

Declaration of Christopher M. Schmandt in Support of
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of
U.S. Patent No. 8,489,599 B2

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FACEBOOK, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

PALO ALTO RESEARCH CENTER INC.,
Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 8,489,599 B2
Issue Date: July 16, 2013

Title: CONTEXT AND ACTIVITY-DRIVEN CONTENT DELIVERY AND INTERACTION

DECLARATION OF CHRISTOPHER M. SCHMANDT

Declaration of Christopher M. Schmandt in Support of
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of
U.S. Patent No. 8,489,599 B2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS	5
A. Qualifications and Experience	5
B. Materials Considered.....	10
II. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	11
III. STATEMENT OF LEGAL PRINCIPLES.....	14
A. Claim Construction	14
B. Obviousness.....	16
IV. THE '599 PATENT.....	21
A. Overview of the Specification.....	21
B. The Challenged Claims	23
V. APPLICATION OF THE PRIOR ART TO CHALLENGED CLAIMS	24
A. Brief Summary of Prior Art	25
1. Lamont [Ex. 1003]	25
2. Wolfe [Ex. 1004].....	29
3. Wang [Ex. 1006]	35
4. Belimpasakis [Ex. 1007]	40
5. Meyers [Ex. 1008].....	43
B. Ground 1: Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 10-12, 15, 17-19, 22, 24, and 25 Are Obvious Over Lamont, Wolfe and Wang	46
1. Claim 1	46

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

Page

(a)	“receiving at least one content package, wherein the content package includes at least one content piece and a set of rules associated with the content package, wherein the set of rules includes a trigger condition and an expected response, and wherein the trigger condition specifies a context that triggers a presentation of the content piece” (Claim 1[a]).....	49
(b)	“receiving a set of contextual information with respect to the first user” (Claim 1[b]).....	67
(c)	“processing the contextual information to determine a current context for the first user” (Claim 1[c])	70
(d)	“determining whether the current context satisfies the trigger condition” (Claim 1[d]).....	82
(e)	“in response to the trigger condition being satisfied, presenting the content piece to the first user” (Claim 1[e])	83
(f)	“receiving a response from the first user corresponding to the presented content piece; determining whether the received response matches the expected response; and performing an action based on an outcome of the determination.” (Claim 1[f]-[h]).....	86
2.	Claim 4.....	89
3.	Claim 6.....	94
4.	Claim 7.....	98
5.	Claim 10.....	99
6.	Claim 11	100
7.	Claim 12.....	100
8.	Claim 15.....	103

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
9. Claim 17	103
10. Claim 18	104
11. Claim 19	105
12. Claim 22	113
13. Claim 24	114
14. Claim 25	114
C. Ground 2: Claim 9 is Obvious Over Lamont, Wolfe and Wang, in Further View of Belimpasakis	115
1. Claim 9	115
D. Ground 3: Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 10-12, 15, 17-19, 22, 24, and 25 Are Obvious Over Lamont, Wolfe, Wang and Meyers	122
E. Ground 4: Claims 9 Is Obvious Over Lamont, Wolfe, Wang, Belimpasakis, and Meyers.....	127
VI. NO SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NONOBVIOUSNESS.....	128
VII. CONCLUSION.....	128

Declaration of Christopher M. Schmandt in Support of
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of
U.S. Patent No. 8,489,599 B2

I, Christopher M. Schmandt, declare as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS

A. Qualifications and Experience

1. I have recently retired from my position as a Principal Research Scientist at the Media Laboratory at Massachusetts Institute of Technology (“M.I.T”), after 40 years of employment by M.I.T. In that role, I also served as faculty for the M.I.T. Media Arts and Sciences academic program. I have more than 40 years of experience in the field of Media Technology, and was a founder of the M.I.T. Media Laboratory.

2. I received my Bachelor of Science degree in Electrical Engineering and Computer Science from M.I.T. in 1978, and my Master of Science degree in Visual Studies (Computer Graphics), also from M.I.T. I had been employed at M.I.T. since 1980, initially at the Architecture Machine Group, which was an early computer graphics research lab. In 1985, I helped found the Media Laboratory and continued to work there until my retirement. I ran a research group titled “Living Mobile.” My research spanned distributed communication and collaborative systems, with an emphasis on multi-media and user interfaces; I have more than 70 published conference and journal papers and one book in these fields.

3. In my faculty position, I taught courses and directly supervised student

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.