

Exhibit 1

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
WACO DIVISION**

OLLNOVA TECHNOLOGIES LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

EMERSON ELECTRIC CO. and VERDANT
ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGIES,
INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 6:22-cv-00358-ADA

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

DECLARATION OF ERIK DE LA IGLESIA
IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF OLLNOVA TECHNOLOGIES LTD.'S
RESPONSIVE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

I, Erik de la Iglesia, hereby declare under penalty of perjury that:

1. I have been retained by Ollnova Technologies Ltd. (“Ollnova”) as an expert in connection with the above-captioned litigation.

2. I am being compensated by Ollnova at the rate of \$650 per hour for my work in this case, including time spent testifying. I am also being reimbursed for reasonable fees and expenses, including hotel and travel expenses, incurred as a result of my work in this case. I have not received any additional compensation for my work in this investigation. My compensation is not tied in any way to the substance of my testimony or the outcome of this investigation. I am available to testify to the facts and opinions herein if called upon to do so.

3. I submit this declaration in support of Ollnova’s Responsive Claim Construction Brief. I have been asked to provide my opinions concerning certain claim terms in U.S. Patent Nos. 7,746,887 (“the ’887 Patent”) and 8,224,282 (“the ’282 Patent”) from the perspective of a person of ordinary skill in the art (“POSITA”).

I. QUALIFICATIONS AND BACKGROUND

4. I hold a Master of Science degree in Electrical Engineering from Stanford University and a Bachelor of Science degree in Electrical Engineering from the University of Florida. I have been associated with computer architecture, computer memory, computer storage mediums including flash and the electronics industry in general as a designer, architect and consultant for approximately 25 years.

5. My skills and experience are in the fields of Computer Architecture, Networks, Memory and IO Systems, Security and Content Management, Storage Protocols and Appliances, Storage Systems, Flash Devices and related areas. Beginning in 1997, I worked as a design engineer within the Mobile and Handheld Products Group at Intel. Since 2003, I have held

director, chief architect and founder roles at private and public companies in fields such as computer networking, security and storage. I have also served as a technical advisor to startups in certain fields of cloud technology.

6. My industry work in these fields has resulted in 68 issued US patents and I have both design and management experience relevant to the fields of integrated hardware and software design for networked system components relevant to this matter. I am familiar with the tools and methodologies for the design, use and maintenance of source code repositories.

7. Since 2014 I have served as a legal consultant / expert witness on over 50 legal matters related to infringement, validity, trade secrets and other aspects and have testified in District Court and before the International Trade Commission. Because of my background, training, and experience, I am qualified as an expert to opine on the subject matter of this declaration. A more detailed account of my work experience and other qualifications is listed in my Curriculum Vitae attached as EXHIBIT A to this declaration.

II. MY UNDERSTANDING OF THE RELEVANT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION LEGAL PRINCIPLES

8. It is my understanding that to ascertain the meaning of claims, the Court looks to three primary sources: the claims, the specification, and the prosecution history.

9. It is my understanding that the specification must contain a written description of the invention that enables one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the invention. It is my further understanding that the patent's claims must be read in view of the specification, and that for claim construction purposes, the description may act as a sort of dictionary, which explains the invention and may define terms used in the claims. In addition, it is my understanding that the

patentee is free to be his own lexicographer, but any special definition given to a word must be clearly set forth in the specification.

10. It is my understanding that it is the function of the claims, not the specification, to set forth the limits of the patentee's invention. Otherwise, there would be no need for claims. It is my further understanding that one purpose for examining the specification is to determine if the patentee has limited the scope of the claims. In addition, it is my understanding that although the specification may indicate that certain embodiments are preferred, particular embodiments appearing in the specification will not be read into the claims when the claim language is broader than the embodiments.

