

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

MPH TECHNOLOGIES OY,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2019-00823
Patent 9,712,494

EXHIBIT 2002

DECLARATION OF PROFESSOR GEORGE N. ROUSKAS, PH.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. QUALIFICATIONS.....	1
III. BASES OF OPINIONS	6
IV. APPLICABLE LEGAL STANDARDS.....	8
A. Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	8
B. Claim Construction.....	10
C. Obviousness (35 U.S.C. § 103).....	10
V. OVERVIEW OF THE '494 PATENT AND THE STATE OF THE ART AT THE TIME OF THE INVENTION.....	13
A. The Difficulties of Implementing Standard IPsec with Mobile Devices and NAT Devices	14
B. The Invention of the '494 Patent.....	21
C. Illustration of the '494 Patent Invention	23
D. RFC 3104 RSIP Support for End-to-End IPsec	25
E. Grabelsky DNAT Support for End-to-End IPsec.....	30
VI. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	33
A. Unique Identity.....	34
B. Mobile Computer	40
C. Substitute/Substituting	46
VII. GROUND 1: CLAIMS 1-5 AND 8-11 ARE PATENTABLE OVER THE COMBINATION OF RFC 3104 AND GRABELSKY.....	49

A.	Claim 1 is Patentable Over the Combination of RFC 3104 and Grabelsky	49
1.	The Petition Fails to Establish that the Prior Art Teaches the “Mobile Computer” in “The Intermediate Computer Configured to Receive from a Mobile Computer a Secure Message”	49
2.	The Petition Fails Because There is No Reasonable Expectation of Success that the Modifications Necessary to Make RSIP Support Mobile Hosts Would Work	73
B.	Claim 2 is Further Patentable Because The Petition Fails to Establish that the Prior Art Teaches “The Intermediate Computer Is Further Configured to Substitute the Unique Identity Read from the Secure Message With Another Unique Identity Prior to Forwarding	74
1.	Dr. Goldschlag’s “Adding . . . an outer IP Header” Is Not Substituting the Unique Identity	75
2.	Dr. Goldschlag’s “Replacing an Outer IP Header” Does Not Meet the Limitation of Substituting the Unique Identity	76
3.	The Confusing Argument That Combining RFC 3104 and Grabelsky Produces a “combination of the outermost IP header and the IPSec protocol header [that] is changed by RSIP server N” Is Completely Unsupported	77
C.	Claims 3, 5, 8 and 10 Are Patentable Over the Combination of RFC 3104 and Grabelsky	80
D.	Claim 4 is Further Patentable Over the Combination of RFC 3104 and Grabelsky.....	80
1.	The Petition Fails to Fill In the Missing Limitation	80
2.	The Cited Art Does Not Disclose the Claimed Two-Part Translation Table.....	83

E. **Claim 9 is Further Patentable Over the Combination of RFC 3104 and Grabelsky.....85**

F. **Claim 11 is Further Patentable Over the Combination of RFC 3104 and Grabelsky.....87**

VIII. GROUND 2: CLAIMS 6-7 ARE PATENTABLE OVER THE COMBINATION OF RFC 3104, GRABELSKY AND WAGNER.....89

IX. CONCLUSION.....90

I. INTRODUCTION

1. My name is George Rouskas. I have been retained as an expert witness to provide my independent opinion in regards with matters at issue in the *inter partes* review of U.S. 9,712,494 (“the ’494 Patent”) in the IPR2019-00823 proceeding. I have been retained by MPH Technologies Oy (“MPH”), the Patent Owner, in the above proceedings. Petitioner in this case is Apple Inc. (“Apple”).

2. Unless otherwise noted, the statements made herein are based on my personal knowledge, and if called to testify about this declaration, I could and would do so competently and truthfully.

3. A detailed record of my professional qualifications including cases in which I was an expert is being submitted herewith as Exhibit 2003 and is summarized in Section II, *infra*.

4. I am not a legal expert and offer no opinions on the law. However, I have been informed by counsel of the various legal standards that apply, and I have applied those standards in arriving at my conclusions.

II. QUALIFICATIONS

5. I am an Alumni Distinguished Graduate Professor with Tenure in the Department of Computer Science at North Carolina State University (NC State), where I also serve as the Director of Graduate Programs. I am an experienced researcher and educator in the field of computer networking, with expertise in

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.