## <u>Litigation Support Experience - Tal Lavian, Ph.D.</u>

https://TelecommNet.com

tlavian@telecommnet.com

(408) 209-9112

Law Firm:	Fisch Sigler LLP
Case Name:	Juniper Networks v. Smart Path Connections LLC PTAB
Patent No:	US 7,463,580
Service Provided:	PTAB Declaration
Type of Matter:	MPLS Tunneling, IETF RFCs standards for MPLS
Date:	June 2021
Law Firm:	Klarquist Sparkman, LLP
Case Name:	Nicrosoft v. Uniloc - PTO Ex-Parte Re-examination '622
	patent
Patent No:	US. 8,724,622
Service Provided:	Expert Declaration
Type of Matter:	Network Communications, instant VoIP messaging using
	mobile wireless devices.
	(same patent for other parties, Apple, Facebook, and
	WhatsApp)
Date:	April 2021
Law Firm:	Finnegan, Henderson,, LLP ("Finnegan")
Case Name:	Juniper Networks TAB IPR
Patent No:	US 8,179,960
Service Provided:	Expert Declaration
Type of Matter:	Video communications, streaming, and codding
Date:	February 2021
Law Firm:	Unified Patents, LLC
Case Name:	Unified Patents v. BCS Software LLC USPTO
	Reexamination
Patent No:	US 7,302,612
Service Provided:	Expert Declaration
Type of Matter:	Network Management, Network health, and operation,
	Operational Support System (OSS), SNMP, Device
	Menagment.
Date:	March 2021
	Network Communications
Law Firm:	McGuireWoods
Case Name:	WSOU Investment v. <b>Huawei</b> Technologies
I I I A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	I LIC 6 997 677 LIC 7 609 766 and LIC 7 977 072
Patent No:	US 6,882,627, US 7,508,755 and US 7,872,973, US 7,406,260, US 7,423,962

Service Provided:	An investigation, expert report for '627, '755 and '973.
	Claim Construction expert report for '260 and '962
Type of Matter:	Claim Construction, MPLS Routing, Packet Switching,
	Queuing
Date:	January 2021
	Network Communications
Law Firm:	Cozen O'Connor
Case Name:	TCL Communication Technology Holding
Patent No:	US 6,058,304 and US 7,139,591
Service Provided:	IPR declarations, deposition
Type of Matter:	Wireless telephony, handheld wireless device architecture
Date:	March 2020
	Network communications
Law Firm:	Oblon (PTAB) and Pepper Hamilton (Federal)
Case Name:	Polycom, Inc. v. DirectPacket Research, Inc.
Patent No:	US 7,710,978, US 7,773,588, and US 8,560,828
Service Provided:	Six PTAB IPR declarations, multiple depositions
	Expert reports for federal court, a deposition
Type of Matter:	Firewall and secured multimedia communications
Date:	June 2019
Bato.	04110 2010
Law Firm:	Hopkins Carley
Case Name:	Avago Technologies v. Netflix
Patent No:	US 8,572,138, US 9,319,289, and US 9,497,264
Service Provided:	An investigation, technology analysis
Type of Matter:	Video Streaming, distributed network services
Date:	September 2019
Date.	Wireless Communications
Law Firm:	Knobbe Martens, and ROBIC LLP
Law i iiii.	Guest Tek v. <b>Nomadix</b> - Case No. T-448-17 Federal Court
Case Name:	in Canada
	CA 600,760, CA 2,750,345, CA 2 790 354, and 2 817 932.
Patent No:	US8811184, US9154435, US9531640, US9871738
	An investigation, expert reports, testimony in a Canadian
Service Provided:	Court
Type of Matter:	Wireless and communications access control
Date:	June 2019
Date.	Mobile devices
Law Firm:	Klarquist Sparkman LLP
Case Name:	Microsoft V. Uniloc USA, IPR
Patent No:	US8,724,622
Service Provided:	IPR expert report
Service Frovided.	
Type of Matter:	IPR expert report (very similar to Apple, Facebook
Data:	WhatsApp expert reports)
Date:	Notwork Socurity Firewall
	Network Security, Firewall