11. It is my understanding that the words used in a claim are generally given their ordinary and customary meaning. It is my further understanding that the ordinary and customary meaning of a claim term is the meaning that the term would have to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, i.e., as of the effective filing date of the patent application. In addition, it is my understanding that the person of ordinary skill in the art is deemed to have read the claim term not only in the context of the particular claim in which the disputed term appears, but in the context of the entire patent, including the specification, because the claims are part of a fully integrated written instrument.

12. It is my understanding that the prosecution history is intrinsic evidence that is relevant to the determination of how the inventor understood the invention and whether the inventor limited the invention during prosecution by narrowing the scope of the claims. In addition, it is my understanding that to operate as a disclaimer, the statement in the prosecution history must be clear and unambiguous, and constitute a clear disavowal of scope.

13. It is my understanding that extrinsic evidence, such as dictionary definitions or expert testimony, may be considered during claim construction, but that extrinsic evidence is subordinate to the intrinsic record.

14. With respect to indefiniteness, I understand that a claim element is indefinite if, read in light of the specification delineating the patent, and the prosecution history, the claim element fails to inform, with reasonable certainty, those skilled in the art about the scope of the claim element. I have also been informed that the definiteness requirement mandates clarity, while recognizing that absolute precision is unattainable. It is further my understanding the asserting party, here Defendants, bears the burden of proving indefiniteness by clear and convincing evidence.

15. I understand that antecedent basis is applicable to terms that use “the” to refer to a previous instance of the term or concept. I further understand that when a term or concept is first introduced in a patent, it should use an indefinite article such as “a” or “an.” For example, in a patent for a bicycle, the first time the term “handle bar” is used, it should be phrased as “a handle bar.” If further limitations are desired for the “handle bar,” the patent should refer to “the handle bar.” It is my understanding that this concept is based in indefiniteness. In other words, I understand that a mistake in antecedent basis does not necessarily render a claim term indefinite if a POSITA would understand the scope of the term to a reasonable certainty.

III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART

16. It is my understanding that a number of factors can be used to determine the level of ordinary skill in the art, including: (1) the education and experience of people working in the field of the invention at the time of the invention; (2) the types of problems encountered in the

field of the invention; (3) the types of solutions to those problems in the prior art; and (4) the sophistication of the technology in the field of the invention.

17. For the purpose of my opinions in this report, I have been asked to assume that the priority date for the '887 Patent is at least as early as April 12, 2006, and that the priority date for the '282 Patent is at least as early as March 19, 2008. Therefore, when I refer to one of ordinary skill in the art, I am referring to one of ordinary skill in the art as of these dates.

18. For the purpose of my opinions in this report, I have been asked to adopt Dr. Neikirk's proposed standard as to the relevant skill level of a person of ordinary skill in the art. Specifically, Dr. Neikirk states:

18. In my opinion, as of April 12, 2006, a POSITA relating to the technology of the '887 patent would have had a minimum of a bachelor's degree in electrical engineering, or a related field, along with at least two years of professional experience in sensors, controls, and/or wireless communications. Additional graduate education could substitute for professional experience, or significant experience in the field could substitute for formal education.

19. In my opinion, as of March 19, 2008, the level of experience for a POSITA relating to the technology of the '282 patent would be similar to that for the '887 patent, namely, a POSITA relating to the technology of the '887 patent would have had a minimum of a bachelor's degree in electrical engineering, or a related field, along with at least two years of professional experience in sensors, controls, and/or wireless communications. To the extent that there might have been any changes in the level of the ordinary skill in the art between April 12, 2006 and March 19, 2008 with respect to the technology of the Asserted Patents, any such changes do not materially impact my opinions set forth in this declaration.

19. Based at least on my educational and work experience, it is my opinion that I qualify as a POSITA under this standard as of the filing dates of each of the '887 and '282 patents.

