

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SNAP, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

BLACKBERRY LIMITED,
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2019-00715
Patent No. 8,326,327

SECOND DECLARATION OF PATRICK McDANIEL, PH.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF WORK	6
II.	QUALIFICATIONS	7
III.	MATERIALS CONSIDERED	11
IV.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	13
V.	BACKGROUND OF THE '327 PATENT	14
	A. '327 Patent Overview (Ex. 1001).....	14
	B. The Prosecution History of the '327 Patent.....	21
VI.	INTERPRETATION OF THE '327 PATENT CLAIMS AT ISSUE.....	23
	A. “determine/determining” at least one “action spot”	25
	B. “determine/determining at least one action spot within a predetermined distance from the current location of the mobile device”	32
VII.	ANALYSIS OF GROUNDS 2-4: ALLEGED OBVIOUSNESS IN VIEW OF LEMMELA AND CROWLEY (GROUND 2) / IN VIEW OF LEMMELA, CROWLEY, AND WINKLER (GROUND 3) / IN VIEW OF LEMMELA, CROWLEY, AND WALDMAN (GROUND 4).....	35
	A. Overview Of Prior Art.....	35
	i. Lemmela.....	35
	ii. Crowley.....	39
	iii. Waldman	40
	B. Grounds 2-4 Deficiencies	41
	i. The Petition Has Not Shown That Lemmela’s System Determines At Least One Action Spot For Activity That “Is Occurring” Relative To A Current Location Of A Mobile Device (Claims 1, 10, And 13)	41

ii.	Lemmela Does Not Provide An “Activity Level” As Recited In Independent Claims 1 and 13.....	49
iii.	The Petition Has Not Shown That Lemmela Discloses An Indication Of Activity Level That Is Based Upon A Number Of Actions “Within A Predetermined Distance From The At Least One Action Spot,” As Recited In Claims 3 And 15	54
iv.	The Combination Of Winkler With Lemmela And Crowley Would Not Have Provided A “Graphical Item Identifying A Direction, Relative To The Current Location [Of A First Mobile Device], In Which To Travel In Order To Arrive At The Determined At Least One Action Spot” As Recited In Claim 10	58
v.	Deficiencies In The Petition’s Proposed Combination Based On Lemmela, Crowley, And Waldman (Claims 9 And 20).....	62
VIII.	ANALYSIS OF GROUND 1: ALLEGED OBVIOUSNESS IN VIEW OF WINKLER AND ALTMAN	65
A.	Overview Of Prior Art.....	65
i.	Winkler.....	65
ii.	Altman.....	69
B.	Ground 1 Deficiencies	70
i.	The Petition Presents Inconsistent Mappings For “The At Least One Action Spot” Of Independent Claims 1, 10, And 13	70
ii.	The Petition Has Not Shown Winkler’s Map Elements Correspond To A Location “Where” At Least One Other Mobile Device “Has Engaged” In Documenting Action.....	74
iii.	The Petition Has Not Shown That The Alleged Winkler-Altman Combination Would Have Set A “Predetermined Distance” Before Determining “The At Least One Action Spot”	77
iv.	The Petition Conflates The Distance From A Tagged Location / Map Element With A Distance From Current Location Of A First Mobile Device	81

v.	Winkler’s Color-Changing Map Element Is Not A “Graphical Item Identifying A Direction, Relative To The Current Location [Of The Mobile Device], In Which To Travel In Order To Arrive At The Determined At Least One Action Spot” As Recited In Claim 10	84
IX.	PROPOSED SUBSTITUTE CLAIM 21	87
A.	The Subject Matter of Claim 21	87
B.	The Original Disclosure Supports Substitute Claim	93
i.	Element [21b]: Touch Sensitive Display	93
ii.	Element [21c]: Displaying an Interactive Map.....	94
iii.	Elements [21e]/[21g]: Action Spot/Activity Level.....	97
iv.	Element [21f]: Action Spot & Current Location Signifying	99
v.	Element [21i]: Providing a Pop-Display.....	100
C.	The References Asserted in the Petition Lack Multiple Features of Substitute Claim 21	102
i.	Winkler (EX1004).....	102
ii.	Altman (EX1006).....	104
iii.	Lemmela (EX1005).....	106
iv.	Crowley (EX1008).....	107
v.	Waldman (EX1011).....	107
D.	Substitute Claim 21 Represents a Non-Abstract Technological Improvement over Traditional Mobile Devices	108
X.	LEGAL STANDARDS	114
A.	Obviousness.....	115
B.	Written Description.....	118
C.	Patent Eligibility	119

XII. ADDITIONAL REMARKS120

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.