Law Firm:	Unified Patents
Case Name:	Unified Patents v. FireNet Technologies LLC, IPR
Patent No:	US 8,892,600
Service Provided:	IPR expert report
	Access and security of data networking attached devices,
Type of Matter:	Network Firewall, Proxy Server
Date:	2019
Dato.	2010
	Network communications
Law Firm:	Novack and Macey LLP
Case Name:	Guaranteed Rate, Inc. v. Netrix
Patent No:	MPLS and broadband architecture
Service Provided:	Expert report, deposition
Type of Matter:	MPLS and broadband architectures using Cisco equipment
Date:	2019
2 0.00	Network communications
Law Firm:	Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP
	Citrix Systems, Inc. v. <b>Avi Networks</b> , Inc., No. 17-1843-
Case Name:	LPS (D. Delaware)
Patent No:	US 9,148,493, US 8,631,120
Service Provided:	Expert declarations for PTAB IPR
Type of Matter:	Declaration for Claim construction brief, depositions
Date:	2019
	Mobile devices
Law Firm:	Mobile devices Erise IP P.A.
Law Firm: Case Name:	Erise IP P.A.
Case Name:	Erise IP P.A.  Apple Inc. v. Voip-Pal.com, Inc.; Inter Partes Review
Case Name:	Erise IP P.A.  Apple Inc. v. Voip-Pal.com, Inc.; Inter Partes Review US 9,537,762; US 9,813,330; US 9,826,002; and US
Case Name: Patent No:	Erise IP P.A.  Apple Inc. v. Voip-Pal.com, Inc.; Inter Partes Review US 9,537,762; US 9,813,330; US 9,826,002; and US 9,948,549
Case Name: Patent No: Service Provided:	Erise IP P.A.  Apple Inc. v. Voip-Pal.com, Inc.; Inter Partes Review US 9,537,762; US 9,813,330; US 9,826,002; and US 9,948,549 Expert declarations
Case Name: Patent No: Service Provided: Type of Matter:	Erise IP P.A.  Apple Inc. v. Voip-Pal.com, Inc.; Inter Partes Review US 9,537,762; US 9,813,330; US 9,826,002; and US 9,948,549  Expert declarations VoIP and network communications
Case Name: Patent No: Service Provided: Type of Matter:	Erise IP P.A.  Apple Inc. v. Voip-Pal.com, Inc.; Inter Partes Review US 9,537,762; US 9,813,330; US 9,826,002; and US 9,948,549 Expert declarations VoIP and network communications 2019
Case Name: Patent No: Service Provided: Type of Matter: Date:	Erise IP P.A.  Apple Inc. v. Voip-Pal.com, Inc.; Inter Partes Review US 9,537,762; US 9,813,330; US 9,826,002; and US 9,948,549  Expert declarations VoIP and network communications 2019 Web Application and Database
Case Name: Patent No: Service Provided: Type of Matter: Date: Law Firm:	Erise IP P.A.  Apple Inc. v. Voip-Pal.com, Inc.; Inter Partes Review US 9,537,762; US 9,813,330; US 9,826,002; and US 9,948,549 Expert declarations VoIP and network communications 2019 Web Application and Database Fish & Richardson P.C.
Case Name: Patent No: Service Provided: Type of Matter: Date: Law Firm:	Erise IP P.A.  Apple Inc. v. Voip-Pal.com, Inc.; Inter Partes Review US 9,537,762; US 9,813,330; US 9,826,002; and US 9,948,549 Expert declarations VoIP and network communications 2019 Web Application and Database Fish & Richardson P.C. Ticket Network, Inc. and Ticket Software LLC v.
Case Name: Patent No: Service Provided: Type of Matter: Date: Law Firm: Case Name:	Erise IP P.A.  Apple Inc. v. Voip-Pal.com, Inc.; Inter Partes Review US 9,537,762; US 9,813,330; US 9,826,002; and US 9,948,549 Expert declarations VoIP and network communications 2019 Web Application and Database Fish & Richardson P.C. Ticket Network, Inc. and Ticket Software LLC v. C.E.A.T.S., Inc. US7,548,867, US7,640,178 IPR Expert reports, deposition
Case Name: Patent No: Service Provided: Type of Matter: Date: Law Firm: Case Name: Patent No:	Erise IP P.A.  Apple Inc. v. Voip-Pal.com, Inc.; Inter Partes Review US 9,537,762; US 9,813,330; US 9,826,002; and US 9,948,549 Expert declarations VoIP and network communications 2019 Web Application and Database Fish & Richardson P.C. Ticket Network, Inc. and Ticket Software LLC v. C.E.A.T.S., Inc. US7,548,867, US7,640,178
Case Name: Patent No: Service Provided: Type of Matter: Date: Law Firm: Case Name: Patent No: Service Provided:	Erise IP P.A.  Apple Inc. v. Voip-Pal.com, Inc.; Inter Partes Review US 9,537,762; US 9,813,330; US 9,826,002; and US 9,948,549 Expert declarations VoIP and network communications 2019 Web Application and Database Fish & Richardson P.C. Ticket Network, Inc. and Ticket Software LLC v. C.E.A.T.S., Inc. US7,548,867, US7,640,178 IPR Expert reports, deposition
Case Name: Patent No: Service Provided: Type of Matter: Date: Law Firm: Case Name: Patent No: Service Provided:	Erise IP P.A.  Apple Inc. v. Voip-Pal.com, Inc.; Inter Partes Review US 9,537,762; US 9,813,330; US 9,826,002; and US 9,948,549  Expert declarations VoIP and network communications 2019  Web Application and Database Fish & Richardson P.C. Ticket Network, Inc. and Ticket Software LLC v. C.E.A.T.S., Inc. US7,548,867, US7,640,178  IPR Expert reports, deposition Web reservation over Internet and Database consistency
Case Name: Patent No: Service Provided: Type of Matter: Date: Law Firm: Case Name: Patent No: Service Provided: Type of Matter:	Erise IP P.A.  Apple Inc. v. Voip-Pal.com, Inc.; Inter Partes Review US 9,537,762; US 9,813,330; US 9,826,002; and US 9,948,549 Expert declarations VoIP and network communications 2019 Web Application and Database Fish & Richardson P.C. Ticket Network, Inc. and Ticket Software LLC v. C.E.A.T.S., Inc. US7,548,867, US7,640,178 IPR Expert reports, deposition Web reservation over Internet and Database consistency over multiple reservations instances
Case Name: Patent No: Service Provided: Type of Matter: Date: Law Firm: Case Name: Patent No: Service Provided: Type of Matter:	Erise IP P.A.  Apple Inc. v. Voip-Pal.com, Inc.; Inter Partes Review US 9,537,762; US 9,813,330; US 9,826,002; and US 9,948,549 Expert declarations VoIP and network communications 2019 Web Application and Database Fish & Richardson P.C. Ticket Network, Inc. and Ticket Software LLC v. C.E.A.T.S., Inc. US7,548,867, US7,640,178 IPR Expert reports, deposition Web reservation over Internet and Database consistency over multiple reservations instances 2017-2018
Case Name: Patent No: Service Provided: Type of Matter: Date: Law Firm: Case Name: Patent No: Service Provided: Type of Matter: Date:	Erise IP P.A.  Apple Inc. v. Voip-Pal.com, Inc.; Inter Partes Review US 9,537,762; US 9,813,330; US 9,826,002; and US 9,948,549 Expert declarations VoIP and network communications 2019 Web Application and Database Fish & Richardson P.C. Ticket Network, Inc. and Ticket Software LLC v. C.E.A.T.S., Inc. US7,548,867, US7,640,178 IPR Expert reports, deposition Web reservation over Internet and Database consistency over multiple reservations instances 2017-2018 Wireless
Case Name: Patent No: Service Provided: Type of Matter: Date: Law Firm: Case Name: Patent No: Service Provided: Type of Matter: Date: Law Firm:	Erise IP P.A.  Apple Inc. v. Voip-Pal.com, Inc.; Inter Partes Review US 9,537,762; US 9,813,330; US 9,826,002; and US 9,948,549 Expert declarations VoIP and network communications 2019 Web Application and Database Fish & Richardson P.C. Ticket Network, Inc. and Ticket Software LLC v. C.E.A.T.S., Inc. US7,548,867, US7,640,178 IPR Expert reports, deposition Web reservation over Internet and Database consistency over multiple reservations instances 2017-2018 Wireless The W.E.B.B. Law Firm
Case Name: Patent No: Service Provided: Type of Matter: Date: Law Firm: Case Name: Patent No: Service Provided: Type of Matter: Date: Law Firm: Case Name:	Erise IP P.A.  Apple Inc. v. Voip-Pal.com, Inc.; Inter Partes Review US 9,537,762; US 9,813,330; US 9,826,002; and US 9,948,549 Expert declarations VoIP and network communications 2019 Web Application and Database Fish & Richardson P.C. Ticket Network, Inc. and Ticket Software LLC v. C.E.A.T.S., Inc. US7,548,867, US7,640,178 IPR Expert reports, deposition Web reservation over Internet and Database consistency over multiple reservations instances 2017-2018 Wireless The W.E.B.B. Law Firm Amazon Inc v. Hera Wireless

Date:	2018
	Network communications
Law Firm:	Mei & Mark LLP ( / Devlin Law Firm LLC)
Case Name:	ATEN International Co., LTD v. Uniclass Technology Co., LTD
Patent No:	US6,957,287, US7,472,217, US7,640,289 and US8,589,141
Service Provided:	Several infringement expert reports. Testified in depositions, testified in front of a judge and jury.
Type of Matter:	Patents related to KVM switch architectures, Bluetooth
Date:	2016-2017
	Mobile devices
Law Firm:	Stern Kessler Goldstein Fox
Case Name:	Apple V. Uniloc USA, IPR2017-01804
Patent No:	US8,724,622
Service Provided:	IPR expert report
Type of Matter:	IPR expert report (the same as for Facebook WhatsApp)
Date:	2017
Bato.	TCP/IP, Internet Protocols
Law Firm:	Wolf Greenfield LLP
Case Name:	IPR for <b>Huawei</b> and <b>RPX</b>
Patent No:	US6,738,378 & US6,252,848
Service Provided:	IPR expert report
Type of Matter:	Patents in network communications
Date:	2017
Z dito:	Wireless Mobile Devices
Law Firm:	Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett &Dunner, LLP
Case Name:	<b>L.G.</b> and <b>Huawei</b> V. Intellectual Venture
Patent No:	US8,994,433
Service Provided:	IPR expert report
Type of Matter:	IPR expert report (the same as for Facebook WhatsApp)
Date:	2017
Date.	Mobile wireless
Low Firms	
Law Firm: Case Name:	Perkins Coie LLP
	T-Mobile v. Barkan Wireless Access Technologies L.P.
Patent No:	US8,559,369 and US9,042,306
Service Provided: Type of Matter:	Expert for T-Mobile in a single IPR for these two patents Wi-Fi Tethering in broadband cellular data
Date:	2017
Date.	Mobile wireless, cellular systems
Law Firm:	Cooley, LLP
Case Name:	Facebook, Inc., Instagram LLC v. Skky, LLC
Jase Name.	US8,892,465, US9,118,693, US9,124,717, US9,124,718,
Patent No:	US9,203,870, US9,203,956, US9,215,310 and US 9,219,810,