IV. DISPUTED CLAIM TERMS

A. "information associated reading of the indicator", '887 Patent, Claim 1

Ollnova's Proposed Construction	Emerson's Proposed Construction
information associated <u>with the</u> reading of the indicator	Indefinite

20. The disputed language is bolded and underlined in Claim 1 below:

1. A wireless automation device, comprising:
a transceiver operable to wirelessly communicate packets of information over a wireless network;
a sensor operable to generate a indicator for a sensed condition;
a controller configured to poll the sensor at a polling interval to read the indicator during a current period of the polling interval and to selectively operate the transceiver to communicate **information associated [with the] reading of the indicator**; and
a memory, the controller storing a reading of the indicator during the current period in the memory, where the memory stores at least one prior reading of the indicator, the prior reading of the indicator made during a prior period of the polling interval,
wherein the transceiver is configured to transmit a most recent reading of the indicator stored in the memory during a period of a transmission interval in response to detecting a change in the sensed condition outside a predetermined range and wherein transmission of the most recent reading of the indicator stored in the memory during the period of the transmission interval is suspended in response to detecting a chance in the sensed condition within the predetermined range.

21. I have reviewed Defendants' Opening Claim Construction Brief and the Opening Declaration of Dean P. Neikirk, Ph.D. I understand that Emerson argues that the term "information associated reading of the indicator" is indefinite and that the certificate of correction is invalid. I disagree. In my opinion, a POSITA would understand the scope of the claim with reasonable certainty in light of the corresponding description in the specification even without any correction to the claim language. Emerson and Dr. Neikirk do not show that the claim, viewed in light of the specification, fails to inform a POSITA about the scope of the invention with reasonable certainty.

22. I understand that a district court may correct obvious minor typographical and clerical errors in patents. I understand that the error must be evident from the face of the patent. I also understand that correction is appropriate only if (1) the correction is not subject to reasonable

debate based on consideration of the claim language and the specification and (2) the prosecution history does not suggest a different interpretation of the claims.

23. I understand that the USPTO issued a certificate of correction on March 22, 2022, that added the words “with the” to this term, as seen below.

It is certified that error appears in the above-identified patent and that said Letters Patent is hereby corrected as shown below:

In the Claims

Claim 1, Column 14, Lines 56-57: change “associated reading of the indicator” to —associated with the reading of the indicator—; and

Claim 21, Column 16, Line 35: change “associated reading of the indicator” to —associated with the reading of the indicator—.

24. In my opinion, a POSITA would understand that the grammatical error in the disputed term is evident from the face of the patent in light of the claim language. I note that Emerson’s expert, Dr. Neikirk, agrees: “a POSITA reading the term ‘information associated reading of the indicator’ would recognize that the term is grammatically flawed and is missing one or more words.” Neikirk Decl. ¶ 36.

25. A POSITA would further understand that the correction should not be subject to reasonable debate because the related discussion in the specification makes clear that the words “with the” were inadvertently omitted: “The controller also controls the transceiver to selectively communicate information associated **with the** signal from the sensor.” ’887 Patent at 2:16-18. A POSITA would understand that this description in the specification is directly related to the claim limitation and that it confirms that the omission of the words “with the” was a typographical error. I note that Emerson’s expert, Dr. Neikirk, also identified this portion of the specification, and stated that it is “consistent with this interpretation” (referring to the claim interpretation “information associated [with the] reading of the indicator”). Neikirk Decl. ¶ 37.

26. I have also reviewed the prosecution history and a POSITA would understand that it does not suggest a different interpretation of the claim. I note that Dr. Neikirk did not identify anything in the prosecution history to the contrary. Neikirk Decl. ¶ 42.

27. I understand that Emerson and Dr. Neikirk contend that the correction is subject to reasonable debate. I disagree. As a first alternative interpretation, I understand that Emerson suggests that the term could be “interpreted such that claimed controller should communicate ‘information [with the] associated reading of the indicator.’” Br. at 5; Neikirk Decl. ¶ 38 (“Another reasonable interpretation of claim 1 of the ’887 patent is that the claim should read ‘information [with the] associated reading of the indicator’—putting the phrase ‘with the’ before the word ‘associated[.]’”). I disagree that a POSITA would understand that this is a reasonable interpretation in light of the description in the specification. There is no corresponding language in the specification to support this interpretation.

