

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SNAP INC.,
Petitioner

v.

BLACKBERRY LIMITED
Patent Owner

Patent No. 8,326,327

DECLARATION OF DR. SAMRAT BHATTACHARJEE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....i

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. QUALIFICATIONS1

III. SUMMARY OF OPINIONS.....5

IV. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART6

V. BACKGROUND OF THE RELEVANT FIELD7

VI. OVERVIEW OF THE '327 PATENT8

VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION10

 A. “determine at least one action spot within a predetermined distance from the current location of the first mobile device” 10

 B. “display the image with the at least one activity spot”12

VIII. OVERVIEW OF THE PRIOR ART14

 A. *Winkler*14

 B. *Altman*.....17

 C. *Lemmela*19

 D. *Crowley*21

 E. *Waldman*.....22

IX. THE PRIOR ART Teaches OR SUGGESTS ALL OF THE FEATURES OF CLAIMS 1-3, 8-11, 13-15, and 20 OF THE '327 PATENT23

 F. Ground 1: Claims 1-3, 8, 10-11, and 13-15 Are Obvious Over *Winkler* in View of *Altman*.....23

 1. Claim 124

 2. Claim 2.....44

 3. Claim 345

 4. Claim 846

 5. Claim 1047

6.	Claim 11	49
7.	Claim 13	50
8.	Claim 14	51
9.	Claim 15	52
B.	Ground 2: Claims 1-3, 8, and 13-15 Are Obvious Over <i>Lemmela</i> in View of <i>Crowley</i>	53
10.	Claim 1	53
11.	Claim 2	67
12.	Claim 3	68
13.	Claim 8	68
14.	Claim 13	69
15.	Claim 14	71
16.	Claim 15	71
C.	Ground 3: Claims 10-11 Are Obvious Over <i>Lemmela</i> in View of <i>Crowley</i> , in Further View of <i>Winkler</i>	72
17.	Claim 10	72
18.	Claim 11	78
D.	Ground 4: Claims 9 and 20 Are Obvious Over <i>Lemmela</i> in View of <i>Crowley</i> , in Further View of <i>Waldman</i>	78
19.	Claim 9	79
20.	Claim 20	87
X.	CONCLUSION.....	88

I, Dr. Samrat Bhattacharjee, declare as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I have been retained by Snap Inc. (“Petitioner”) as an independent expert consultant in this proceeding before the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“PTO”) regarding U.S. Patent No. 8,326,327 (“the ’327 patent”) (Ex. 1001). I have been asked to consider whether certain references teach or suggest the features recited in claims 1-3, 8-11, 13-15, and 20 (“the challenged claims”) of the ’327 patent. My opinions are set forth below.

2. I am being compensated at my rate of \$600 per hour for the time I spend on this matter. My compensation is in no way contingent on the nature of my findings, the presentation of my findings in testimony, or the outcome of this or any other proceeding. I have no other interest in this proceeding.

II. QUALIFICATIONS

3. My qualifications for forming the opinions in this report are summarized here and explained in more detail in my curriculum vitae, which I understand is provided as Exhibit 1003.

4. I earned a Ph.D. in Computer Science from Georgia Institute of Technology in 1999. Before that, I earned Bachelor of Science degrees in Mathematics and Computer Science from Georgia College and State University in

1994. I was a Teaching Assistant at the Georgia Institute of Technology from 1994 to 1995 and an Instructor in 1998.

5. From 1999 through 2005, I was an Assistant Professor at the University of Maryland, College Park, in the Department of Computer Science, and then an Associate Professor with tenure from 2005 through 2009. In 2006, I was a Visiting Professor at Max Planck Institut für Software Systems in Saarbrücken, Germany. In 2007, I was a Visiting Researcher at AT&T Labs in Florham Park, New Jersey.

6. Since 2009, I have been a tenured Professor at the University of Maryland. My teaching and research have focused on systems, security, and computer networking, including mobile systems, and all aspects of the technologies pertaining to the '327 patent.

7. I have served as a reviewer for ACM/IEEE Transactions on Networking, IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications, Computer Communications Journal (Special Issue on Network Security), ACM Transactions on Computer Systems, Performance Evaluation Journal, Computer Communications Review, European Transactions on Telecommunications, IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems, and ACM Transactions on Internet Technology.

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.