	E (I IDD ( D ( (N II) 1100 000 405 1100 440 000
	Further IPRs for Patent Nos. US8,892,465, US9,118,693, US9,124,717 and US9,124,718
	Expert for defendant Facebook, IPR, and CBM expert
Service Provided:	reports, Testified in depositions
Type of Matter:	Patents related to cellular systems using OFDM
Date:	2017
Date.	Mobile wireless, Unified Communications
Law Firm:	Cooley, LLP
Case Name:	Facebook, WhatsApp. V. Uniloc U.S.A., Inc.
Case Mairie.	US8,199,747, US8,995,433, US8,243,723, and US
Patent No:	7,535,890
Paterit No.	· · · ·
	IPR2017-01524, IPR2017-01365, IPR2017-01523
Service Provided:	Expert for defendant Facebook. Wrote IPR expert reports.
	Testified in depositions.
Type of Matter:	Patents related to VoIP, Cellphone Short Messages, Chat
Doto	app
Date:	2016
	Unified communications
Law Firm:	Akerman LLP
Case Name:	YMax Corporation v. Focal I.P., LLC
Patent No:	US7,764,777, US8,155,298, US8,724,622 and US
	8,457,113
	Expert for the defendant and IPR petitioner, YMax corp.
Service Provided:	Wrote three expert reports for the PTAB Testified in
	depositions.
Type of Matter:	Patents related to telecommunicators architecture, PSTN,
	and VoIP
Date:	2016
	Mobile devices, wireless network, cellular systems
Law Firm:	Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP
	FedEx (RPX) v. Intellectual Ventures IPR2017-00729,
Case Name:	IPR2017-00741
oudo Humo.	Intellectual Ventures II LLC and Callahan Cellular LLC v.
	FedEx Corp.
Patent No:	US6,633,900 and US8,494,581
Service Provided:	Wrote two IPR expert reports. Testified in depositions
Type of Matter:	Patents related to mobile devices over wireless networks.
Date:	2016 - 2017
	Routing Switching
Law Firm:	Warner Norcross & Judd
Case Name:	Patentmarks Communications, LLC v. Internap
Case Maille.	Corporation
Datant No:	US6,016,307, US6,473,404, US6,144,641, US8,400,926
Patent No:	and US9,036,499
Convine Provided:	Expert for the defendant. Wrote a claim construction
Service Provided:	declaration.
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