28. I also understand that Emerson contends that this alternative interpretation is narrower than the language resulting from the certificate of correction. Specifically, Dr. Neikirk states:

This second interpretation (“information [with the] associated reading of the indicator”) is narrower than the first interpretation (“information associated [with the] reading of the indicator). The second interpretation requires the claimed controller to be configured to selectively operate the transceiver to communicate both the most recent reading of the indicator and information associated with that reading. The first interpretation, on the other hand, simply requires that the claimed controller be configured to selectively operate the transceiver to communicate only the information associated with the reading of the indicator, and not the reading itself.

Neikirk Decl. ¶ 39.

29. I disagree that Emerson and Dr. Neikirk have shown any difference in claim scope under the first alternative interpretation because claim 1 separately requires that the “transceiver

is configured to transmit a most recent reading of the indicator.” Accordingly, under both the ordinary reading of the claim and the first alternative interpretation, the transceiver must communicate both the most recent reading of the indicator and information associated with that reading. Accordingly, Emerson and Dr. Neikirk do not show any difference in claim scope under this first alternative interpretation.

30. As a second alternative interpretation, I understand that Emerson suggests that the term could be interpreted to refer to “[a]n information[-]associated reading of the indicator.” Neikirk Decl. ¶ 40. Dr. Neikirk explains that “[u]nder this interpretation, the claim requires the controller to operate the transceiver to communicate only the ‘reading’ and not the associated ‘information’ itself.” Neikirk Decl. ¶ 40. I disagree that a POSITA would understand that this is a reasonable interpretation in light of the description in the specification. There is no corresponding language in the specification to support this interpretation.

31. Accordingly, in light of the specification’s teachings (’887 Patent at 2:16-18), a POSITA would understand that the omission of the words “with the” was a typographical error and would not have any uncertainty about the scope of the claim. A POSITA would understand that the omission of the words “with the” was a typographical error that is clearly evident to one of skill in the art. A POSITA would conclude that there is only one reasonable correction to the claim, as set forth in the certificate of correction.

B. “identification flag for each identified sensor value”, ’282 Patent, Claims 4, 10, 16

Ollnova’s Proposed Construction	Emerson’s Proposed Construction
No construction necessary Plain and ordinary meaning	Indefinite
Preamble: “The automation component of claim [3] / [9] / [15]”	

32. The disputed language is bolded and underlined in Claims 3 and 4 below:

3. The automation component of claim 1, wherein the computer readable instructions are further programmed to:

identify sensor values within the sensor data that exceed a corresponding change-of-value threshold.

4. The automation component of **claim 1 [3]**, wherein the computer readable instructions are further programmed to:

set an identification flag for **each identified sensor value**.

33. I have reviewed Defendants' Opening Claim Construction Brief and the Opening Declaration of Dean P. Neikirk, Ph.D. I understand that Emerson argues that the term "identification flag for each identified sensor value" is indefinite due to the lack of antecedent basis. In my opinion, a POSITA would understand that the lack of antecedent basis for the term "each identified sensor value" confirms that each claim was intended to refer back to the preceding dependent claim 3, 9, and 15. I agree with Emerson that there is no antecedent basis for the term "each identified sensor value" in independent claim 1. Instead, the antecedent basis is clearly found in claim 3 (as shown above).

34. I understand that a district court may correct obvious minor typographical and clerical errors in patents. I understand that the error must be evident from the face of the patent. I understand that correction is appropriate only if (1) the correction is not subject to reasonable debate based on consideration of the claim language and the specification and (2) the prosecution history does not suggest a different interpretation of the claims.

