

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

GOOGLE LLC,

Petitioner,

v.

UNILOC 2017 LLC,

Patent Owner.

---

Case No. IPR2020-00765  
U.S. Patent No. 6,366,908  
Filing Date: December 30, 1999  
Issue Date: April 2, 2002

---

**DECLARATION OF BERNARD J. JANSEN, PH.D.**

**(Exhibit 1003)**

## TABLE OF CONTENT

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Qualifications.....	2
III.	Scope of Opinion .....	5
IV.	Materials Reviewed and Considered .....	6
V.	LEGAL STANDARDS FOR PATENTABILITY .....	6
	A. Anticipation Analysis: 35 U.S.C. § 102 .....	8
	B. Obviousness Analysis: 35 U.S.C. § 103 .....	8
	C. Step-Plus-Function Claims: 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 6 .....	13
VI.	State of the Art Prior to the '908 Patent .....	14
VII.	Overview of Prior Art.....	19
	A. Overview of <i>Braden-Harder</i> .....	19
	B. Overview of <i>Heidorn</i> .....	25
	C. Overview of <i>Messerly</i> .....	30
	D. <i>Grossman</i> .....	36
	E. <i>Kucera</i> .....	39
	F. <i>Miller</i> .....	40
VIII.	Overview of the '908 Patent and Prosecution History .....	41
IX.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	48
X.	Claim Construction.....	50
XI.	Summary of My Opinions .....	59
XII.	Ground 1: Claims 6-12 Would Have Been Obvious over <i>Braden-Harder</i> (incorporating <i>Heidorn</i> and <i>Messerly</i> ) and in view of	

*Grossman*; Ground 2: Claims 6-12 Would Have Been Obvious over *Braden-Harder* in view of *Heidorn, Messerly, and Grossman* .....60

A. Independent claim 6 .....61

B. Claim 7 .....98

C. Claim 8 .....102

D. Claim 9 .....107

E. Claim 10 .....109

F. Claim 11 .....119

G. Claim 12 .....125

XIII. Ground 3: Claim 7-9 Would Have Been Obvious Over *Braden-Harder* in View of *Grossman*, as Set Forth in Ground 1, and Further in View of *Kucera*; Ground 4: Claim 7-9 Would Have Been Obvious Over *Braden-Harder* in View of *Heidorn, Messerly, and Grossman*, as Set Forth in Ground 2, and Further in View of *Kucera* .....127

A. Claim 7 .....127

B. Claims 8-9 .....132

XIV. Ground 5: Claim 9 Would Have Been Obvious Over *Braden-Harder* in View of *Grossman*, as Set Forth in Ground 1, and Further in View of *Miller*; Ground 6: Claim 9 Would Have Been Obvious Over *Braden-Harder* in View of *Heidorn, Messerly, and Grossman*, as Set Forth in Ground 2, and Further in View of *Miller* .....133

A. Claim 9 .....133

XV. Ground 7: Claim 9 Would Have Been Obvious Over *Braden-Harder* in View of *Grossman* and *Kucera*, as Set Forth in Ground 3, and Further in View of *Miller*; Ground 8: Claim 9 Would Have Been Obvious Over *Braden-Harder* in View of *Heidorn, Messerly, Grossman, and Kucera*, as Set Forth in Ground 4, and Further in View of *Miller* .....138

A. Claim 9 .....138

XVI. Conclusion .....140

I, Dr. Jim Jansen, declare as follows:

**I. Introduction**

1. My name is Bernard J. (Jim) Jansen, and I have been retained by Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP, counsel for Google LLC (“Google”), as an expert witness in the case GOOGLE LLC v. UNILOC 2017 LLC, Case No. IPR2020-00755 with respect to U.S. Patent No. 6,366,908.

2. My opinions are based on my years of education, research, and experience, as well as my investigation and study of relevant materials. The materials that I have studied for this declaration include the documents identified in Appendix B of this declaration.

3. I may rely upon these materials, my knowledge and experience, and/or additional materials to rebut arguments raised by the patent owner. Further, I may also consider additional documents and information in forming any necessary opinions, including documents that may not yet have been provided to me.

4. My analysis of the materials produced in this investigation is ongoing, and I will continue to review any new material as it is provided. This declaration represents only those opinions I have formed to date. I reserve the right to revise, supplement, and/or amend my opinions stated herein based on new information and my continuing analysis of the materials already provided.

# 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.