

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE, INC.,  
Petitioner

v.

UNILOC USA, INC. and UNILOC LUXEMBOURG S.A.,  
Patent Owner

---

IPR2018-00580  
PATENT 8,724,622

---

**DECLARATION OF WILLIAM C EASTTOM II**

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

FACEBOOK, INC., WHATSAPP INC.,  
Petitioners,

v.

UNILOC USA, INC. and UNILOC LUXEMBOURG S.A.,  
Patent Owners.

---

Case IPR2017-01668  
Patent 8,724,622

---

**DECLARATION OF WILLIAM C EASTTOM II**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS .....	2
III.	LEGAL STANDARDS USED IN MY ANALYSIS.....	2
	A. Obviousness.....	3
	B. Priority Date .....	4
	C. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	4
	D. Broadest Reasonable Interpretation.....	6
IV.	OVERVIEW OF THE ‘622 PATENT .....	6
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	9
	A. “communication platform system” .....	9
VI.	PETITIONERS’ CITED REFERENCES.....	10
	A. International Application WO 01/11824 (“Zydney”) .....	10
	B. Excerpt of Computer Networking Essentials (“Shinder”).....	15
	C. Excerpt of Paul S. Hethmon, Illustrated Guide to HTTP (“Hethmon”) ..	15
	D. U.S. Patent No. 6,173,323 (“Moghe”).....	16
VII.	VALIDITY ANALYSIS.....	17
	A. No prima facie obviousness for dependent Claims 4, 5 and 12.....	17
	1. Zydney distinguishes voice containers from voice messages .....	17
	2. Zydney does not render obvious “wherein the instant voice message includes an object field” (claims 3, 4, 5 and 12).....	19
	3. Zydney teaches away from “wherein the instant voice message includes an action field identifying one of a predetermined set of permitted actions requested by the user” (claims 4 and 5).....	21

B. Zydney does not render obvious “wherein the messaging system receives connection object messages from the plurality of instant voice message client systems, wherein each of the connection object messages includes data representing a state of a logical connection with a given one of the plurality of instant voice message client systems” (claims 24-26).....	22
1. Zydney expressly teaches away from use of “connection objects” as defined in the ’622 patent.....	23
2. No motivation to combine Zydney with Hethmon because Zydney’s transport mechanism would not have worked with HTTP at that time .....	24
VIII. CONCLUSION .....	26

I, Chuck Easttom, hereby declare as follows:

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. My name is William Charles Easttom II (Chuck Easttom) and I have been retained by Uniloc, USA, Inc., and Uniloc Luxembourg S.A. (“Uniloc” or the “Patent Owner”) to provide my expert opinions regarding U.S. Patent No. 8,724,622 (the ‘622 Patent). In particular, I have been asked to opine on whether a person of ordinary skill in the art (POSITA) at the time the inventions described in the ‘622 patent were conceived would have found all claims, Claims 4, 5, 12, and 24-26 (“Challenged Claims”) as obvious in light of the following referenced cited in IPR2017-01668:

- Ex. 1113, PCT Patent Application No. PCT/US00/21555 (“*Zydney*”)
- Ex. 1114, Excerpts from Debra Littlejohn Shinder, Computer Networking Essentials (“*Shinder*”)
- Ex. 1109, Paul S. Hethmon, Illustrated Guide to HTTP (“*Hethmon*”)
- Ex. 1118, Excerpts from *Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary* (1991) (“Microsoft (1991)”)
- Ex. 1119, U.S. Patent No. 6,173,323 (“*Moghe*”)

2. Based on my review of the prior art then available, my understanding of the relevant of the relevant requirements of patent law, and my decades of experience in the field of computer science including communications systems, it is my opinion that the Challenged Claims would not have been obvious in light of the proposed combinations.

# 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.