35. A POSITA would understand that the error in the claim dependency is evident from the face of the patent based on the lack of antecedent basis. A POSITA would understand that the correction is not subject to reasonable debate because there is no other antecedent basis for the

term “each identified sensor value” (other than in dependent claim 3). The term “sensor value” does not appear in any of the other dependent claims.

36. The specification further confirms this interpretation:

At block 604, the sensor data identified during the sensor and memory scan may be compared to a **COV [change-of-value] threshold** value corresponding to each individual sensor and/or sensor value. **Sensor data found to exceed the COV [change-of-value] threshold may be flagged** for later transmission.

’282 Patent at 9:4-8.

37. A POSITA would understand that this specification discussion is directly tied to dependent claims 3 and 4, and that it confirms claim 4 was intended to depend on claim 3. And this applies equally to claims 10 and 16.

38. I have also reviewed the prosecution history and a POSITA would understand that it does not suggest a different interpretation of the claim. The prosecution history confirms that this was a typographical error introduced in the original claim set. I note that Dr. Neikirk did not identify anything in the prosecution history to the contrary. Neikirk Decl. ¶ 53.

39. Accordingly, in light of the lack of antecedent basis and specification’s teachings (’282 Patent at 9:4-8), a POSITA would understand that the claim dependency was a typographical error that is clearly evident to one of skill in the art. A POSITA would conclude that there is only one reasonable correction to the claims to refer back to the preceding dependent claim 3, 9, and 15.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the above is true and correct, to the best of my knowledge.

Executed on this 17th day of November 2022, in Mountain View, CA.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Erik de la Iglesia', written over a horizontal line.

Erik de la Iglesia

EXHIBIT A

Erik de la Iglesia

Curriculum Vitae

Expert Witness and IP strategist with entrepreneurial background as chief architect for both hardware and software-based companies in the information technology sector having generated acquisition values over \$100M and public offerings.

Legal and Litigation Experience

6/22 – Current Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe (Patent Infringement)
Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. v. Realtek ITC 337-TA-1318
Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. v. Realtek 2:22-cv-00134 EDTX Supporting Realtek

6/22 – Current Russ August & Kabat (Patent Infringement)
Ollnova Technologies LTD v. Ecobee Technologies 2:22-cv-00072-JRG EDTX
Ollnova Technologies LTD v. Emerson Electric. Co and Verdant Environmental Technologies Inc 6:22-cv-00358 WDTX
Ollnova Technologies LTD v. Google LLC 6:22-cv-00246 WDTX
Supporting Ollnova

6/22 – Current Russ August & Kabat (Patent Infringement)
Vivato Technologies v. Aruba Networks 2:21-cv-04912
Vivato Technologies v. Belkin International 2:21-cv-04914
Vivato Technologies v. Netgear Inc. 8:21-cv-01064
Vivato Technologies v. Ubiquity Networks 8:21-cv-01065 Supporting Vivato in CDCA

5/22 - Current Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP (Patent Infringement)
Webroot Inc. et al. v. Sophos Ltd. 22-cv-00240 WDTX Supporting Sophos

5/22 – Current Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe (IPR)
Realtek Semiconductor Corp. v. Future Link Systems, LLC IPR2022-01071 Supporting Realtek

4/22 – Current Russ August & Kabat (Patent Infringement)
AlmondNet, Inc, et al. v. Roku, Inc., 6:21-cv-00876-ADA
AlmondNet, Inc, et al. v. Meta Platforms, Inc., 6:21-cv-00896-ADA
AlmondNet, Inc, et al. v. Microsoft Corporation, 6:21-cv-00897-ADA
AlmondNet, Inc, et al. v. Amazon.com, Inc., et al., 6:21-cv-00898-ADA
AlmondNet, Inc, et al. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., et al., 6:21-cv-00891-ADA
Supporting AlmondNet, Inc. in WDTX