Tune of Motton	Patents related to multi-protocol telecommunications
Type of Matter:	routing optimization
Date:	2016
	Mobile wireless (SMS on WhatsApp)
Law Firm:	Cooley, LLP
Case Name:	Facebook IPR PTAB v. Windy City
	US8,458,245, US8,407,356, US8,473,552 and
Patent No:	US8,694,657
Tatorit 140.	(IPR2016-01157, IPR2016-01158, IPR2016-01159,
	IPR2016-01156)
Service Provided:	Expert for petitioner Facebook, Inc., wrote an IPR expert
	report for the PTAB Testified in depositions.
Type of Matter:	Patents related to network communications
Date:	2016
	Network communications
Law Firm:	Winston & Strawn
Case Name:	RPX IPR PTAB filing
Patent No:	US8,788,090
Service Provided:	Expert for petitioner RPX, wrote an IPR expert report for the PTAB
Type of Matter:	Patents related to network communications
Date:	2016
	Network Management
Law Firm:	Cooley, LLP
Case Name:	ServiceNow, Inc. v. BCM Software, Inc.
Case Name:	
Case Name:	ServiceNow, Inc. v. BCM Software, Inc.
Case Name: Patent No:	ServiceNow, Inc. v. BCM Software, Inc. USPTO PTAB IPR Cases: IPR2015-01555; IPR2015-
	<b>ServiceNow</b> , Inc. v. BCM Software, Inc. USPTO PTAB IPR Cases: IPR2015-01555; IPR2015-01211; IPR2015-01631; IPR2015-01601. CBM Case
	ServiceNow, Inc. v. BCM Software, Inc. USPTO PTAB IPR Cases: IPR2015-01555; IPR2015-01211; IPR2015-01631; IPR2015-01601. CBM Case CBM2015-00170 ,2:14-CV-00903
	ServiceNow, Inc. v. BCM Software, Inc.  USPTO PTAB IPR Cases: IPR2015-01555; IPR2015-01211; IPR2015-01631; IPR2015-01601. CBM Case CBM2015-00170 ,2:14-CV-00903  US8,646,093; US8,646,093 (CBM as well), US7,617,073; US8,674,992; US6,816,898  Expert for the defendant and IPR petitioner, ServiceNow,
Patent No:	ServiceNow, Inc. v. BCM Software, Inc.  USPTO PTAB IPR Cases: IPR2015-01555; IPR2015-01211; IPR2015-01631; IPR2015-01601. CBM Case CBM2015-00170 ,2:14-CV-00903  US8,646,093; US8,646,093 (CBM as well), US7,617,073; US8,674,992; US6,816,898  Expert for the defendant and IPR petitioner, ServiceNow, Inc., wrote IPR and CBM expert reports for PTAB, wrote
	ServiceNow, Inc. v. BCM Software, Inc.  USPTO PTAB IPR Cases: IPR2015-01555; IPR2015-01211; IPR2015-01631; IPR2015-01601. CBM Case CBM2015-00170 ,2:14-CV-00903 US8,646,093; US8,646,093 (CBM as well), US7,617,073; US8,674,992; US6,816,898  Expert for the defendant and IPR petitioner, ServiceNow, Inc., wrote IPR and CBM expert reports for PTAB, wrote expert reports for claim constructions. Testified in
Patent No:  Service Provided:	ServiceNow, Inc. v. BCM Software, Inc.  USPTO PTAB IPR Cases: IPR2015-01555; IPR2015-01211; IPR2015-01631; IPR2015-01601. CBM Case CBM2015-00170 ,2:14-CV-00903  US8,646,093; US8,646,093 (CBM as well), US7,617,073; US8,674,992; US6,816,898  Expert for the defendant and IPR petitioner, ServiceNow, Inc., wrote IPR and CBM expert reports for PTAB, wrote expert reports for claim constructions. Testified in depositions.
Patent No:  Service Provided:  Type of Matter:	ServiceNow, Inc. v. BCM Software, Inc.  USPTO PTAB IPR Cases: IPR2015-01555; IPR2015-01211; IPR2015-01631; IPR2015-01601. CBM Case CBM2015-00170, 2:14-CV-00903  US8,646,093; US8,646,093 (CBM as well), US7,617,073; US8,674,992; US6,816,898  Expert for the defendant and IPR petitioner, ServiceNow, Inc., wrote IPR and CBM expert reports for PTAB, wrote expert reports for claim constructions. Testified in depositions.  Patents related to network management
Patent No:  Service Provided:	ServiceNow, Inc. v. BCM Software, Inc.  USPTO PTAB IPR Cases: IPR2015-01555; IPR2015-01211; IPR2015-01631; IPR2015-01601. CBM Case CBM2015-00170 ,2:14-CV-00903  US8,646,093; US8,646,093 (CBM as well), US7,617,073; US8,674,992; US6,816,898  Expert for the defendant and IPR petitioner, ServiceNow, Inc., wrote IPR and CBM expert reports for PTAB, wrote expert reports for claim constructions. Testified in depositions.
Patent No:  Service Provided:  Type of Matter:	ServiceNow, Inc. v. BCM Software, Inc.  USPTO PTAB IPR Cases: IPR2015-01555; IPR2015-01211; IPR2015-01631; IPR2015-01601. CBM Case CBM2015-00170 ,2:14-CV-00903 US8,646,093; US8,646,093 (CBM as well), US7,617,073; US8,674,992; US6,816,898  Expert for the defendant and IPR petitioner, ServiceNow, Inc., wrote IPR and CBM expert reports for PTAB, wrote expert reports for claim constructions. Testified in depositions.  Patents related to network management 2015  Internet protocols, routing and switching
Patent No:  Service Provided:  Type of Matter: Date:  Law Firm:	ServiceNow, Inc. v. BCM Software, Inc.  USPTO PTAB IPR Cases: IPR2015-01555; IPR2015-01211; IPR2015-01631; IPR2015-01601. CBM Case CBM2015-00170 ,2:14-CV-00903  US8,646,093; US8,646,093 (CBM as well), US7,617,073; US8,674,992; US6,816,898  Expert for the defendant and IPR petitioner, ServiceNow, Inc., wrote IPR and CBM expert reports for PTAB, wrote expert reports for claim constructions. Testified in depositions.  Patents related to network management  2015  Internet protocols, routing and switching  Cooley, LLP
Patent No:  Service Provided:  Type of Matter: Date:	ServiceNow, Inc. v. BCM Software, Inc.  USPTO PTAB IPR Cases: IPR2015-01555; IPR2015-01211; IPR2015-01631; IPR2015-01601. CBM Case CBM2015-00170 ,2:14-CV-00903  US8,646,093; US8,646,093 (CBM as well), US7,617,073; US8,674,992; US6,816,898  Expert for the defendant and IPR petitioner, ServiceNow, Inc., wrote IPR and CBM expert reports for PTAB, wrote expert reports for claim constructions. Testified in depositions.  Patents related to network management  2015  Internet protocols, routing and switching  Cooley, LLP  ServiceNow, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Company
Patent No:  Service Provided:  Type of Matter: Date:  Law Firm:	ServiceNow, Inc. v. BCM Software, Inc.  USPTO PTAB IPR Cases: IPR2015-01555; IPR2015-01211; IPR2015-01631; IPR2015-01601. CBM Case CBM2015-00170, 2:14-CV-00903  US8,646,093; US8,646,093 (CBM as well), US7,617,073; US8,674,992; US6,816,898  Expert for the defendant and IPR petitioner, ServiceNow, Inc., wrote IPR and CBM expert reports for PTAB, wrote expert reports for claim constructions. Testified in depositions.  Patents related to network management  2015  Internet protocols, routing and switching  Cooley, LLP  ServiceNow, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Company  USPTO PTAB IPR Cases IPR2015-00707; IPR2015-
Patent No:  Service Provided:  Type of Matter: Date:  Law Firm:	ServiceNow, Inc. v. BCM Software, Inc.  USPTO PTAB IPR Cases: IPR2015-01555; IPR2015-01211; IPR2015-01631; IPR2015-01601. CBM Case CBM2015-00170 ,2:14-CV-00903 US8,646,093; US8,646,093 (CBM as well), US7,617,073; US8,674,992; US6,816,898  Expert for the defendant and IPR petitioner, ServiceNow, Inc., wrote IPR and CBM expert reports for PTAB, wrote expert reports for claim constructions. Testified in depositions.  Patents related to network management 2015  Internet protocols, routing and switching  Cooley, LLP  ServiceNow, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Company USPTO PTAB IPR Cases IPR2015-00707; IPR2015-00716; IPR2015-00631; IPR2015-00717; IPR2015-00707.
Patent No:  Service Provided:  Type of Matter: Date:  Law Firm: Case Name:	ServiceNow, Inc. v. BCM Software, Inc.  USPTO PTAB IPR Cases: IPR2015-01555; IPR2015-01211; IPR2015-01631; IPR2015-01601. CBM Case CBM2015-00170, 2:14-CV-00903  US8,646,093; US8,646,093 (CBM as well), US7,617,073; US8,674,992; US6,816,898  Expert for the defendant and IPR petitioner, ServiceNow, Inc., wrote IPR and CBM expert reports for PTAB, wrote expert reports for claim constructions. Testified in depositions.  Patents related to network management  2015  Internet protocols, routing and switching  Cooley, LLP  ServiceNow, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Company  USPTO PTAB IPR Cases IPR2015-00707; IPR2015-00716; IPR2015-00631; IPR2015-00717; IPR2015-00707. CBM
Patent No:  Service Provided:  Type of Matter: Date:  Law Firm:	ServiceNow, Inc. v. BCM Software, Inc.  USPTO PTAB IPR Cases: IPR2015-01555; IPR2015-01211; IPR2015-01631; IPR2015-01601. CBM Case CBM2015-00170 ,2:14-CV-00903  US8,646,093; US8,646,093 (CBM as well), US7,617,073; US8,674,992; US6,816,898  Expert for the defendant and IPR petitioner, ServiceNow, Inc., wrote IPR and CBM expert reports for PTAB, wrote expert reports for claim constructions. Testified in depositions.  Patents related to network management  2015  Internet protocols, routing and switching  Cooley, LLP  ServiceNow, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Company  USPTO PTAB IPR Cases IPR2015-00707; IPR2015-00716; IPR2015-00631; IPR2015-00717; IPR2015-00707. CBM  Cases CBM2015-00108; CBM2015-00077
Patent No:  Service Provided:  Type of Matter: Date:  Law Firm: Case Name:	ServiceNow, Inc. v. BCM Software, Inc.  USPTO PTAB IPR Cases: IPR2015-01555; IPR2015-01211; IPR2015-01631; IPR2015-01601. CBM Case CBM2015-00170, 2:14-CV-00903  US8,646,093; US8,646,093 (CBM as well), US7,617,073; US8,674,992; US6,816,898  Expert for the defendant and IPR petitioner, ServiceNow, Inc., wrote IPR and CBM expert reports for PTAB, wrote expert reports for claim constructions. Testified in depositions.  Patents related to network management  2015  Internet protocols, routing and switching  Cooley, LLP  ServiceNow, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Company  USPTO PTAB IPR Cases IPR2015-00707; IPR2015-00716; IPR2015-00631; IPR2015-00717; IPR2015-00707. CBM

