

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

KIOSOFT TECHNOLOGIES LLC

and

TECHTREX, INC.

Petitioners

v.

PAYRANGE, INC.

Patent Owner

Patent 10,891,608

**DECLARATION OF GERALD SMITH IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR
POST-GRANT REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 10,891,608**

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"

Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Kiosoft LLC EX1005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....	1
II. Summary of My Opinions	1
Failure to further limit the claim from which it depends.....	3
III. Qualifications and Experience	3
IV. Materials Considered.....	7
V. Relevant Legal Standards	9
VI. The '608 Patent.....	15
A. Technology Background of Vending Machines	15
B. Overview of the claimed subject matter of claims 1-20	21
C. Earliest possible effective priority date of '608 Patent claims.....	22
D. A person having ordinary skill in the art (“POSITA”)	23
E. Meaning (or lack thereof) of certain terms in claims 1-20	23
1. “a first interface module configured to output to a control unit of the offline payment-operated machine one or more electrical pulses”	24
2. “a second interface module configured to store control signals from the control unit of the offline payment-operated machine that initiate operation of the offline payment-operated machine”	28
3. “a second interface module configured to store control signals from the control unit of the offline payment-operated machine that initiate operation of the offline payment-operated [machine]”	32
4. “a first interface module configured to communicate with a control unit of the offline payment-operated machine using a serial interface to send one or more commands to the control unit”	33
5. “a second interface module configured to count one or more electrical pulses generated by the coin receiving switch of the offline payment-operated machine in response to the insertion of a single coin of a predetermined type in the offline payment-operated machine and to store an output of the control unit corresponding to an operation of the offline payment-operated machine”	34
6. “interface”	34
7. “offline payment-operated machine”	38

8.	“storing, in the memory of the payment module, a number of the electrical pulses that must be received by the control unit to initiate an operation of the offline payment operating machine”	40
9.	“initiate a cashless operation of the offline-payment operated machine” ...	46
10.	“sending operation information corresponding to the initiated operation of the offline payment-operated machine to the respective mobile device via the short-range wireless transceiver”	49
VII.	Overview of the Prior Art.....	52
A.	U.S. Patent No. 9,092,768 (“Breitenbach,” EX1007).....	52
B.	U.S. Patent No. 7,110,954 (“Yung,” EX1011)	60
C.	U.S. Patent No. 6,743,095 (“Cole,” EX1014).....	62
VIII.	POSITA’s understanding of the challenged claims, in view of the ’608 patent specification and prosecution history.....	63
A.	Ground 1: Claims 19-20 lack of written description.....	63
B.	Ground 2: Claims 1-20 lack definiteness	67
	1. In claims 1-18, “a first interface module configured to output to a control unit ... one or more electrical pulses” (“CL1”) lacks definiteness	68
	2. In claims 19-20, “a first interface module configured to communicate with a control unit of the offline payment-operated machine using a serial interface to send one or more commands to the control unit” (“CL2”) lacks definiteness	72
	3. In claims 4, 10, 16, “a second interface module configured to store [or sample] control signals from the control unit ...” (“CL3”) lacks definiteness	75
	4. In claims 19-20, “a second interface module configured to count one or more electrical pulses ... and to store an output of the control unit ...” (“CL4”) lacks definiteness	77
	5. In claims 5, 11, 17, “the offline payment-operated machine is not connected to any networks” (“CL5”) lacks definiteness.....	79
C.	Ground 3: Claims 5, 11, 17 fail to be further limiting	80
IX.	Application of the Prior Art to the Challenged Claims.....	81
A.	Claims 1-20 are anticipated by Breitenbach (Ground 4)	81
	1. Claims 1, 7, 13 and 19.....	81
	2. Claims 2, 8, 14, and 20.....	108

3. Claims 3, 9, and 15.....	114
4. Claims 4, 10, and 16.....	115
5. Claims 5, 11, and 17.....	123
6. Claims 6, 12, and 18.....	124
B. Claims 1-20 would have been obvious in view of Breitenbach and Yung (Ground 5).....	125
1. Disclosure of Yung.....	125
2. Motivation to combine Breitenbach and Yung	127
3. Breitenbach in view of Yung disclose each and every limitation of claims 1-20	128
C. Claims 1-20 would have been obvious in view of Breitenbach and Cole	131
1. Disclosure of Cole	132
2. Motivation to combine Breitenbach and Cole	134
3. Breitenbach in view of Cole disclose each and every limitation of claims 1- 20	135
X. Other evidence relevant to Obviousness.....	136

I, GERALD SMITH, declare as follows:

I. Introduction

1. I have been asked by KioSoft Technologies LLC and TechTrex, Inc. (“Petitioners” and, collectively, “KioSoft”) to provide my opinions in the above-captioned post-grant review proceeding involving U.S. Patent No. 10,891,608 (“the ’608 patent,” EX1002), which is titled “Method and System for an Offline-Payment Operated Machine to Accept Electronic Payments.”

2. I am being compensated at the rate of \$450 per hour for the time I spend in connection with the proceeding. My compensation is not dependent in any way on the substance of my opinions or on the outcome of this proceeding.

II. Summary of My Opinions

3. To assist and orient the reader in reviewing this declaration, I have provided a summary of my main opinion below. A person of ordinary skill in the art (“POSITA”) at the time of the alleged invention would have found the subject matter of claims 1-20 (the “challenged claims”) to be disclosed and/or obvious in view of the prior art. Additionally, a POSITA would have found certain elements of the claims to lack written description or to lack definiteness. A POSITA would have found certain claims to fail to further limit claims from which they depend.

4. The specific grounds of unpatentability that I refer to are identified below:

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.