4/22 – Current Davis Firm PC (Patent Infringement)
TQ Delta, LLC v. Nokia Corp., et al. 2:21-cv-00309-JRG Supporting TQ Delta, LLC

1/22 – Current Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP (Patent Infringement)
KOM Software Inc. v. NetApp, Inc. et al. 1:18-cv-00160-RGA Supporting NetApp, Inc

11/21 – Current Russ August & Kabat (Patent Infringement)
Sonrai Memory v. Google LLC 6:21-cv-00167-ADA Supporting Sonrai Memory
Sonrai Memory v. LG Electronics 6:21-cv-00168-ADA Supporting Sonrai Memory
Sonrai Memory v. Samsung Electronics 6:21-cv-00169-ADA Supporting Sonrai Memory

6/21 – 12/21 Russ August & Kabat (Patent Infringement, Domestic Industry)
EcoFactor Inc. v. EcoBee et al. ITC 337-TA-1258 Supporting EcoFactors Inc.
Reports, Depositions, Testimony at Hearing (ITC)

6/21 – 2/22 Russ August & Kabat (Patent Infringement)
EcoFactor Inc. v. Google, Vivint 6:20-cv-00075, -78, -80 Supporting EcoFactors Inc.
Reports, Depositions, Testimony at Trial (WDTX)

5/21 – 3/22 Carlson Caspers (Patent Infringement)
Dali Wireless v. CommScope Technologies 1:19-cv-00952 supporting CommScope
Report, Deposition

1/21 – Current Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP (Claim Construction, Patent
Infringement, Validity, Trade Secrets)
Carnival Corp. v. DeCurtis Corp. and DeCurtis, LLC, 20-CV-22945 supporting Carnival
Declarations, Reports, Depositions

12/20 – 7/21 Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP (Patent Infringement, Domestic
Industry)
Koninklijke Philips v. Realtek ITC 337-TA-1224 supporting Realtek
Report, Deposition, Testimony at Hearing (ITC)

11/20 – 7/21 Baker McKenzie (Trade Secrets, Copyright)
Proofpoint, Inc., et al. v. Vade Secure Inc., et al. 3:19-cv-04238 Supporting Vade Secure, Inc

10/20 – 4/21 Russ August & Kabat (Claim Construction, Patent Infringement)
Parking Technology Holdings LLC v. Park Assist, LLC 1:20-cv-03156-PGG Supporting Parking
Technology Holdings LLC
Declaration

9/20 – 12/20 Russ August & Kabat (Patent Infringement)
Neodron Ltd v. Apple et al. 337-TA-1193 Supporting Neodron

7/20 – 10/20 Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP (Patent Infringement)
Actifio Inc. v. Rubrik Inc. 1:20-cv-00886-CFC Supporting Rubrik

7/20 – 8/21 Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP (Patent Infringement)
Commvault Systems Inv. V. Rubrik Inc. 1:20-cv-00524-UNA Supporting Rubrik

6/20 – 7/21 Russ August & Kabat (Patent Infringement)

Linksmart v. Deep Blue 1:18-cv-02441-EK-PK Supporting Linksmart

12/19 – 11/20 Russ August & Kabat (Patent Infringement)
EcoFactor Inc. v. EcoBee et al. ITC 337-TA-1185 Supporting EcoFactor Inc.
Report, Deposition, Testimony at Hearing (ITC)

9/19 – 10/19 Singer Cashman LLP (Patent Infringement)
Crane Merchandising Systems v. NewZoom 1:17-cv-1000-GMS Supporting NewZoom

7/19 – 12/19 Hosie Rice LLP (Patent Infringement)
Implicit, LLC v. Imperva, Inc 2:19-cv-00040-JRG-RSP Supporting Implicit

4/19 – 6/20 TechKnowledge Law Group LLP (IPR, Patent Infringement, Validity)
Samsung Electronics v. Promos Technologies, Inc. Supporting Promos Technologies, Inc.
IPR2019-00784, IPR2019-00781, IPR2019-00780, IPR2019-00779
Declarations, Depositions

