

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

PARUS HOLDINGS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2020-00686 & IPR2020-00687
U.S. Patent No. 7,076,431 & 9,451,084

**DECLARATION OF BENEDICT OCCHIOGROSSO IN SUPPORT OF
PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S.
PATENT NOS. 7,076,431 & 9,451,084**

Parus Exhibit 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE.....	2
III. MATERIALS CONSIDERED	10
IV. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	13
V. LEGAL STANDARDS	14
A. Obviousness.....	14
B. Claim Construction.....	16
VI. PRIOR ART SPEECH-BASED INFORMATION RETRIEVAL SYSTEMS	16
VII. BACKGROUND AND TECHNOLOGY FOR THE '431 AND '084 PATENTS	18
A. Multiple Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) Systems Existed in the Prior Art with Strikingly Different Capabilities	24
B. Prior Art Interactive Voice Response Systems Suffered From Numerous Drawbacks	28
1. Typical Prior Art Systems For Accessing Web Sites Were Not Sufficiently Portable, Comprehensive, And Affordable	28
2. Voice Enabled Options Introduced Additional Problems and Drawbacks	29
3. Prior Art “Interactive Voice Response” Systems Suffered From A Lack Of Fault Tolerance, Limited Webpage Resources, And Generic Search Options And Results	30
C. The '431 and '084 Patent’s Solutions	33
VIII. '686 IPR ANALYSIS	34
A. '686 Prior Art	34
1. Ladd.....	34
2. Kurosawa	35
3. Goedken	36

4.	Houser	38
B.	Petitioner does not establish that Claim 1(c) is taught by the combination of <i>Ladd</i> , <i>Kurosawa</i> , and <i>Goedken</i> or by any other combination.	38
C.	Petitioner does not establish that Claim 1(k) is taught by the combination of <i>Ladd</i> , <i>Kurosawa</i> , and <i>Goedken</i> or by any other combination.	43
D.	Petitioner does not provide a sufficient motivation to combine <i>Ladd</i> , <i>Kurosawa</i> , and <i>Goedken</i>	45
1.	A POSITA would not combine <i>Ladd</i> with <i>Kurosawa</i> because it would create unacceptable latencies in a voice browsing system.....	45
2.	A POSITA would not combine <i>Ladd</i> modified by <i>Kurosawa</i> in further view of <i>Goedken</i>	51
3.	Petitioner relies on hindsight to cobble together the alleged combination	54
E.	Petitioner does not establish that Claim 5 is disclosed by the combination of <i>Ladd</i> , <i>Kurosawa</i> , and <i>Goedken</i>	56
F.	Petitioner does not establish that Claim 6 is disclosed by the combination of <i>Ladd</i> , <i>Kurosawa</i> , and <i>Goedken</i>	57
G.	The addition of <i>Houser</i> does not cure the shortcomings of the combination of <i>Ladd</i> , <i>Kurosawa</i> , and <i>Goedken</i>	58
H.	Petitioner does not provide a sufficient motivation to combine <i>Houser</i> with <i>Ladd</i> , <i>Kurosawa</i> , and <i>Goedken</i>	58

I, Benedict Occhiogrosso, hereby declare the following:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Benedict Occhiogrosso. I am a citizen of the United States over 21 years of age, and the co-founder and President of DVI Communications, Inc. I make this Declaration based on facts and matters within my own knowledge and on information provided to me by others, and if called as a witness, I could and would competently testify to the matters set forth herein.

2. I have been retained as a technical expert witness in this matter by Counsel for Patent Owner, Parus Holdings, Inc. (“Patent Owner” or “Parus”) to provide my independent opinions on certain issues requested by Counsel for Patent Owner relating to the Petitions for Inter Partes Review of United States Patent No. 7,076,431 (the “’431 patent”) and United States Patent No. 9,451,084 (the “’084 patent”). I am being compensated at an hourly rate of \$475. My compensation in this matter is not based on the substance of my opinions or on the outcome of this matter.

3. I am providing this Declaration for both the ’431 and ’084 Patents given the patents have substantially the same specification. Counsel has also informed me that both the ’431 and ’084 Patents claim the same priority date—specifically, February 4, 2000—due to both patents claiming priority to the same priority document. Many of the claimed limitations of the ’084 Patent are substantially

similar to the '431 Patent and vice-versa. Many of my citations to the patents are made with respect to the '431 Patent for ease of reference. However, because the specifications of the '431 and '084 Patents are substantially similar, any citation to the specification of the '431 Patent applies equally to the '084 Patent, unless otherwise indicated.

4. I have been informed by counsel that the claims being challenged in the accompanying Petition for the '431 Patent is Claims 1-7, 9-10, 13-14, 18-21, and 25-30 (“the Challenged Claims of the '431 Patent”); and of the '084 Patent is Claims 1-7, 10, and 14 (“the Challenged Claims of the '084 Patent”).

II. QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

5. I offer the following summary description of my background and experience, which I believe qualifies me to opine as one skilled in the art of the relevant technology. I attach my CV as Exhibit A to this Declaration, which is current as of this date to the best of my knowledge.

6. I hold a Bachelor of Science Degree in Electrical Engineering as well as a Master of Science Degree in Electrical Engineering, both from the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn (now part of New York University).

7. I have authored or co-authored nearly three dozen articles in peer-reviewed journals, conference proceedings, texts, industry trade publications, and monographs. These publications span a range of topics including: Integrated Voice–

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.