

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC. AND
CHOICE HOTELS INTERNATIONAL, INC.,

Petitioners

v.

FALL LINE PATENTS, LLC,

Patent Owner

Patent No. 9,454,748

**DECLARATION OF KENDYL A. ROMÁN
IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR
INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT 9,454,748**

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	5
A. Engagement.....	5
B. Background and Qualifications.....	7
(i) Relevant Technical Experience.....	8
(ii) Patent Experience.....	17
(iii) Technical Expert.....	18
(iv) Testifying Engagements.....	19
C. Compensation.....	23
D. Information Considered	23
II. Legal Standards Related to Patentability	24
A. My Understanding of Claim Construction.....	24
B. My Understanding of Anticipation/Novelty	25
C. My Understanding of Obviousness.....	26
III. The '748 Patent.....	33
A. Background of subject matter related to the subject matter disclosed in the '748 specification	33
(i) Computer Hardware, Software, and Firmware	33
(ii) Graphic Images and Graphical User Interfaces	34
(iii) Computer-Based Questionnaires	35
(iv) Tokens and Tokenizing.....	36
(v) Global Positioning System (GPS) and Location Identification	37
B. Summary of the Alleged Invention of the '748 Patent.....	37
C. '748 Prosecution History.....	39
D. Effective Filing Date of the Challenged Claims	41
IV. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	41
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	42
A. "GPS integral thereto"	43
B. "token"	44
C. "questionnaire".....	46
D. "originating computer" / "recipient computer" / "central computer".....	47
VI. Prior Art References	48
A. Barbosa.....	48
B. Hancock.....	49

C. Bandera.....	50
VII. Patentability Analysis of the Challenged Claims of the '748 Patent	50
A. Comparison of Barbosa in View of the Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art to Claims 1, 9, 11, 13, and 15-22.....	51
(i) Claim 19	51
(ii) Claim 20.....	65
(iii) Independent Claim 21	65
(iv) Claim 22.....	70
(v) Independent Claim 1	71
(vi) Independent Claim 9	73
(vii) Claim 11	76
(viii) Claim 13.....	76
(ix) Claim 15	77
(x) Independent Claim 16	77
(xi) Claim 17	79
(xii) Claim 18.....	80
B. Comparison of Barbosa In View of Bandera to Claims 1, 9, 11, 13, and 15-22.....	80
(i) A Person of Ordinary Skill Would Have Considered Barbosa In Conjunction With Bandera	80
(ii) Claims 1, 9, 11, 13, and 15-22	81
C. Comparison of Hancock in View of the Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art to Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 11, 13, and 15-22.....	82
(i) Independent Claim 19	82
(ii) Claim 20.....	95
(iii) Independent Claim 21	95
(iv) Claim 22.....	105
(v) Independent Claim 1	105
(vi) Claim 2.....	109
(vii) Claim 5.....	110
(viii) Independent Claim 9	110
(ix) Claim 11	113
(x) Claim 13	113
(xi) Claim 15.....	113
(xii) Independent Claim 16	114
(xiii) Claim 17.....	116

(xiv) Claim 18.....	116
D. Comparison of Hancock In View of Bandera to Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 11, 13, and 15-22 ...	116
(i) A Person of Ordinary Skill Would Have Considered Bandera In Conjunction With Hancock	117
(ii) Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 11, 13, and 15-22	118
VIII. Conclusion	119
IX. Appendix A: Materials considered by Kendyl Román.....	121

I, Kendyl A. Román, declare as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Engagement

1. I have been engaged by counsel for Petitioners Uber Technologies, Inc. and Choice Hotels International, Inc. as an expert witness for the above-captioned *inter partes* review (IPR) proceeding. I have been asked to provide my opinions about the state of the art of the technology described in United States Patent No. 9,454,748, entitled “System and method for data management,” by J. David Payne, filed October 22, 2010, and issued September 22, 2016 (the “’748 Patent”). I also have been asked to provide my opinions on the patentability of claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 11, 13, and 15-22 (the “Challenged Claims”) of the ’748 Patent. The following is my written report on these topics. I understand that the ’748 Patent has been provided as Ex. 1001.

2. I understand that the ’748 Patent has been provided as Ex. 1001. I understand that the ’748 Patent claims priority to provisional application No. 60/404,491, filed August 19, 2002. For the purposes of this review, I assume the earliest possible priority date of the ’748 Patent is the August 19, 2002 filing date to which the ’748 Patent claims priority. I understand that the ’748 Patent is currently assigned to Fall Line Patents, LLC. (“P.O.” or “Fall Line”).

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.