001 – 1010 provided by Petitioner as well as the Petition. I also studied the Decision; Exhibit 2003, Declaration of Dr. Joseph L. De Bellis; Exhibit 2014, *Excel III* (excerpt tof Excel 2000 Bible); Exhibit 2015, Deposition Transcript of Dr. Philip Greenspun; and Exhibits 2019 (Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary), 2018 (IEEE Dictionary of Electrical and Electronics Terms), and Exhibit 2020, (Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary).

4. In preparing this Declaration, I relied, in addition to the above Papers and other documents, on my knowledge and experience gained through 56 years as an engineer, professor, and consultant.

II. QUALIFICATIONS AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

5. My Curriculum Vitae is provided as Exhibit 2002. Following is a summary of my education and relevant experience.

6. I am Emeritus Distinguished Professor at the University of California, Los Angeles. I received a Bachelor of Science degree in electrical engineering from the University of Michigan in 1960 and a Master of Science degree in electrical engineering

from the University of Michigan in 1961. I received a Ph.D. in electrical engineering from Stanford University in 1966.

7. From 1961 to 1962, I worked at General Electric (now Honeywell) in Phoenix, Arizona with a focus on electrical switching circuits for computers. From 1964 to 1966, I worked on the design of large-scale computers at IBM in San Jose, California. From 1966 to 1969, I worked at Bell Laboratories in Holmdel, New Jersey with a focus on computer communications and distributed databases.

8. I joined the faculty of the University of California, Los Angeles in 1969 in the Computer Science Department. I served as Department Chair from 1988 to 1991, as Distinguished Professor since 1998, and as Emeritus Distinguished Professor since 2009.

9. From 1982 to 2005, I worked as a consultant for several large computer companies:

- 1982 - 1984, Western Union Corporation, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, Executive Consultant to VP Engineering and Member of the Technical Review Board with duties that included:
 - Evaluating and planning for the Western Union Packet Switched Network, Easylink, and other value-added services.
 - Developing transition plans for network modernization, integration with existing networks and for future network growth.
 - Critiquing on going and proposed enhancement plans and compare with other viable alternatives for effectiveness.

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.