### UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

THE DATA COMPANY TECHNOLOGIES INC., Petitioner,

v.

BRIGHT DATA LTD., Patent Owner.

Case No. TBD Patent No. 10,257,319

\_\_\_\_\_

## DECLARATION OF PROF. DAVID LEVIN IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 10,257,319



## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

| I.   | PE                   | RSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND  | 1  |  |
|------|----------------------|---|----|--|
| II.  | M                    | ATERIALS CONSIDERED   | 5  |  |
| III. | M                    | Y UNDERSTANDING OF PATENT LAW   | 9  |  |
|      | A.                   | Anticipation  | 12 |  |
|      | B.                   | Obviousness   | 12 |  |
| IV.  | PE                   | RSON HAVING ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART ("POSA")  | 15 |  |
| V.   | TECHNICAL BACKGROUND |   |    |  |
|      | A.                   | Network Components  | 19 |  |
|      |                      | 1. Client, Server, and Peer   | 19 |  |
|      |                      | 2. Sources and Destination  | 20 |  |
|      | B.                   | Intranets and (the) Internet  | 22 |  |
|      |                      | 1. Layers of Abstraction  | 24 |  |
|      |                      | 2. Establishing TCP Connections   | 25 |  |
|      |                      | 3. Proxies and Middleboxes  | 27 |  |
|      |                      | 4. HTTP and the Web   | 28 |  |
|      | C.                   | Peer-to-Peer Architectures  | 30 |  |
| VI.  | TH                   | IE '319 PATENT  | 34 |  |
|      | A.                   | Overview  | 34 |  |
|      | B.                   | Prosecution History   | 36 |  |
|      | C.                   | Challenged Claims   | 37 |  |
| VII. | CL                   | AIM INTERPRETATION  | 41 |  |
|      | A.                   | Patent Owner's Litigation Argument  | 42 |  |
|      | B.                   | District Court Constructions  | 42 |  |
|      | C.                   | "establishing a Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) connection using TCP/IP protocol" | 44 |  |
|      |                      | 1. Plain meaning  |    |  |
|      |                      | 2. Usage in '319 patent specification   |    |  |



|   | 3    | Prosecution history   | 55  |
|---|------|---|-----|
|   |      | CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE WHEN  MPARED TO THE PRIOR ART IDENTIFIED IN THE PETITION | 57  |
| 1 |      | Ground 1: Plamondon Teaches The Subject Matter Recited In                                   |     |
|   | (    | Claims 1, 12-14, and 21-27  |     |
|   | 1    | . Plamondon   |     |
|   | 2    | Claim 1.  | 65  |
|   | 3    | Claim 12  | 83  |
|   | 4    | . Claim 13  | 87  |
|   | 5    | 5. Claim 14   | 89  |
|   | 6    | 5. Claim 21   | 90  |
|   | 7    | 7. Claim 22.  | 91  |
|   | 8    | 8. Claim 23.  | 92  |
|   | 9    | Claim 24  | 94  |
|   | 1    | 0. Claim 25   | 100 |
|   | 1    | 1. Claim 26   | 101 |
|   | 1    | 2. Claim 27   | 101 |
| ] | В. ( | Ground 2: Claims 28-29 are obvious over Plamondon   | 103 |
|   | 1    | . Claim 28  | 103 |
|   | 2    | Claim 29  | 104 |
| ( |      | Ground 3: Claims 15-17 are obvious over Plamondon in view of RFC 2616                       | 105 |
|   | 1    | . RFC 2616  | 105 |
|   | 2    | Plamondon in view of RFC 2616   | 107 |
|   | 3    | . Claim 15  | 110 |
|   | 4    | . Claim 16  | 111 |
|   | 5    | 5. Claim 17   | 114 |
| ] |      | Ground 4: Claims 17-18 are obvious over Plamondon in view of                                |     |
|   |      | RFC 1122  | 117 |
|   | 1    | REC 1122  | 117 |



|    | 2.  | Plamondon in view of RFC 1122.                                       | 118 |
|----|---|--|-----|
|    | 3.  | Claim 18.  | 122 |
|    | 4.  | Claim 17   | 124 |
| E. |   | ound 5: Claims 2 is obvious over Plamondon in view of IEEE 2.11-2007 | 124 |
|    | 1.  | IEEE 802.11-2007   | 124 |
|    | 2.  | Plamondon in view of IEEE 802.11-2007.                               | 132 |
|    | 3.  | Claim 2.   | 133 |
| F. | Ground 6: Claims 2-5 and 19-20 are obvious over Plamondon in view of Price. |  |     |
|    | 1.  | Price  | 136 |
|    | 2.  | Plamondon in view of Price.  | 137 |
|    | 3.  | Claim 2  | 143 |
|    | 4.  | Claim 3  | 146 |
|    | 5.  | Claim 4.   | 149 |
|    | 6.  | Claim 5  | 152 |
|    | 7.  | Claim 19.  | 154 |
|    | 8.  | Claim 20.  | 157 |
| G. | Ground 7: Claims 6-11 are obvious over Plamondon in view of Kozat           |  |     |
|    |   | Kozat  |     |
|    | 2.  | Plamondon in view of Kozat.  |     |
|    | 3.  | Claim 6.   |     |
|    | 4.  | Claim 7.   |     |
|    | 5.  | Claim 8.   | 175 |
|    | 6.  | Claim 9  |     |
|    | 7.  | Claim 10   | 178 |
|    | 0   | Claim 11   | 101 |



### I, David Levin, declare:

- 1. I have been retained on behalf of The Data Company Technologies Inc. (the "Petitioner") as an independent technical expert in this IPR proceeding. This document provides certain of my opinions concerning the patentability of all claims in U.S. Patent No. 10,257,319 ("the '319 patent"), specifically claims 1-29 (the "Challenged Claims").
- 2. For my work as an expert in this matter, I am being compensated for my services at my standard rate of \$500 per hour, plus actual expenses. My compensation is not dependent in any way upon my conclusions, the results of my analysis, or the outcome of this *inter partes* review of the '319 patent.

#### I. PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND

- 3. I am an Assistant Professor in the Department of Computer Science at the University of Maryland, a position that I have held since 2017. I am also affiliated with the University of Maryland Institute for Advanced Computer Studies (UMIACS), the Maryland Cybersecurity Center (MC2), and I am an affiliate assistant professor in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering. I chair the Computer Science Undergraduate Honors program at the University of Maryland. My curriculum vitae ("CV") is provided as Exhibit 1004.
- 4. Before taking a position as Assistant Professor, I was a research scientist at the University of Maryland and held research positions at Hewlett



# DOCKET

## 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.

