

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

FINTIV, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2022-00976
U.S. Patent No. 9,892,386

**DECLARATION OF DR. HENRY HOUH,
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	13
IV.	Relevant Legal Standards.....	14
V.	Overview of the '386 Patent	17
VI.	Claim Construction	31
VII.	Identification of How the Claims are Unpatentable.....	32
A.	Ground 1: Claims 1 and 3 would have been obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Dill in view of Vadhri, Akashika, and Hansen.....	34
1.	Summary of Dill (APPL-1005).....	34
2.	Summary of Vadhri (APPL-1006).....	42
3.	Summary of Akashika (APPL-1007)	46
4.	Summary of Hansen (APPL-1008)	53
5.	Overview of Analysis	57
6.	Claim 1	59
B.	Grounds 1 and 2: claim 3 would have been obvious over Dill in view of Vadhri, Akashika, and Hansen (Ground 1); claim 2 would have been obvious over Dill in view of Vadhri, Akashika, Hansen, and Liao (Ground 3).	143
1.	Limitations in Claims 2 and 3 That are Identical or Similar to Claim 1	144
2.	Limitations Unique to Both Claims 2 and 3	150
3.	Limitations Unique to Claim 3 (Ground 1)	153

4. Limitations Unique to Claim 2 (Ground 2) 158

VIII. Conclusion.....176

I, Henry Houh, do hereby declare as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I am making this declaration at the request of Apple, Inc. in the matter of the *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 9,892,386 (“the ’386 patent”) to Michael A. Liberty.

2. I am being compensated for my work in this matter at my standard hourly rate. 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.

3. I have been asked to provide my opinions regarding whether claims 1-3 (“the Challenged Claims”) of the ’386 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 ’386 patent, APPL-1001;
- b. the prosecution history of the ’386 Patent (“’386 File History”), APPL-1002;
- c. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2009/0265272 to Dill et al. (“Dill,” APPL-1005);

- d. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2010/013334 to Vadhri (“Vadhri,” APPL-1006);
- e. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2009/0217047 to Akashika et al. (“Akashika,” APPL-1007);
- f. U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0230527 (“Hansen,” APPL-1008);
- g. U.S. Patent No. 7,865,141 to Liao et al. (“Liao,” APPL-1009);
- h. 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 software and telecommunications as described below, as well as the following materials:

- a. G. Winfield Treese et al., “Designing Systems for Internet Commerce,” Second Edition, Addison-Wesley, 2003 (“Treese”) (excerpt), APPL-1012;
- b. H. Newton, “Newton’s Telecom Dictionary,” 17th Edition, CMP Books, 2001 (excerpt, p. 52), APPL-1014; and

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.