UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE LLC,

Petitioner,

v.

TRAXCELL TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,

Patent Owner.

IPR2022-00442 (Patent No. 10,820,147)

DECLARATION OF ROBERT VAN ESSEN

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD Patent Trial and Appeal Board United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

DOCKET

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION
II.	BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS
III.	SUMMARY OF OPINIONS
IV. U	NDERSTANDING OF APPLICABLE LAW
А.	Priority Date and Prior Art4
В.	Claim Interpretation
V.	THE '147 PATENT
VI.	SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART
А.	Myr (Ex. 1007)
В.	Yiu (Ex. 1006)10
C.	Machida (Ex. 1009)11
D.	Uehara (Ex. 1005)12
VII.	CLAIM INTERPRETATION
VIII.	OPINIONS REGARDING ASSERTED GROUNDS 14
Α.	Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, and 17-19 are not Obvious Over Myr in View of Yiu
C	Claim 1
В.	Petitioner Fails to Establish in Ground II that Challenged Claims 2, 6, 13, 16
	remoner runs to Establish in Ground if that Chantenged Channis 2, 0, 15, 10
	and 22 are Obvious Over Myr in View of Yiu and Machida
C	
	and 22 are Obvious Over Myr in View of Yiu and Machida23
C	and 22 are Obvious Over Myr in View of Yiu and Machida
C	and 22 are Obvious Over Myr in View of Yiu and Machida
C	and 22 are Obvious Over Myr in View of Yiu and Machida23Claims 2 and 623Claims 13 and 1625Claim 2226
C	and 22 are Obvious Over Myr in View of Yiu and Machida23Claims 2 and 623Claims 13 and 1625Claim 2226Petitioner Fails to Establish in Ground III that Challenged Claims 1, 5, 7, 8,11-12 and 17-19 are Obvious Over Uehara in View of Yiu and Myr27
C. 1	and 22 are Obvious Over Myr in View of Yiu and Machida23Claims 2 and 623Claims 13 and 1625Claim 2226Petitioner Fails to Establish in Ground III that Challenged Claims 1, 5, 7, 8,11-12 and 17-19 are Obvious Over Uehara in View of Yiu and Myr27.Claim 127
C. 1 1	and 22 are Obvious Over Myr in View of Yiu and Machida23Claims 2 and 623Claims 13 and 1625Claim 2226Petitioner Fails to Establish in Ground III that Challenged Claims 1, 5, 7, 8,11-12 and 17-19 are Obvious Over Uehara in View of Yiu and Myr27Claim 127Claim 131

D. Petitioner Fails to Establish in Ground IV that Challenged Claim 22 is	
Obvious Over Uehara in View of Yiu, Myr and Machida	32
VII. CONCLUSION	

I, Robert van Essen, do hereby declare as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I have been retained as an expert on behalf of Patent Owner Traxcell Technologies LLC ("Patent Owner" or "Traxcell") in this *inter partes* review ("IPR") proceeding of U.S. Patent No. 10,820,147 ("the '147 Patent"). I understand this proceeding was initiated by Petitioner Google LLC ("Petitioner" or "Google").

2. I have set forth my professional qualifications and relevant experience in Section II of this Declaration, and a copy of my curriculum vitae is available at Attachment A.

3. I have been asked to provide my expert opinions regarding the validity or invalidity of claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-13, 16-19, and 22 of the '147 Patent.

4. I understand that Petitioner has asserted invalidity based on the following references:

Reference	Exhibit
U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0002036 (Uehara)	1005
U.S. Patent No. 6,928,291 (Yiu)	1006
U.S. Patent No. 6,480,783 (Myr)	1007
U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2001/0002036 ("Machida")	1009

I understand that Petitioner has asserted the following "grounds" of invalidity based on these references:

Ground	Challenged Claims	Alleged Basis	Asserted References
1	1, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, and 17-19	Obviousness	Myr, Yiu
2	2, 6, 13, 16, and 22	Obviousness	Myr, Yiu, Machida
3	1, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, and 17-19	Obviousness	Uehara, Myr, Yiu
4	22	Obviousness	Uehara, Myr, Yiu,
			Machida

As set forth in this Declaration, I do not agree that the identified combinations of references render obvious the challenged claims of the '147 Patent.

In forming my opinions, I have considered, among other things, the materials cited or discussed in this Declaration, the '147 Patent, the corresponding file history, Google's IPR Petition, Michalson's Declaration (Ex. 1003), and the references and exhibits on which Petitioner and Michalson rely. Additionally, I have relied on my own knowledge, training, and more than 30 years of experience in geospatial technology.

8. I am being compensated for my time in connection with this IPR at my standard consulting rate, and my compensation is not affected by the outcome of this matter.

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.