

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE LLC, SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,
LG ELECTRONICS INC., and
LG ELECTRONICS U.S.A., INC.,
Petitioners,

v.

PARUS HOLDINGS INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2020-00846
Patent No. 7,076,431

REPLY DECLARATION OF STUART J. LIPOFF

Google Exhibit 1057 Google v Parus IPR2020-00846
--

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	GROUNDS 1-4: ARGUMENTS REGARDING THE KOVATCH/NEAL COMBINATION	1
	A. Arguments Regarding Neal’s Teachings.....	2
	1. First Argument	2
	2. Second Argument.....	3
	3. Third Argument.....	6
	4. Fourth Argument	8
	B. Arguments Regarding Motivation to Combine Kovatch with Neal.....	11
	1. Arguments Regarding “Speeding Up HeyAnita”	11
	2. Arguments Regarding Fault Tolerance	13
II.	GROUND 5: ARGUMENTS REGARDING CLAIM 9	16
III.	GROUND 6: ARGUMENTS REGARDING CLAIM 14	23

I, Stuart J. Lipoff, declare:

1. I have reviewed the Patent Owner's Response (Paper 14, "POR") in IPR2020-00846, and portions of the Declaration of Benedict Occhiogrosso (Ex. 2059, "Occhiogrosso-Decl.") cited in the POR. Specifically, I reviewed Sections I-VII and IX of Mr. Occhiogrosso's declaration. I have not been asked to review or opine on Section VIII of Mr. Occhiogrosso's declaration.

I. GROUNDS 1-4: ARGUMENTS REGARDING THE KOVATCH/NEAL COMBINATION

2. I understand that Section IV.B of the POR and Section IX.B of Mr. Occhiogrosso's declaration argue that the Kovatch/Neal combination (discussed, *e.g.*, in Section VII.A.2 of my original declaration, Ex. 1002) does not meet limitation [1.j] of claim 1 of the '431 patent, reciting "access[ing] said first web site...and, if said information to be retrieved is not found...,... sequentially access[ing] said plurality of web sites until said information to be retrieved is found or until said plurality of web sites has been accessed." For the reasons discussed in Section I.A below, I disagree with Parus's and Mr. Occhiogrosso's arguments, and in my opinion a person of ordinary skill in the art ("POSA") would have disagreed.

3. I understand that Section IV.C.1 of the POR and Section IX.C.1 of Mr. Occhiogrosso's declaration argue that a POSA would not have been motivated to make the Kovatch/Neal combination. For the reasons discussed in Section I.B

below, I disagree with Parus's and Mr. Occhiogrosso's arguments, and in my opinion POSA would have disagreed.

A. Arguments Regarding Neal's Teachings

4. I understand that Section IV.B.2 of the POR and Section IX.B.2 of Mr. Occhiogrosso's declaration present four arguments related to Neal's teachings. POR, pages 35-40; Occhiogrosso-Decl., ¶¶ 119-129. I disagree with each of these arguments, and in my opinion a POSA would have disagreed, for the reasons discussed below in Sections I.A.1-4.

1. First Argument

5. I understand that Parus's and Mr. Occhiogrosso's "[f]irst" argument is that "Neal does not teach accessing web sites." POR, page 37; Occhiogrosso-Decl., ¶ 122. This argument does not address the Kovatch/Neal combination, which does not rely on Neal to teach accessing web sites. *Kovatch* teaches retrieving information from suppliers' websites, and the Kovatch/Neal combination applies to Kovatch's system Neal's *teaching* of sequentially searching different suppliers' electronically stored data in a hierarchical order until the information to be retrieved is found or until the available suppliers have been searched. *See* Ex. 1002 ("Lipoff-Orig-Decl."), ¶ 102 (discussing "Kovatch's context of searching for desired information from various web sites" modified based on Neal's teaching to perform "hierarchical ordering and search").

2. Second Argument

6. I understand that Parus's and Mr. Occhiogrosso's "[s]econd" argument is that "Neal teaches away from the very keyword search algorithm that the [*sic*] Mr. Lipoff and the Petition identify...for their combination." Occhiogrosso-Decl., ¶ 123; POR, pages 37-38. I disagree, and in my opinion a POSA would have disagreed, for at least two reasons.

7. *First*, paragraph 125 of Mr. Occhiogrosso's declaration is incorrect—the Kovatch/Neal combination does *not* use a "keyword search algorithm" from Neal to search each individual website. The Kovatch/Neal combination uses *Kovatch's* web parsing methodology to search each individual website. *See* Lipoff-Orig.-Decl., ¶¶ 139, 157, 161 (discussing how the Kovatch/Neal combination uses Kovatch's Anita Query Engine and Anita Web Parser to query and retrieve information from each individual website). As I explained in my original declaration, what the Kovatch/Neal combination applies from Neal is Neal's teaching to search supplier data sets sequentially in an order, as Neal's FIG. 2 (reproduced below) illustrates. Lipoff-Orig-Decl., ¶¶ 98-106. Mr. Occhiogrosso's declaration (¶ 125) acknowledges this, where he states that my original declaration "focus[ed] on the search technique where if the match is not found in the first data set, then the same search technique is applied to the next data

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.