

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re *Inter Partes* Review of:                    )  
U.S. Patent No. 9,454,748                        )  
Issued: September 27, 2016                    )  
Application No.: 12/910,706                    )  
Filing Date: October 22, 2010                )

For: **System and Method for Data Management**

**FILED VIA E2E**

**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.....	16
(iii)	Technical Expert.....	18
(iv)	Testifying Engagements.....	18
C.	Compensation.....	22
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.....	35
(v)	Global Positioning System (GPS) and Location Identification.....	36
B.	Summary of the Alleged Invention of the '748 Patent.....	37
C.	'748 Prosecution History.....	39
D.	Effective Filing Date of the Challenged Claims.....	40
IV.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.....	41
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	41
A.	“GPS integral thereto”.....	42
B.	“token”.....	43
C.	“questionnaire”.....	45
D.	“loosely networked”.....	46
E.	“originating computer” / “recipient computer” / “central computer”.....	46
VI.	Prior Art References.....	47
A.	Barbosa.....	47

B.	Hancock.....	48
C.	Bandera.....	49
D.	Falls .....	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 and 19-22.....	51
(i)	Claim 19 .....	51
(ii)	Claim 20 .....	66
(iii)	Independent Claim 21.....	66
(iv)	Claim 22 .....	73
(v)	Independent Claim 1.....	73
B.	Comparison of Barbosa In View of Bandera to Claims 1 and 19-22.....	76
(i)	A Person of Ordinary Skill Would Have Been Motivated to Combine Barbosa With Bandera .....	76
(ii)	Claims 1 and 19-22.....	78
C.	Comparison of Barbosa In View of Falls to Claim 7.....	79
(i)	A Person of Ordinary Skill Would Have Been Motivated to Combine Barbosa With Falls .....	79
(ii)	Independent Claim 7.....	80
D.	Comparison of Hancock in View of the Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art to Claims 1, 2, 5, and 19-22.....	86
(i)	Independent Claim 19.....	86
(ii)	Claim 20 .....	99
(iii)	Independent Claim 21.....	99
(iv)	Claim 22 .....	110
(v)	Independent Claim 1.....	110
(vi)	Claim 2 .....	114
(vii)	Claim 5.....	115
E.	Comparison of Hancock in View of Bandera to Claims 1, 2, 5, and 19-22.....	115
(i)	A Person of Ordinary Skill Would Have Been Motivated to Combine Bandera With Hancock .....	116
(ii)	Claims 1, 2, 5, and 19-22.....	117
F.	Comparison of Hancock in View of Falls to Claim 7.....	118
(i)	A Person of Ordinary Skill Would Have Been Motivated to Combine Hancock With Falls .....	118
(ii)	Independent Claim 7.....	120

VIII. Conclusion..... 124  
IX. Appendix A: Materials considered by Kendyl Román..... 127

I, Kendyl A. Román, declare as follows:

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

### **A. Engagement**

1. I have been engaged by counsel for Petitioners American Multi-Cinema, Inc. (“AMC”); McDonald’s Corporation and McDonald’s USA, LLC (collectively “McDonald’s”); Starbucks Corporation (“Starbucks”); Boston Market Corporation (“Boston Market”); Panda Restaurant Group, Inc. and Panda Express, Inc. (collectively, “Panda”); Papa John’s International, Inc. and Star Papa, LP (collectively, “Papa John’s”) (collectively, “Petitioners”) 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, 7, and 19-22 (the “Challenged Claims”) of the ’748 Patent. The following is my written report on these topics.

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

# 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.