	Expert for the defendant and IPR petitioner ServiceNow,
Service Provided:	Inc., wrote IPR and CBM expert reports for the PTAB
	Cases IPR2015-00631, IPR2015-00717. Testified in
Tour of Matters	depositions.
Type of Matter:	Patents related to Web services and Internet technologies
Date:	2015
	Internet Protocols, TCP/IP, Network Management, SNMP
Law Firm:	Holland & Knight, LLP
Case Name:	SNMP Research International, Inc., et al. v. <b>Avaya</b> , Inc.
Service Provided:	Expert for defendant Avaya, Inc., wrote expert reports.
	Testified in a deposition.
Type of Matter:	Network management for IP-PBX
Date:	2015
	Routing Switching, Internet Protocols
Law Firm:	Perkins Coie, LLP
0 11	Qurio Holdings v. DirectTV
Case Name:	Case No. 15-cv-01986-HSG (N.D. CA), and 3 IPR petitions
D	IPR2015-02005, IPR2015-02006, IPR2015-02007
Patent No:	US7,787,904, US8,102,863 and US8,879,567
Service Provided:	Expert for the defendant and IPR petitioner DirectTV,
	wrote three IPR expert reports
Type of Matter:	Mobile device control, WAN to wireless LAN gateway,
Type of Matter.	wireless LAN gateway
	ŭ i
Date:	2015
Date:	2015 Mobile wireless (mobile handset devices)
Date:  Law Firm:	2015 Mobile wireless (mobile handset devices) Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett &
	2015 Mobile wireless (mobile handset devices) Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP
	2015 Mobile wireless (mobile handset devices) Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP FedEx Corporation and FedEx Corporate Services, Inc.,
Law Firm: Case Name:	2015 Mobile wireless (mobile handset devices) Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP FedEx Corporation and FedEx Corporate Services, Inc., Petitioner v. Loramax LLC, Patent Owner
Law Firm:	2015 Mobile wireless (mobile handset devices) Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP FedEx Corporation and FedEx Corporate Services, Inc., Petitioner v. Loramax LLC, Patent Owner US5,689,642 and US5,513,126
Law Firm: Case Name: Patent No:	2015 Mobile wireless (mobile handset devices) Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP FedEx Corporation and FedEx Corporate Services, Inc., Petitioner v. Loramax LLC, Patent Owner US5,689,642 and US5,513,126 Expert for defendant and IPR petitioner FedEx Corporation
Law Firm: Case Name:	Mobile wireless (mobile handset devices) Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP FedEx Corporation and FedEx Corporate Services, Inc., Petitioner v. Loramax LLC, Patent Owner US5,689,642 and US5,513,126 Expert for defendant and IPR petitioner FedEx Corporation wrote an IPR expert report.
Law Firm:  Case Name:  Patent No:  Service Provided:	Mobile wireless (mobile handset devices)  Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP  FedEx Corporation and FedEx Corporate Services, Inc., Petitioner v. Loramax LLC, Patent Owner  US5,689,642 and US5,513,126  Expert for defendant and IPR petitioner FedEx Corporation wrote an IPR expert report. (Plaintiff dismissed the case without IPR filed)
Law Firm: Case Name: Patent No: Service Provided: Type of Matter:	Mobile wireless (mobile handset devices)  Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP  FedEx Corporation and FedEx Corporate Services, Inc., Petitioner v. Loramax LLC, Patent Owner  US5,689,642 and US5,513,126  Expert for defendant and IPR petitioner FedEx Corporation wrote an IPR expert report. (Plaintiff dismissed the case without IPR filed) Improving communication between devices or stations
Law Firm:  Case Name:  Patent No:  Service Provided:	Mobile wireless (mobile handset devices)  Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP  FedEx Corporation and FedEx Corporate Services, Inc., Petitioner v. Loramax LLC, Patent Owner  US5,689,642 and US5,513,126  Expert for defendant and IPR petitioner FedEx Corporation wrote an IPR expert report. (Plaintiff dismissed the case without IPR filed)  Improving communication between devices or stations 2015
Law Firm:  Case Name:  Patent No:  Service Provided:  Type of Matter:  Date:	Mobile wireless (mobile handset devices)  Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP  FedEx Corporation and FedEx Corporate Services, Inc., Petitioner v. Loramax LLC, Patent Owner  US5,689,642 and US5,513,126  Expert for defendant and IPR petitioner FedEx Corporation wrote an IPR expert report. (Plaintiff dismissed the case without IPR filed)  Improving communication between devices or stations 2015  Mobile and Wireless, Cellular System,
Law Firm:  Case Name:  Patent No:  Service Provided:  Type of Matter:  Date:  Law Firm:	Mobile wireless (mobile handset devices) Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP FedEx Corporation and FedEx Corporate Services, Inc., Petitioner v. Loramax LLC, Patent Owner US5,689,642 and US5,513,126 Expert for defendant and IPR petitioner FedEx Corporation wrote an IPR expert report. (Plaintiff dismissed the case without IPR filed) Improving communication between devices or stations 2015 Mobile and Wireless, Cellular System, McGuire Woods, LLP
Law Firm:  Case Name:  Patent No:  Service Provided:  Type of Matter:  Date:  Law Firm:  Case Name:	Mobile wireless (mobile handset devices)  Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP  FedEx Corporation and FedEx Corporate Services, Inc., Petitioner v. Loramax LLC, Patent Owner  US5,689,642 and US5,513,126  Expert for defendant and IPR petitioner FedEx Corporation wrote an IPR expert report. (Plaintiff dismissed the case without IPR filed) Improving communication between devices or stations 2015  Mobile and Wireless, Cellular System,  McGuire Woods, LLP  Expert for GT&T
Law Firm:  Case Name:  Patent No:  Service Provided:  Type of Matter:  Date:  Law Firm:  Case Name:  Service Provided:	Mobile wireless (mobile handset devices)  Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP  FedEx Corporation and FedEx Corporate Services, Inc., Petitioner v. Loramax LLC, Patent Owner  US5,689,642 and US5,513,126  Expert for defendant and IPR petitioner FedEx Corporation wrote an IPR expert report. (Plaintiff dismissed the case without IPR filed)  Improving communication between devices or stations 2015  Mobile and Wireless, Cellular System,  McGuire Woods, LLP  Expert for GT&T  Expert for a cellular telecommunications company
Law Firm:  Case Name:  Patent No:  Service Provided:  Type of Matter:  Date:  Law Firm:  Case Name:  Service Provided:  Type of Matter:	Mobile wireless (mobile handset devices) Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP FedEx Corporation and FedEx Corporate Services, Inc., Petitioner v. Loramax LLC, Patent Owner US5,689,642 and US5,513,126 Expert for defendant and IPR petitioner FedEx Corporation wrote an IPR expert report. (Plaintiff dismissed the case without IPR filed) Improving communication between devices or stations 2015 Mobile and Wireless, Cellular System, McGuire Woods, LLP Expert for GT&T Expert for a cellular telecommunications company Analysis of cellular network and phone systems.
Law Firm:  Case Name:  Patent No:  Service Provided:  Type of Matter:  Date:  Law Firm:  Case Name:  Service Provided:	Mobile wireless (mobile handset devices)  Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP  FedEx Corporation and FedEx Corporate Services, Inc., Petitioner v. Loramax LLC, Patent Owner  US5,689,642 and US5,513,126  Expert for defendant and IPR petitioner FedEx Corporation wrote an IPR expert report.  (Plaintiff dismissed the case without IPR filed)  Improving communication between devices or stations 2015  Mobile and Wireless, Cellular System,  McGuire Woods, LLP  Expert for GT&T  Expert for a cellular telecommunications company  Analysis of cellular network and phone systems.  2015
Law Firm: Case Name: Patent No: Service Provided: Type of Matter: Date: Law Firm: Case Name: Service Provided: Type of Matter: Date:	Mobile wireless (mobile handset devices) Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP FedEx Corporation and FedEx Corporate Services, Inc., Petitioner v. Loramax LLC, Patent Owner US5,689,642 and US5,513,126 Expert for defendant and IPR petitioner FedEx Corporation wrote an IPR expert report. (Plaintiff dismissed the case without IPR filed) Improving communication between devices or stations 2015 Mobile and Wireless, Cellular System, McGuire Woods, LLP Expert for GT&T Expert for a cellular telecommunications company Analysis of cellular network and phone systems. 2015 Network Security
Law Firm:  Case Name:  Patent No:  Service Provided:  Type of Matter: Date:  Law Firm: Case Name: Service Provided: Type of Matter: Date:  Law Firm: Law Firm: Law Firm: Law Firm:	Mobile wireless (mobile handset devices)  Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP  FedEx Corporation and FedEx Corporate Services, Inc., Petitioner v. Loramax LLC, Patent Owner  US5,689,642 and US5,513,126  Expert for defendant and IPR petitioner FedEx Corporation wrote an IPR expert report.  (Plaintiff dismissed the case without IPR filed)  Improving communication between devices or stations  2015  Mobile and Wireless, Cellular System,  McGuire Woods, LLP  Expert for GT&T  Expert for a cellular telecommunications company  Analysis of cellular network and phone systems.  2015  Network Security  Wolf Greenfield, LLP
Law Firm:  Case Name:  Patent No:  Service Provided:  Type of Matter:  Date:  Law Firm:  Case Name:  Service Provided:  Type of Matter:  Date:  Law Firm:  Case Name:  Case Name:	Mobile wireless (mobile handset devices) Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP FedEx Corporation and FedEx Corporate Services, Inc., Petitioner v. Loramax LLC, Patent Owner US5,689,642 and US5,513,126 Expert for defendant and IPR petitioner FedEx Corporation wrote an IPR expert report. (Plaintiff dismissed the case without IPR filed) Improving communication between devices or stations 2015 Mobile and Wireless, Cellular System, McGuire Woods, LLP Expert for GT&T Expert for a cellular telecommunications company Analysis of cellular network and phone systems. 2015 Network Security Wolf Greenfield, LLP M.D. Security Solutions, LLC v. RPX
Law Firm:  Case Name:  Patent No:  Service Provided:  Type of Matter: Date:  Law Firm: Case Name: Service Provided: Type of Matter: Date:  Law Firm: Law Firm: Law Firm:	Mobile wireless (mobile handset devices)  Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP  FedEx Corporation and FedEx Corporate Services, Inc., Petitioner v. Loramax LLC, Patent Owner  US5,689,642 and US5,513,126  Expert for defendant and IPR petitioner FedEx Corporation wrote an IPR expert report.  (Plaintiff dismissed the case without IPR filed)  Improving communication between devices or stations  2015  Mobile and Wireless, Cellular System,  McGuire Woods, LLP  Expert for GT&T  Expert for a cellular telecommunications company  Analysis of cellular network and phone systems.  2015  Network Security  Wolf Greenfield, LLP

