

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

SCRAMOGE TECHNOLOGY LTD.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2022-00351
U.S. Patent No. 10,622,842

**DECLARATION OF DR. JOSHUA PHINNEY,
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.68 IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR
INTER PARTES REVIEW**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	4
II.	Qualifications and Professional Experience.....	6
III.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	10
IV.	Relevant Legal Standards	11
V.	Background.....	12
VI.	Overview of the '842 Patent.....	13
VII.	Claim Construction.....	15
VIII.	Identification of how the Claims are Unpatentable.....	15
A.	Ground 1: Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 14-16, and 19-20 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Suzuki.	16
1.	Summary of Suzuki	16
2.	Claim 1.....	18
3.	Claim 2.....	30
4.	Claim 5.....	31
5.	Claim 6.....	32
6.	Claim 7.....	34
7.	Claim 14.....	37
8.	Claim 15.....	39
9.	Claim 16.....	39
10.	Claim 19.....	40
11.	Claim 20.....	42
B.	Ground 2: Claim 7 is obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Suzuki in view of Park	42

1.	Support for the claims of the '842 patent.	43
2.	Summary of Park	50
3.	Reasons to Combine Park with Suzuki.....	52
4.	Claim 7.....	54
IX.	Conclusion.....	58

I, Dr. Joshua Phinney, do hereby declare as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I am making this declaration at the request of Cisco Systems, Inc. in the matter of the *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 10,622,842 (“the ’842 Patent”) to Lee *et al.*

2. I am also being reimbursed for reasonable and customary expenses associated with my work and testimony in this investigation. My compensation is not contingent on the outcome of this matter or the specifics of my testimony, and I have no other interest in this case or the parties thereto.

3. I have been asked to provide my opinions regarding whether claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 14-16, 19, and 20 (“the Challenged Claims”) of the ’842 Patent are unpatentable as they would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art (“POSITA”) at the time of the alleged invention, in light of the prior art. It is my opinion that all of the limitations of the challenged claims would have been obvious to a POSITA.

4. In the preparation of this declaration, I have studied:

- a. the ’842 Patent, Ex.1001;
- b. the prosecution history of the ’842 Patent (“’842 File History”),

Ex.1002;

- c. U.S. Patent No. 8,421,574 to Suzuki *et al.* (“Suzuki”), Ex.1005; and

d. U.S. Patent No. 8,922,162 to Park et al. (“Park”), Ex.1006.

5. In forming the opinions expressed below, I have considered:

the documents listed above;

the relevant legal standards, including the standard for obviousness, and any additional authoritative documents as cited in the body of this declaration; and

my own knowledge and experience based upon my work in the field of networking as described below, as well as the following materials.

e. Prosecution History of U.S. Patent No. 10,153,666, Ex.1007;

f. U.S. Patent No. 10,069,346, Ex.1008;

g. U. S. Patent Publication No. 2010/0203831 to Muth (“Muth”), Ex.1009; and

h. U.S. Patent No. 8,687,537 to Michaelis (“Michaelis”), Ex.1010; and

i. A redline comparison between U.S. Patent No. 10,069,346 specification in the issued patent (text taken from USPTO website) with the as-filed specification of U.S. Patent No. 10,153,666 (text taken from publication 2017/0338697 on the USPTO website, which represents the as-filed specification of the ’666 patent); Ex.1011.

6. Unless otherwise noted, all emphasis in any quoted material has been added.

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.