

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE (USPS)
AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
AS REPRESENTED BY THE POSTMASTER GENERAL
Petitioner,

v.

RETURN MAIL, INC.
Patent Owner.

Case CBM2014-00116
Patent 6,826,548

Declaration of Scott M. Nettles, Ph.D. Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. QUALIFICATIONS AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	1
II. THE PATENT INVOLVED IN THIS PROCEEDING	3
III. MATERIALS REVIEWED	4
IV. SCOPE OF ASSIGNMENT	4
V. SUMMARY OF MY OPINIONS.....	5
VI. LEGAL PRINCIPLES USED IN ANALYSIS.....	5
VII. '548 PATENT.....	9
VIII. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE RELEVANT ART.....	12
A. Relevant Field.....	12
B. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	12
IX. INTERPRETATION OF CLAIM TERMS	13
A. The Board's Interpretation.....	13
B. The Petitioner's Interpretation.....	15
X. CLAIMS 39-44 OF THE '548 PATENT RECITE PATENT-ELIGIBLE SUBJECT MATTER	16
A. The '548 Patent claims do not address only an abstract concept.	17
B. The '548 patent method claims 39 and 42, as well as the dependent claims 43 and 44, and also the product and system claims 40 and 41, have an "inventive concept."	18
1. The '548 claims are a technological improvement.	18
2. The '548 claims meet the "machine or transformation test."	31
3. The '548 patent claims do not preempt the field.	37

XI. 1997 ACS DOES NOT ANTICIPATE CLAIMS 39-44.....	41
A. The 1997 ACS Process.....	42
B. Non-Anticipation Arguments That Cut Across Claims 39-44.....	43
1. There is no encoded data or decoding of encoded data.....	43
2. 1997 ACS does not disclose any means for decoding information indicating whether a sender wants a corrected address.....	46
C. Claim 39 is not anticipated by 1997 ACS.....	47
D. Claim 40 is not anticipated by 1997 ACS.....	49
E. Claim 41 is not anticipated by 1997 ACS.....	52
F. Claim 42 is not anticipated by 1997 ACS.....	56
G. Claim 43 is not anticipated by 1997 ACS.....	61
H. Claim 44 is not anticipated by 1997 ACS.....	62
I. Conclusion.....	63
XII. AVAILABILITY FOR CROSS-EXAMINATION.....	63
XIII. RIGHT TO SUPPLEMENT.....	64
XIV. JURAT.....	64

I, Scott M. Nettles, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, declare under penalty of perjury that the following statements are true and correct:

I. QUALIFICATIONS AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

1. I have been retained in this matter by Return Mail, Inc. (RMI) to provide various opinions regarding U.S. Patent No. 6,826,548 B2 (the '548 patent). I am being compensated at my usual rate of \$550 per hour, plus expenses, which is my standard consulting fee, for my work in this matter. My compensation is not dependent on the outcome of this matter. Nor is my compensation dependent upon the outcome of any related litigation proceedings, the opinions I express, or my testimony. I have no financial interests in RMI.

2. My qualifications are set forth in my curriculum vitae, a copy of which is included as Exhibit 2034. A list of the cases during at least the last five years in which I have signed a Protective Order, have testified as an expert either at a trial, hearing, or deposition, or have submitted statements and/or opinions is also included.

3. I attended Michigan State University from 1977 to 1981 as a Merit Scholar and an Alumni Distinguished Scholar, and received a bachelor's degree in Chemistry. I later attended Carnegie Mellon University from 1988 to 1995, during which time I received both a master's degree (1992) and a Ph.D. (1996) in Computer Science. My dissertation was entitled "Safe and Efficient Persistent

Heaps” and focused on high performance automatic storage management for advanced database systems.

4. Before earning my Ph.D., I worked for over four years in industry at Silicon Solutions, Inc. and Digital Equipment Corporation, developing computer aided design (CAD) software for the semiconductor and computer sectors. For example, I designed and implemented systems for VLSI mask generation and VLSI design rule checking. I also built the first graphical drawing editor for the X window system, Artemis, which included a sophisticated graphical user interface.

5. I have worked as a professor at three universities since 1995; the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Arizona, and The University of Texas at Austin. I was the recipient of a National Science Foundation CAREER award for “CAREER: Advancing Experimental Computer Science in Storage Management and Education” while I was an Assistant Professor at the University of Pennsylvania. During this time, I also was part of the DARPA funded SwitchWare project, which was one of the pioneering groups in the area of Active Networking (“AN”). My group developed PLAN, the first domain-specific programming language for programmable packets, as well as PLANet, the first purely active inter-network.

6. I joined the faculty of The University of Texas at Austin (“UT”), in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering in 1999. In 2005, I was

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.