

In the United States Patent and Trademark Office

In the *Inter Partes* Review of:

Trial Number: To Be Assigned

U.S. Patent Nos. 8,155,012; 8,902,760;
9,049,019; 9,812,825

Filed: September 26, 2008

Issued: April 10, 2012

Inventor(s): John F. Austermann, III
and Marshall B. Cummings

Assignee: ChriMar Systems, Inc.

Title: System and Method for Adapting a Piece of Terminal Equipment
Panel: To Be Assigned

Mail Stop *Inter Partes* Review
Commissions for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**DECLARATION OF GEORGE ZIMMERMAN UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.68 IN
SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NOS. 8,155,012, 8,902,760; 9,049,019; AND 9,812,825**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Background and Qualifications.....	4
II.	Materials and Other Information Considered	6
III.	Understanding of Patent Law.....	7
IV.	Background on the ChriMar Patents	12
	A. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	16
V.	Claim Construction	17
	A. ‘012 Patent.....	18
	B. ‘760 Patent.....	22
	C. ‘019 Patent.....	26
	D. ‘825 Patent.....	26
VI.	Detailed Analysis.....	28
	A. ‘012 Patent.....	32
	1. Ground 1: Hunter in View of Bulan	32
	2. Ground 2: Bloch in View of IEEE 802.3	80
	B. ‘760 Patent.....	104
	1. Ground 1: Hunter in View of Bulan	104
	2. Ground 2: Hunter in view of Bulan, and Nelson	129
	3. Ground 3: Bloch in View of IEEE 802.3 and Peguiron	139
	C. The ‘019 Patent	161
	1. Ground 1: Hunter in View of Bulan	161
	2. Ground 2: Hunter in View of Bulan and Nelson	179
	3. Ground 3: Bloch in View of IEEE 802.3.....	189

4.	Ground 4: Bloch in View of IEEE 802.3 and Peguiron	201
D.	'825 Patent.....	206
1.	Ground 1: Hunter in View of Bulan	206
2.	Ground 2: Bloch in View of IEEE 802.3 and Peguiron	232
VII.	Secondary Indicia of Non-Obviousness	254
VIII.	Public Availability of IEEE Standards.....	255
IX.	Conclusion	256

I, George Zimmerman, do hereby declare as follows:

1. I have been retained as an expert witness on behalf of Cisco Systems, Inc. (“Cisco”) for the Petitions for *Inter Partes* Review (“IPR”) of U.S. Patent No. 8,155,012 (“the ‘012 patent”), 8,902,760 (“the ‘760 patent”); 9,049,019 (“the ‘019 patent”); and 9,812,825 (“the ‘825 patent”) (collectively, the “ChriMar Patents”). I am being compensated for my time in connection with this IPR at my standard consulting rate of \$300 per hour. My compensation is not affected by the outcome of this matter.

2. I have been asked to provide my opinions regarding whether claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 13, 16, 22, 25, 26, 29, 30, 67, 73, 80, 88, 106, 108, 114, 121, 129, and 147 (“Challenged ‘012 Claims”) of the ‘012 patent; claims 73, 106, 112, 134, 142, 145, 146, 175, 203, 216, and 219 of the ‘760 patent (“Challenged ‘760 Claims”); claims 44, 76, and 77 of the ‘019 patent (“Challenged ‘019 Claims”); and claims 1, 15, 34, 38, 49, and 64 of the ‘825 patent (“Challenged ‘825 Claims”) (collectively, the “Challenged Claims”) are invalid as obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the alleged invention.

3. The ChriMar Patents all share a common specification and are all continuations of U.S. Patent No. 6,650,622. The ‘012 patent issued on April 10, 2012, from U.S. Patent Appl. No. 12/239,001, filed on September 26, 2008.

(Ex.1003 at cover.) The ‘760 patent issued on December 2, 2014, from U.S. Patent

Declaration of George Zimmerman in Support of *Inter Partes* Review of 8,155,012; 8,902,760; 9,049,019; and 9,812,825

Appl. No. 13/370,918, filed on February 10, 2012. Ex.1004, Cover. The ‘019 patent issued on June 2, 2015, from U.S. Patent Appl. No. 13/615,726, filed on September 14, 2012. Ex.1005, Cover. The ‘825 patent issued on November 7, 2017, from U.S. Patent Appl. No. 14/726,940, filed on June 1, 2015. Ex.1006, Cover. For the purposes of my Declaration, I have been asked to assume that the priority date of the alleged invention recited in the ‘012 patent is April 10, 1998.

4. In forming the opinions expressed in this Declaration, I relied upon my education and experience in the relevant field of the art, and I have considered the viewpoint of a person having ordinary skill in the relevant art as of the priority date of the ‘622 parent patent, *i.e.*, April 10, 1998. My opinions are based, at least in part, on the following prior art references:

Reference	Date of Public Availability
WO 96/23377 (“Hunter”) (Ex.1033)	Hunter was filed on January 26, 1996, was published on August 1, 1996, has a priority date of January 27, 1995.
U.S. Patent No. 5,089,927 (“Bulan”) (Ex.1027)	Bulan was filed on October 12, 1989, and issued on February 18, 1992.
U.S. Patent No. 4,823,070 (“Nelson”) (Ex.1026)	Nelson was filed on August 3, 1987, and issued on April 18, 1989.
U.S. Patent No. 4,173,714 (“Bloch”) (Ex.1025)	Bloch was filed on June 3, 1977, and issued on November 6, 1979.

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.