

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TRILLER, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

TIKTOK PTE. LTD.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2022-00180
U.S. Patent No. 9,992,322

DECLARATION OF RAJEEV SURATI, PH.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF WORK	1
II.	SUMMARY OF OPINIONS	2
III.	BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS.....	2
IV.	BASIS FOR OPINIONS	6
V.	FIELD OF ART	7
VI.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	7
VII.	OVERVIEW OF THE TECHNOLOGY OF THE '132 AND '322 PATENTS	8
VIII.	INTERPRETATIONS OF THE '132 AND '322 PATENT CLAIMS AT ISSUE.....	11
A.	“Software Application”	11
IX.	THE EARLIER FILED MAY 2007 PCT APPLICATION PROVIDES SUPPORT FOR CLAIMS 3, 6, AND 27 OF THE '132 PATENT AND CLAIMS 32, 35, AND 56 OF THE '322 PATENT	12
A.	The May 2007 PCT Application provides support for using a multitasking or multithreading architecture to balance the computational demands of a DRM program.....	13
B.	The May 2007 PCT Application provides support for a music application that uses track meta-data that is formed as a separate meta-data layer, is external to a music track, and defines attributes of tracks, to make sharing and browsing of track information possible.....	25
X.	ALLEGED ANTICIPATION OR OBVIOUSNESS OF INDEPENDENT CLAIMS BASED ON ABRAMS.....	33
A.	The system of Abrams does not inherently perform the claimed functions over a “wireless connection.”	34
B.	The Petitions do not demonstrate a “Software Application” according to the definition recited by the '132 and '322 patents.....	46
XI.	THE PROPOSED COMBINATION OF ABRAMS AND KHEDOURI....	48

XII. LEGAL STANDARDS.....	57
A. Claim Interpretation	58
B. Anticipation.....	59
C. Obviousness	59
XIII. CONCLUSION	63

I, Rajeev Surati, Ph.D., of Cambridge, Massachusetts, declare that:

I. INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF WORK

1. I have been retained by Patent Owner TikTok PTE. LTD. in the above-captioned *Inter Partes* Review (IPR) proceedings as an independent expert in the relevant field.

2. I have been asked to provide my independent analysis regarding the references identified by petitioner Triller, Inc. (“Petitioner”) in IPR proceeding IPR2022-00179 involving U.S. Patent No. 9,648,132 (“the ’132 patent”) and IPR proceeding IPR2022-00180 involving U.S. Patent No. 9,992,322 (“the ’322 patent”), which are assigned to Patent Owner. I note that the ’322 patent is a continuation of the ’132 patent and that the patents share a common specification and priority date. I have been asked to consider what one of ordinary skill in the art before the priority date of the ’132 and ’322 patents would have understood from the ’132 and ’322 patents, including scientific and technical knowledge related to the ’132 and ’322 patents. I have also been asked to consider whether the references relied on by Petitioner disclose or render obvious the inventions claimed by the ’132 and ’322 patents.

3. My analysis is directed by my education, training, and experience as a person of ordinary skill in the art as of the priority date of the ’132 and ’322

patents, which for purposes of my analysis here is assumed to be the filing date of the UK patents to which the '132 and '322 patents claim priority—May 5, 2006.

4. I am being compensated for my work in connection with this IPR proceeding at my standard hourly rate. My compensation is not in any way contingent on the substance of my opinions or the outcome of these proceedings.

II. SUMMARY OF OPINIONS

5. Based on my experience and expertise, discussed below, and my review of the references identified by Petitioner in these IPRs for the '132 and '322 patents, it is my opinion that the cited references do not render obvious the challenged claims of the '132 and '322 patents.

III. BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS

6. I have more than thirty (30) years of experience in electrical engineering, computer science, and electronic messaging. The following paragraphs summarize some of my experience that is relevant to the technologies described within the '132 and '322 patents. For further details, please refer to my *curriculum vitae* which is attached as Appendix A.

7. I attended the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) from 1988 to 1999, during which time I earned Bachelor of Science (1992), Master of Science (1995), and Doctor of Philosophy (1999) degrees in electrical engineering and computer science.

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.