

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

DATASPEED INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

SUCXESS LLC,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2020-00116

Patent 9,871,671

EXPERT DECLARATION OF MAHDI SHAHBAKHTI, PH.D.

IN SUPPORT OF PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Qualifications, publications, and prior testimony	4
III.	Person having ordinary skill in the art.....	9
IV.	Claim construction.....	10
	A. "data bus"	10
	B. “adding a second data bus”	11
	C. “receives”	13
V.	Background: Hacking Vehicle Networks.....	15
VI.	The Munoz Reference	18
VII.	A person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that Munoz does not disclose spoofing of CAN messages.....	19
VIII.	Differences between Munoz and claimed invention; expert assumptions	33
	A. Claim 1 [1.1]: Munoz does not teach a first message from the first apparatus 110 to the factory-installed second apparatus 105	40
	B. Claim 1 [1.3]: Munoz does not add a second data bus.	58
	C. Claim 1 [1.4]: Munoz does not teach connecting a retrofit apparatus to the vehicle bus and the second data bus.	65

D. Claim 1 [1.5]: Munoz does not teach connecting the factory-installed first apparatus to the second data bus.....	65
E. Claim 1 [1.6]: Munoz does not teach transmitting a second message being indistinguishable from a first message.....	65
F. Claim 2: Munoz does not teach that the second message uses the identifier of the first message.	71
G. Claim 3: Munoz does not teach receiving the first message in the retrofit device.	71
H. Claim 4: Munoz does not teach that the retrofit apparatus re-transmits messages received on the vehicle data bus to the factory-installed first apparatus through the second data bus.	72
I. Claim 5: Munoz does not teach a vehicle that has been retrofitted according to the method of the '671 patent.	73
J. Claim 6 [6.1]: Munoz does not teach a factory-installed first apparatus including a first processor which is programmed to receive a first message on a vehicle data bus from a factory-installed second apparatus.	73
K. Claim 6 [6.2]: Munoz does not teach a retrofit apparatus connected to the vehicle data bus including a second processor programmed to transmit a second message that mimics the first message through a second data bus.	73

L. Claim 7: Munoz does not teach wherein the first message comprises a message identifier that has been assigned to the factory-installed second apparatus and wherein the second processor is programmed to transmit the second message with the same message identifier.	74
M. Claim 10 [10.1]: Munoz does not teach a factory-installed first apparatus including a first processor, programmed to receive a first message via a vehicle data bus from a factory-installed second apparatus, the first message having a message identifier.	75
N. Claim 10 [10.2]: Munoz does not teach a retrofit apparatus, operatively connected to the vehicle data bus, including a second processor programmed to send a second message having the same message identifier.	75
O. Claim 10 [10.3]: Munoz does not teach that the factory-installed first apparatus communicates with the retrofit apparatus through a second data bus.	76
P. Claim 11: Munoz does not teach that the second message originating from the retrofit apparatus is indistinguishable to the first apparatus from the first message which the first processor is programmed to receive from the second apparatus.	76
Q. Dependent Claim 12: Munoz does not teach that the factory-installed first apparatus responds to the second message originating from the retrofit apparatus	

as if it were the first message which the first processor is programmed to receive from the factory-installed second apparatus.	76
R. Dependent Claim 13: Munoz does not teach that the factory- installed first apparatus is electrically disconnected from the vehicle data bus.	77
S. Dependent Claim 14: Munoz does not teach wherein the retrofit apparatus is a gateway through which the factory-installed first apparatus transmits and/or receives messages from the vehicle data bus.	77
T. Claim 15: Munoz does not teach wherein the retrofit apparatus selectively suppresses forwarding messages received from the factory-installed first apparatus to the vehicle data bus.	79
U. Claim 19: Munoz does not to teach wherein the second data bus is added to the vehicle during a retrofit.	80
IX. Dietz does not teach the claimed inventionS.....	80
A. The Dietz reference is not enabling.....	80
B. Dietz does not teach a vehicle having a factory-installed first apparatus including a processor, programmed to communicate with a factory-installed second apparatus through a vehicle data bus with a first message having an identifier.	81
C. Dietz does not to teach adding a second data bus to the vehicle.	83

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.