Type of Matter:	Network communications for alarm systems
Date:	2015
	Mobile devices
Law Firm:	Simpson Thacher & Bartlett, LLP
Case Name:	IXI Mobile v. Apple Inc. 14-cv-7954 SDNY
Patent No:	US7,295,532, US7,426,398, US7,016,648, and US
Paterit No.	7,039,033
Service Provided:	Searched for prior art, prepared invalidity claim charts
Type of Matter:	Invalidity claim charts related to iPhone, iPad, and others,
	Apple's mobile wireless products and technologies
Date:	2015
	Network communications
Law Firm:	Hovey Williams, LLP
Case Name:	USPTO Office Action App. 13/432.775 (NetAirus)
Patent No:	Patent App. 13/432.775
Service Provided:	Wrote a short declaration for an office action
Type of Matter:	Desktop computer configuring the system
Date:	2015
	Routing and switching, TCP/IP, Internet Protocols
Law Firm:	Kirkland & Ellis, LLP
Case Name:	Spherix v. Cisco Systems
	1:14-cv-393-SLR (D. Del.)
	US RE40467, US 6,697,325, US 6,578,086, US 6,222,848,
Detent No.	US 6,130,877, US 5,970,125, US 6,807,174, US
Patent No:	7,397,763, US 7,664,123, US 7,385,998, US 8,607,323 US
	6,879,594, US 6,661, 788, US 6,233,245, US 6,684,241,
	US 6,661, 788, US 6,879,594
Service Provided:	Searched for prior art, invalidity claim charts, and investigation
	Network communication, routing, and switching
Type of Matter:	technologies
Date:	2014
Date.	Routing switching, network communications, TCP/IP
Law Firm:	Desmarais, LLP
	Bockstar Technologies, LLC v. Cisco Systems, Inc.
Case Name:	Case No. 1: 13-cv-2020-SLR (D. Del.)
	US 5,732,080, US 6,069,895, US 6,233,245, US
Patent No:	6,636,508, US 6,684,241, US 6,778,653
Service Provided:	Research and analysis of the prior art
	Network communication, routing, and switching
Type of Matter:	technologies
Date:	2014
	Routing Switching, Network Communications, Internet
	Protocols, TCP/IP
Law Firm:	Armstrong Teasdale, LLP
Case Name:	Cisco Systems, Inc USPTO Inter Partes Review (IPR)

