IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent of:	Desmond et al.	
U.S. Patent No.:	10,423,658	Attorney Docket No.: 39843-0116IP1
Issue Date:	September 24, 2019	
Appl. Serial No.:	15/375,927	
Filing Date:	December 12, 2016	
Title:	METHOD AND AP	PARATUS FOR MANAGING DIGITAL
	FILES	

SECOND DECLARATION OF DR. PHILIP GREENSPUN

Declaration

I declare that all statements made herein on my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true, and further, that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code.

 Philip Dreen-youn

 Dated: February 14, 2023
 By: ______

Philip Greenspun, Ph.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OKAMURA AND BELITZ RENDER OBVIOUS THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS
A. Claim Construction
B. The Okamura-Belitz Combination11
1.The Okamura-Belitz combination renders obvious "displaying the map including displaying a [first/second] location selectable thumbnail image at a [first/second] location on the interactive map"
2. The Okamura-Belitz combination renders obvious "displaying an application view"
C. DEPENDENT CLAIMS OF THE '658 PATENT ARE OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF OKAMURA AND BELITZ21
1. Claims 3 and 4
2. Claim 5
3. Claims 7 and 1024
4. Claims 9 and 1225
5. Claim 1325
6. Claims 14 and 1526
II. CONCLUSION

1. This Declaration expands on the conclusions that I have formed based on my analysis provided in my first declaration (SAMSUNG-1003, incorporated herein by reference in its entirety; "Original Declaration"). Consistent with my findings provided in my Original Declaration and based upon my knowledge and experience and my review of the prior art publications listed above, a POSITA would have found that claims 1-15 ("the Challenged Claims") of the '658 patent are rendered obvious by at least the combinations of references set forth in my Original Declaration.

I. OKAMURA AND BELITZ RENDER OBVIOUS THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS

As I further clarify below in response to Patent Owner's arguments, claims
 1-15 are rendered obvious by the combination of Okamura and Belitz.

A. Claim Construction

3. In the Patent Owner Response ("POR"), Patent Owner interprets certain claim terms. I do not agree with these interpretations.

4. <u>First</u>, with respect to claim element [1a] and specifically Patent Owner's argument that "an application view" must be "distinct from the other claimed views," I initially note that the '658 patent makes clear that FIG. 35 is merely one of various "application views" that are provided as examples in the '658 patent,

including those shown in FIGS. 32-34 and 36. SAMSUNG-1001, 9:18-22;

SAMSUNG-1046, 40:8-21. What's more, the '658 patent explicitly refers to its people and location views as the "People Application View" and the "Location Application View." SAMSUNG-1001, FIG. 32, FIG. 34, 3:58-4:4. There is nothing in the '658 patent that differentiates between its "Uploads Application View" in FIG. 35 and its other application views, other than its focus on "Uploads" as compared to "People" or "Location." The '658 patent repeatedly describes the existence of multiple application views and refers to all of the views in FIGS. 32-36 as application views. SAMSUNG-1001, 12:38-39 ("various Application Views"), 18:35-38 ("all Application Views"), 21:50-54 ("any of the Application Views"), 22:55-59 ("every Application View"), 28:5-8 ("When a user selects the 'Advanced Filters' from almost *any Application View* (0801) (the button can be seen in *FIGS. 32, 33, 34, 35, and 36*)").

5. Moreover, according to Dr. Reinman, the '658 patent provides "examples of different application views" and that "a view like a location view is also an application view in the spec of the patent." SAMSUNG-1046, 17:12-18; *see also id.*, 42:9-43:15. In other words, according to the specification of the '658 patent, as per Dr. Reinman, a particular view can "qualify as both" an application view and a location view. I agree that there is no requirement in the '658 patent claims that an application view must be completely distinct from the other views.

6. <u>Second</u>, with respect to claims 3-5, 7, 9, 10, and 12-15, Patent Owner argues that the phrase "responsive to a click or tap ... displaying" requires "a cause-effect relationship between (i) a click or tap of a certain selectable element and (ii) displaying a certain view or content." POR, 17-19. Specifically, Patent Owner interprets this language to require a "*direct* cause-effect relationship" such that "additional clicks or taps or interviewing views" are not allowed. *Id.*, 23-24.

7. However, a POSITA would have recognized that the term "responsive to" simply requires the second event to happen "subsequent to" the first event based on a combination of user interaction and software implementation. In fact, in the '658 patent, the people view that is ultimately shown to the user typically requires not only the initial pressing of "People" (1401) (shown in red below) but further the additional selection of a desired display order via a drop-down list (1402) (shown in purple below). SAMSUNG-1001, FIG. 32, 22:59-67. That is, even the '658 patent itself contemplates having intermediate user actions between the first event (*i.e.*, "cause") and the second event (*i.e.*, "effect").

DOCKET A L A R M



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.