

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

Panasonic Avionics Corp.,  
Petitioner

vs.

Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC,  
Patent Owner

Case IPR2018-00043

U.S. Patent No. RE46,459

---

**DECLARATION OF DR. BILL LIN,  
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.68 IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR  
*INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. RE46,459**

**Ex. 1003**

**Panasonic Avionics v. Linksmart**

**Page 1 of 128**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. Introduction.....4

II. Background and Qualifications .....6

III. Understanding of Patent Law .....8

IV. The '459 Patent..... 11

    A. Overview ..... 11

V. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art..... 15

VI. Claim interpretation in *inter partes* review ..... 17

    A. “*redirection server*” ..... 18

VII. Detailed Invalidity Analysis .....20

    A. Claims 91-99, 108-120, and 122-125 are obvious over Abraham  
    in view of Malkin, further in view of Telia.....21

        1. Overview of Abraham ..... 21

        2. Overview of Malkin..... 25

        3. Reasons to Combine Abraham and Malkin ..... 27

        4. Overview of Telia ..... 32

        5. Reasons to Combine Abraham and Telia ..... 33

        6. Claim 91 ..... 37

        7. Claim 92..... 74

        8. Claim 93..... 76

        9. Claim 94..... 78

        10. Claim 95..... 82

Declaration of Dr. Lin under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68 in support of  
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. RE46,459

---

11.	Claim 96.....	84
12.	Claim 97.....	87
13.	Claim 98.....	90
14.	Claim 99.....	95
15.	Claim 108.....	97
16.	Claim 109.....	104
17.	Claim 110.....	108
18.	Claim 111.....	116
19.	Claim 112.....	117
20.	Claim 113.....	117
21.	Claim 114.....	118
22.	Claim 115.....	118
23.	Claim 116.....	119
24.	Claim 117.....	119
25.	Claim 118.....	120
26.	Claim 119.....	120
27.	Claim 120.....	121
28.	Claim 122.....	122
29.	Claim 123.....	123
30.	Claim 124.....	123
31.	Claim 125.....	124
VIII. Conclusion.....		128

I, Dr. Bill Lin, do hereby declare as follows:

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. I have been retained as an independent expert witness on behalf of Panasonic Avionics Corp. (“Panasonic” or “Petitioner”) for the above-captioned Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (“IPR”) of U.S. Patent No. RE46,459 (“the ’459 Patent”).

2. I am being compensated for my work in this matter at my standard hourly rate. I am also being reimbursed for reasonable and customary expenses associated with my work and testimony in this matter. My compensation is not contingent on the outcome of this matter or the specifics of my testimony.

3. I have been asked to provide my opinions regarding whether claims 91-99, 108-120, and 122-125 (“the Challenged Claims”) of the ’459 Patent are unpatentable as they would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art (“POSITA”) at the time of the alleged invention. It is my opinion that all of the limitations of these claims would have been obvious to a POSITA after reviewing U.S. Patent No. 5,983,270 to Abraham *et al.* (“Abraham”), U.S. Patent No. 6,247,054 to Malkin (“Malkin”), and European Patent No. EP0762707A2 to Telia (“Telia”), as discussed further below.

4. In preparing this Declaration, I have reviewed:

- a) the '459 Patent, Ex. 1001;
- b) the prosecution history of the '459 Patent, Ex. 1002;
- c) U.S. Patent No. 5,983,270 to Abraham *et al.* ("Abraham"), Ex. 1005;
- d) U.S. Patent No. 6,247,054 to Malkin ("Malkin"), Ex. 1006;
- e) European Patent No. EP0762707A2 to Telia ("Telia"), Ex. 1007;
- f) The prosecution history of Pat. No. 6,779,118, surrendered for RE46,459, Ex. 1008;
- g) The prosecution history of *Ex Parte Reexam* control no. 90/009,301, Ex. 1009;
- h) The prosecution history of *Ex Parte Reexam* control no. 90/011,485, Ex. 1010;
- i) The prosecution history of *Ex Parte Reexam* control no. 90/012,149, Ex. 1011;
- j) The prosecution history of *Ex Parte Reexam* control no. 90/012,342, Ex. 1012;
- k) The prosecution history of *Ex Parte Reexam* control no. 90/012,378, Ex. 1013; and
- l) The prosecution history of *Inter Partes Reexam* control no. 95/002,035, Ex. 1014.

# 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.