	(the petition was not filed)
Patent No:	US 5,583,862
Service Provided:	Expert for petitioner Cisco Systems, Inc., wrote invalidation expert reports for the USPTO PTAB
Type of Matter:	Patent-related to telecommunications, routing, and switching technologies
Date:	2014
	Network communications
Law Firm:	Fish Richardson, LLP
Case Name:	Mobotix - Inter Partes Review IPR2015-00093
Patent No:	US 6,975,220
Service Provided:	Expert for petitioner Mobotix, wrote invalidation expert reports for the USPTO PTAB
Type of Matter:	USPTO Inter Partes Review (IPR), patent related to network architecture
Date:	2014
	Routing switching
Law Firm:	Faegre Baker Daniels, LLP
	Brilliant Optical Solutions, LLC v. Comcast
Case Name:	District of Colorado, Case no. 1:13-CV-00886-REB-KMT
	and USPTO Inter Partes Review (IPR)
Patent No:	US 5,555,478
	Expert for defendant and IPR petitioner Comcast, wrote
Service Provided:	invalidation expert reports for the USPTO PTAB IPR
	(Plaintiff dismissed the case without IPR filed)
Type of Matter:	Patent-related to routers' switching fabric architecture
Date:	2014
	Routing Switching, Network Communications,
Law Firm:	Irell & Manella, LLP, CA
	Brixham Solutions, LTD, vs. <b>Juniper Networks</b>
Case Name:	3:13-cv-00616-JCS (N.D. CA)
	and USPTO IPR 2014-00425 and IPR 2014-00431
Patent No:	US7,940,652 and US7,535,895
	Wrote two invalidation expert reports for the USPTO
Service Provided:	PTAB. Testified in depositions.
	Expert for the defendant and IPR petitioner Juniper
	Networks, patent related to routers' switching fabric
Type of Matter:	architecture and a patent related to Ethernet pseudo-wire
	VPN
Date:	2014
Date.	Mobile Systems, Cellular Networks, an ITC Case
Law Firm:	McKool Smith (Dallas, TX)
	Ericsson v. Samsung (I.T.C.)
Case Name:	ITC Investigation NO. 337-TA-862
Patent No:	US6,772,215, US6,519,223
ו מוכווו וזוט.	000,112,210, 000,018,220

	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Service Provided:	Wrote several expert reports. Testified in depositions. Testified in the I.T.C. court.
Type of Matter:	Patent-related to cellular systems, CDMA, GSM, UMTS, LTE, and wireless network communications
Date:	2013
	Routing Switching, Network Communications
Law Firm:	Keker& Van Nest, LLP
	Comcast Cable Communications, LLC et al. v. B.T.
Case Name:	Americas, Inc.
	3:12-cv-01712-M (N.D. Tex.)
Patent No:	US7,142,508, US5,638,516
Service Provided:	Analysis, claim terms, and Markman claim construction
Type of Matter:	MPLS technology
Date:	2013
	Unified communications, streaming video and VoIP
Law Firm:	Williams, LLP (KS)
	NetAirus Systems LLC v. Kappos
Case Name:	USPTO 1:12-cv-00709-AJT-JFA, 1:12-cv-01207-AJT-TRJ
Patent No:	US5,280,583, US5,589,849, US2005/0110780 A1
Service Provided:	Wrote a declaration regarding claim amendment
Type of Matter:	Video conference application program
Date:	2013
	Wireless Networking
Law Firm:	Slater&Matsil, LLP (Dallas, TX)
Coop Name	e-Watch, Inc. v. Mobotix Corp.
Case Name:	USPTO Reexamination
Patent No:	US6,970,183
Service Provided:	Expert for petitioner Mobotix Corp.
Service Frovided.	Wrote an invalidity declaration - USPTO IPR2013-00255
Type of Matter:	A wireless monitoring system, wire-line networking
Date:	2013
	Network Communications
Law Firm:	Nixon Peabody (Chicago, IL)
Case Name:	Teradici's - USPTO Re-examination
Patent No:	US6,012,101, US5,604,509, US5,577,205
Service Provided:	Wrote an invalidity expert report
Type of Matter:	Patents related to network communications remote KVM
Date:	2012
	Network Communications
Law Firm:	Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, LLP (Irvine, CA)
Case Name:	Wassink v. <b>ACS</b> (Affiliated Computer Systems, Inc.) 8:11-cv-00554-CJC-MLG (CD, CA)
Service Provided:	Wrote an expert report
Service Provided:	Cisco certification of IT personnel
	2012
Date:	1 ZU1Z

	Mobile Wireless
Law Firm:	Kenyon& Kenyon, LLP
Case Name:	HumanEyes Technologies, LTD v. Sony Electronics (I.T.C.) 1:12-cv-00398 (D. Del.)
Comico Drovidodi	` '
Service Provided:	Investigation of patents and related technologies
Type of Matter:	Software related to mobile devices, including panoramic imaging
Date:	2012
	Network Communications Protocols
Law Firm:	Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP (New York, NY)
Case Name:	Realtime Data v. <b>Morgan Stanley</b> et al 1:11-cv-6696,-6701,-6704 (S.D. N.Y.)
Service Provided:	Wrote a rebuttal to an infringement report, was deposed
Type of Matter:	Technology related to a network communication protocol
Date:	2012
	Network Security, VPN, SSL
Law Firm:	Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP
Case Name:	Maxim Integrated Products, Inc. v. <b>VanguardBank</b> and P.N.C. Bank
Patent No:	US5,940,510, US5,949,880, US6,105,013, US6,237,095
Service Provided:	Investigation of prior art
Type of Matter:	Patents litigation related to virtual private networks (VPN) and secure service layer (SSL)
Date:	2012
	Mobile wireless, Cellular systems
Law Firm:	Foley & Lardner, LLP
Case Name:	<b>M2M Solutions</b> , LLC v. Sierra Wireless, CA No. 12-030-RGA (D. Del.)
Patent No:	US7,583.197, US8,094,010
Service Provided:	Investigation of the prior art, claim charts
Type of Matter:	Patents related to wireless and mobile devices in cellular systems
Date:	2012
	e-Commerce, Internet and Web Technologies
Law Firm:	Goldstein & Lipski, P.LLC (Houston, TX)
Case Name:	Site Update Solutions, LLC v. Accor North America, Inc., et al. 4:11-CV-03306-PJH (N.D. CA), Ipr2016-01235, Cbs Corp.,
Potent No:	15-1448, 13-1458, 5:11cv3306
Patent No: Service Provided:	US RE40.683, US 6,253,198  A declaration
Type of Matter:	Patent litigation related to Internet web technologies and e- commerce

Date:	2012
	Internet and Web Technologies
Law Firm:	Goldstein & Lipski, P.LLC (Houston, TX)
Case Name:	EIT Holdings LLC V. Netflix and Barnes & Noble Inc.
	5:11-CV-02466; 2012 WL 728387, 1:10-CV-01081,2011
Patent No:	WL 7149251,2011 WL 7149248
Service Provided:	Expert report
Type of Matter:	Patent-related to Internet and Web technologies
Date:	2012
2 0.00	Bandwidth and network access
Law Firm:	Russ, August & Kabat (Los Angeles, CA)
	Proxyconn, Inc. v. Microsoft et al.
Case Name:	8:11-cv-1681-DOC-AN (C.D. Cal)
Patent No:	US6,757,717, US6,370,646
Service Provided:	Investigation of technology, was deposed
Type of Matter:	Speed data accessing in communication networks
Date:	2012
Date.	Network communications
Law Firm:	
	Greenberg Traurig, LLP
Case Name:	Walker Digital v. <b>Google</b> 1:11-cv-00318-LPS (D. Del)
Patent No:	US5,884,272, US5,884,270, US5,824,082, US 5,136,501,
	US5,832,497
Service Provided:	Invalidity analysis, investigation of patents and related
T ( N 4 . 11	technologies
Type of Matter:	Internet and e-commerce technologies
Date:	2012
	Bandwidth Allocation
Law Firm:	Hosie Rice, LLP (San Francisco, CA)
Case Name:	BackWeb v. HP and IBM 4:10-cv-04311-PJH
Service Provided:	Investigated patents and related technologies
Type of Matter:	Patent litigation related to network communication
J .	bandwidth allocation
Date:	2012
	Mobile wireless and SMS, streaming video in Cellular
	systems
Law Firm:	Hogan Lovells U.S., LLP
Case Name:	High Point SARL v. Sprint Nextel 2:09-CV-2269 (Kansas
Case Mairie.	City, KN)
Patent No:	US5,884,272, US5,884,270, US5,824,082, US5,136,501,
ratent NO.	US5,832,497
Service Provided:	Search for invalidity prior art
Type of Matter:	Patents related to mobile wireless and cellular systems
Date:	2011
	Network Communications, Internet Protocol, TCP/IP, SMS,
	Streaming Video
Law Firm:	Greenberg Traurig, LLP
	, <u> </u>

