

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Unified Patents Inc.

Petitioner

v.

Bradium Technologies, LLC

Patent Owner

IPR2018-00095
U.S. Patent 9,253,239

DECLARATION OF CHRISTOPHER WILSON

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. SUMMARY OF OPINIONS.....	3
III. QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE	5
A. Education and Work Experience.....	5
B. Compensation.....	9
C. Documents and Other Materials Relied Upon	9
IV. STATEMENT OF LEGAL PRINCIPLES	11
A. Claim Construction	11
B. Anticipation.....	11
C. Obviousness	12
V. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	13
VI. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND OF THE 239 PATENT.....	15
A. Data Communications Over the Internet	17
B. Data Communications in Wireless Mobile Systems.....	20
C. Image Tiles and Image Pyramids.....	22
D. Compression of Image Tiles	27
E. Progressive Image Resolution Enhancement	28
F. Three-Dimensional Graphics	30
1. Overview of 3D Computer Graphics principles	30
2. Texture.....	36
3. Virtual Reality Modeling Language (VRML).....	40
G. Mip-Maps.....	41
H. Storage of Image data	47
VII. OVERVIEW OF THE 239 PATENT.....	50
VIII. IDENTIFICATIONS OF THE PRIOR ART AND SUMMARY OF OPINIONS	56

A. Reddy	56
B. Hornbacker	57
C. Loomans	58
IX. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	59
A. “Data Parcel”	59
B. Other Claim Terms	60
X. UNPATENTABILITY OF THE 239 PATENT CLAIMS	61
A. Ground 1: Claims 1-20 and 23-25 are unpatentable under 36 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Reddy in view of Hornbacker	61
1. Overview of Asserted References	63
2. Motivations to Combine Reddy and Hornbacker	70
3. Claim 1 is Rendered Obvious by Reddy in view of Hornbacker	77
4. Claim 2	108
5. Claim 3	112
6. Claim 4	115
7. Claim 5	116
8. Claim 6	117
9. Claim 7	117
10. Claim 8	119
11. Claim 9	120
12. Claim 10	122
13. Claim 11	123
14. Claim 12	123
15. Claim 13	124
16. Claim 14	125
17. Claim 15	126
18. Claim 16	126
19. Claim 17	129
20. Claim 18	129

21. Claim 19	130
22. Claim 20	130
23. Claim 23	132
24. Claim 24	136
25. Claim 25	138
B. Ground 2: Claims 21-22 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Reddy in view of Hornbacker and further in view of Loomans.....	139
1. Claim 21	147
2. Claim 22	148
C. Ground 3: Claim 20 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Reddy in view of Hornbacker and further in view of Rosasco.....	153
1. Claim 20	154
XI. CONCLUSION.....	159

I, Christopher Wilson, declare as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Christopher Wilson. I am a consultant in the fields of mapping, navigation systems, and telematics. I have been engaged by Unified Patents Inc. (“Unified”) to investigate and opine on certain issues relating to U.S. Patent No. 9,253,239 B2 (the “239 Patent”) entitled “System and methods for network image delivery with dynamic viewing frustum optimized for limited bandwidth communication channels” in Unified’s petition for *Inter Partes* Review of the 239 Patent (“Unified’s IPR Petition”) which requests the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB”) to review and cancel all claims of the 239 Patent—claims 1-25 (“Challenged Claims”).

2. I understand that the 239 Patent was purportedly assigned from the inventors Isaac Levanon and Yoni Lavi to Inovo Limited on April 3, 2011, and assigned from Inovo Limited to Bradium on June 17, 2013. Bradium is therefore referred to as the “Patent Owner” in this declaration.

3. This declaration is a modified version of the declaration of William R. Michalson for the previous IPR petition IPR2016-01897, executed on September 30, 2016. That petition resulted in a decision by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board to institute a review of most of the claims of the 239 Patent, but the review never occurred due to settlement of the case. I have fully reviewed the declaration of Mr

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.