

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

RIOT GAMES, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

PALTALK HOLDINGS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00129, IPR2018-00130, IPR2018-00131, IPR2018-00132
Patent 5,822,523 & 6,226,686

DECLARATION OF NANCY MIRACLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

II. Qualifications..... 2

III. Materials Reviewed 3

IV. Legal Principles 5

 A. Anticipation 5

 B. Obviousness..... 6

 1. Motivation to Combine 7

 2. Non-Analogous Art..... 7

 3. Combination of Prior Art Renders Prior Art Device Inoperable For Its Intended Purpose..... 8

 4. References Teach Away From Combination 8

 5. Secondary Considerations of Non-Obviousness..... 8

V. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art 9

VI. Claim Construction..... 9

 A. “group messaging server” (Claim 1 of the ‘523 Patent and Claim 12 of the ‘686 Patent)..... 9

 B. “message group” (Claim 1 of the ‘523 Patent and Claims 1, 3, 7, 12, and 18 of the ‘686 Patent)..... 10

 C. “portion for identifying said first message group” (Claim 1 of the ‘523 Patent), “portion that is used to identify said message group” (Claims 1, 3, 7, and 18 of the ‘686 Patent), and “portion that is used to identify said first message group” (Claim 12 of the ‘686 Patent)..... 10

 D. “aggregated message” (Claim 1 of the ‘523 Patent and Claims 1, 3, 7, and 12 of the ‘686 Patent) and “server message” (Claim 18 of the ‘686 Patent) 11

 E. “payload portion” (Claim 1 of the ‘523 Patent and Claims 1, 3, 7, 12, and 18 of the ‘686 Patent)..... 15

 F. “aggregated payload” (Claim 1 of the ‘523 Patent and Claims 1, 7, and 12 of the ‘686 Patent), “aggregating said payload portions” (Claim 3 of the ‘686 Patent), and “aggregating said payload portion with the payload portion of a second host message” (Claim 18 of the ‘686 Patent) 16

VII. Request for Comments and State of the Internet in 1994 18

VIII.	Claim 1 of the ‘523 Patent and Claims 1, 3, 7, 12, and 18 of the ‘686 Patent	20
A.	Petitioner’s Assertion that Aldred Inherently or Obviously Discloses a portion for identifying a message group is flawed	20
B.	RFC 1692 Does Not Disclose or Suggest “aggregating . . . said payload portions of said messages to create an aggregated payload” (Claim 1 of the ‘523 Patent and Claims 7 and 12 of the ‘686 Patent); “aggregating said payload portions of said host messages . . . to create an aggregated payload” (Claims 1 and 3 of the ‘686 Patent); “aggregating said payload portion with the payload portion of a second host message” (Claim 18 of the ‘686 Patent)	25
C.	RFC 1692 Does Not Disclose or Suggest “forming an aggregated message using said aggregated payload” (Claim 1 of the ‘523 Patent and Claims 1 and 12 of the ‘686 Patent); “create an aggregated message” (Claim 3 of the ‘686 Patent); “said aggregated message” (Claim 7 of the ‘686 Patent); and “forming a server message . . .” (Claim 18 of the ‘686 Patent)	33
1.	Petitioner does not provide sufficient motivation to combine Aldred and RFC 1692	34
2....	RFC 1692 does not disclose or suggest “forming an aggregated message using said aggregated payload,” (Claim 1 of the ‘523 Patent and Claim 12 of the ‘686 Patent) “create an aggregated message” (Claim 3 of the ‘686 Patent); “said aggregated message” (Claim 7 of the ‘686 Patent); and “forming a server message . . .” (Claim 18 of the ‘686 Patent).....	36
D.	Aldred in view of RFC 1692 does not render obvious Claim 8 of the ‘523 Patent	43
E.	Aldred in view of RFC 1692 does not render obvious Claim 33 of the ‘523 Patent nor Claims 29, 48 and 65 of the ‘686 Patent.....	44
F.	Aldred in view of RFC 1692 does not render obvious Claims 2-7, 9, 10, 15-27, 31, 32, 34-37, 41, 42, and 44-47 of the ‘523 Patent	48
G.	GROUND 2 of IPR2018-00129: Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Aldred in View of RFC 1692 and RFC 1459 Renders Obvious Claims 38-40 of the ‘523 Patent.....	49
H.	GROUND 3 of IPR2018-00129: Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Aldred in View of RFC 1692 and Denzer Renders Obvious Claim 43 of the ‘523 Patent.....	49

I. GROUND 2 of IPR2018-00130: Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Aldred in View of RFC 1692 and Ulrich Renders Obvious Claim 11-15, 23, and 27-30 of the '523 Patent	50
J. Aldred in view of RFC 1692 does not render obvious Claims 2, 4, 8-11, 13-17, 19-21, 26-30, 34, 35, 39, 40, 45-49, 53, 54, 56, 57, 62-66 and 70 of the '686 Patent	50
K. GROUND 2 of IPR2018-00131: Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Aldred in View of RFC 1692 and RFC1459 Renders Obvious Claims 31-33, 50-52, and 67-69 of the '686 Patent	51
L. GROUND 2 of IPR2018-00132: Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Aldred in View of RFC 1692 and Ulrich Renders Obvious Claims 22-27, 41-46, and 58-63 of the '686 Patent	51
M. GROUND 3 of IPR2018-00132: Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Aldred in View of RFC 1692 and Denzer Renders Obvious Claims 36 and 55 of the '686 Patent.....	52
IX. Conclusion	53

I, Nancy Miracle, declare as follows:

I. Introduction

1. I have been retained by the law firm of Munck Wilson Mandala, LLP on behalf of Paltalk Holdings, Inc. (“Paltalk” or “Patent Owner”) as an independent expert consultant in this proceeding before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board of the United States Patent and Trademark Office. All statements herein made of my own knowledge are true, and all statements herein made based on information and belief are believed to be true. I am over 21 and otherwise competent to make this declaration. Although I am being compensated at my standard hourly rate for my time spent on this matter, my opinions herein are my own, no part of my compensation depends on the outcome of this proceeding, and I have no other interest in this proceeding.

2. I understand Petitioner Riot Games, Inc. has requested *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 5,822,523 (“the ‘523 Patent) in *inter partes* review proceeding Nos. IPR2018-00129 and IPR2018-00130. I understand Petitioner has also requested *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 6,226,686 (“the ‘686 Patent) in *inter partes* review proceeding Nos. IPR2018-00131 and IPR2018-00132.

3. I have been asked to opine on whether certain other patents and materials, if combined, would meet all the limitations of the ‘523 and ‘686 patents,

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.