	Embleze v. Apple
Case Name:	Emblaze v. <b>Apple</b> 1:10-cv-5713 -PKC (SDNY.)
Patent No:	US6,389,473, US5,841,432, US5,751,968, US6,138,147,
	US5,610,841, US6,397,230, US5,579,239, US5,928,330,
	US5,987,510, US6,014,694, US6,151,632, US5,864,682,
	US5,659,539
Service Provided:	Investigation of patents, invalidity analysis
Type of Matter:	Computer network protocol for multimedia application
Date:	2011
	Mobile wireless
Law Firm:	Ropes & Gray, LLP (New York, NY)
Case Name:	Motorola Mobility, Inc. v. Microsoft
	1:10-cv-24063-MORENO (SD, FL)
Patent No:	US7,024,214, US7,493,130, US7,725,584, US6,219,694,
	US5,406,643, US7,275,116
Service Provided:	Wrote an invalidity expert report, wrote a response to an
	infringement report. Testified in depositions 7/21/2011
	Patent litigation related to wireless and mobile devices,
Type of Matter:	including smartphones and tablets
Date:	2011
	Network Communications
Law Firm:	Goldstein & Lipski, P.LLC (Houston, TX)
	EIT v. YELP! Inc.
Case Name:	3:10-cv-05623-WHA (N.D. CA)
	US5,828,837, US6,249,868, US6,594,765, US6,081,786,
Patent No:	US6,188,988, US7,298,271, USRE40,683, US8,060,504
Service Provided:	Wrote an expert report
Type of Matter:	Patent litigation related to Internet and Web technologies
Date:	2011
	Network Communications
Law Firm:	Hosie Rice, LLP (San Francisco, CA)
Ossa Nama	Software Research, Inc. v. HP
Case Name:	3:11-cv-1676-JSW (ND, CA)
Patent No:	US7,231,606, US7,757,175
Service Provided:	Wrote a declaration 7/15/2011
Town of Mottow	Patent litigation related to Internet web technologies and e-
Type of Matter:	commerce
Date:	2011
	Network Communications, Unified Communications
Law Firm:	David N. Hoffman (Brooklyn, NY) and S. Robert Diener
	(Berkeley, CA)
Case Name:	Yipes v. Wyckoff Medical Center
	AAA No. 74494 Y 00849 10 NOLG
Service Provided:	Testified in depositions. Testified in front of an arbitrator
Type of Matter:	Network communications infrastructure
Date:	2011
L	ı

	Network communications protocols, TCP/IP, Internet
	Protocols
Law Firm:	Silicon Edge Law Group, LLP
	H.P. v. Alacritech
Case Name:	USPTO Interference No. 105,775
Patent No.	US6,246,683, US6,226,680, US6,697,868
	Wrote an expert report, an expert declaration, a response
Service Provided:	expert report, a reply expert report. Testified twice in
	depositions.
Type of Matter:	USPTO Interference:
	Patents related to a network communications protocol
Date:	2011
	Routing and Switching
Law Firm:	Durie Tangri, LLP (Palo Alto, CA)
Case Name:	Fortinet v. Palo Alto Networks
	5:09-cv-00036-RMW (ND, CA)
Patent No:	US7,519,990, US1,111,111, US7,376,125, US7,177,311,
	US6,930,978
Service Provided:	Wrote an invalidity expert report. Testified in depositions.
Type of Matter:	Patent litigation related to network communications filtering
Date:	2010
	Data Communications, Routing switching
Law Firm:	Hausfeld, LLP (San Francisco, CA)
Case Name:	<b>Backweb</b> Technologies v. Microsoft 4:09-cv-01224-CW (ND, CA)
B	US6,374,289, US6,493,758, US6,539,429, US5,913,040,
Patent No:	US6,317,789, US6,539,429, US7,512,943, US7,139,815,
Service Provided:	US7,216,180, US6,920,110, US7,325,068 Wrote an expert report
Service Provided.	Patent litigation related to network communication
Type of Matter:	bandwidth allocation
Date:	2010
<u> </u>	Network Communications, Internet Protocols
Law Firm:	August & Kabat (Los Angeles, CA)
	Linksmart Wireless v. Cisco Systems, T-Mobile
Case Name:	4:09-cv-01224-CW (ND, CA), 2:08-cv-00385,2:09-cv-
	00026
Patent No:	US6,779,118
Service Provided:	Wrote an expert report. Testified in a deposition.
Type of Matter	Patent litigation related to network communication
Type of Matter:	dynamically redirecting and filtering Internet traffic
Date:	2010
	iPhone email system
Law Firm:	Law Offices of Rod Firoozye (Palo Alto, CA)
Case Name:	Zand v. Armin
25.22 . 16.1101	1-09-FL-149015

Service Provided:	Wrote an expert report. Testified in a deposition. Testified
	in court
Type of Matter:	Email origination in iPhone and laptop
Date:	2010
	Video Teleconferencing, Video streaming
Law Firm:	The Simon Law Firm, PC (St. Louis, MO)
Case Name:	<b>Teleconference</b> System v. Tandberg 3:10-cv-01325-JSW (ND, CA)
Patent No:	US6,980,526
Service Provided:	Investigated patent and related technologies
Type of Matter:	Network protocols in the teleconference system
Date:	2010
	Routing switching
Law Firm:	Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett &Dunner, LLP
Case Name:	F5 Networks v. A10 Networks
	2:10-cv-00654-MJP (WD WASH)
Patent No:	US7,102,996, US7,395,349, US6,311,278
Service Provided:	Invalidity investigation, a search of prior art
Type of Matter:	Patents related to network communications firewall and
Type of Matter.	load balancing
Date:	2010
	Internet Web technologies
Law Firm:	Niro Scavone Haller & Niro
Case Name:	IP Innovation v. Google
	2:07-cv-503-RRR (E.D.TX)
Patent No:	US5,276,785, US5,675,819
Service Provided:	Wrote an infringement expert report and a rebuttal expert report
Type of Matter:	Patent litigation related to Internet and Web technologies
Date:	2009
	Routing, switching, VoIP, and video streaming
Law Firm:	Niro Scavone Haller &Niro
Case Name:	Trace Wilco, Inc. v. Cisco
Case Name.	5:09-cv-000810-SI
Patent No:	US6,158,011, US6,061,796, US7,325,063, US5,796,948
Service Provided:	Investigated patents and related technologies
Type of Matter:	Network communications protocols
Date:	2009