4/19 – 12/19 Davis Firm PC (Patent Infringement)
Implicit, LLC v. Netscout Systems, Inc 2:18-cv-53-JRG Supporting Implicit
Declaration

2/19 – 8/19 Davis Firm PC (Patent Infringement)
RPost Holdings v. Adobe Systems 2:11-CV-00325-JRG
RPost Holdings v. DocuSign Inc. 2:12-CV-00683-JRG
RPost Holdings v. Right Signature, LLC (Citrix) 2:10-CV-00258-JRG
RPost Holdings v. Selligent, Inc 2:12-CV-00515-JRG
Supporting RPost Holdings

11/18 – 7/21 Russ August & Kabat (Claim Construction, Patent Infringement,
Intervening Rights, Validity)
Linksmart v. Caesars Entertainment Corp. 2:18-cv-00862-MMD-NJK,
Linksmart v. Golden Nugget, Inc., Landry's Inc. 2:18-cv-00864-MMD-NJK,
Linksmart v. Las Vegas Sands Corp. 2:18-cv-00865-MMD-NJK,
Linksmart v. MGM Resorts International 2:18-cv-00867-MMD-NJK,
Linksmart v. Wynn Resorts, Limited 2:18-cv-00868-MMD-NJK supporting Linksmart
Declarations, Reports

11/18 – 11/21 Russ August & Kabat (IPR, Claim Construction, Intervening Rights,
Patent Infringement, Validity)
Linksmart v. Panasonic / GoGo 8:18-cv-00654-AG IPR2019-00043 supporting Linksmart
Declarations, Reports, Depositions

6/18 – 7/18 Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP (Patent Infringement)
General Electric Co. v. Vestas Wind Systems A/S, et al. 2:17-cv-05653-AB-PLA supporting
General Electric Co.

5/18 – 9/19 Stubbs Alderton & Markiles (Patent Infringement)
PersonalWeb Technologies v. Amazon 5:18-cv-00767-BLF supporting PersonalWeb
PersonalWeb Technologies v. Twitch Interactive 5:18-cv-05619-BLF supporting PersonalWeb
Declaration, Reports

3/18 – 4/18 Carlson Caspers (Technical Consulting)
Topics: Cellular Telephony

2/18 – 12/18 Latham Watkins (IPR, Patent Infringement)
FotoNation and DigitalOptics Corp v. Samsung 2:17-CV-669-RWS supporting FotoNation and
DigitalOptics Corp

12/17 – 6/19 Carlson Caspers (Patent Infringement)
CommScope Technologies v. Dali Wireless 3:16-cv-00477-M supporting CommScope
Report

11/17 – 6/18 Demarais (Technical Consulting)
Topics: SAN / NAS Storage Technology

6/17 – 9/17 Cozen O'Connor (Patent Infringement, Validity, Domestic Industry)
LG v. BLU ITC 337-TA-1051 Supporting BLU
Declaration, Report

6/17 – 12/17 Fish & Richardson (Patent Infringement, Validity, Domestic Industry)
Broadcom v. MediaTek Inc. et al., 8:17-cv-00405-JVS-JCG
Broadcom v. MStar Semiconductor Inc., 8:17-cv-00406-JVS-JCG
Broadcom v. Mediatek / MStar ITC 337-TA-1047
Supporting Mediatek / MStar

3/17 – 5/17 Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP (Technical Consulting)
Case: Mentor Graphics v. Synopsys supporting Synopsys
USC of Appeals for the Federal Circuit 2015-1470, 2015-1554, 2015-1556
Reviews of 3:10-cv-00954-MO, 3:12-cv-01500-MO, 3:13-cv-00579-MO

2/17 – 6/17 Cozen O'Connor (Patent Infringement)
BlackBerry vs. BLU 16-23535-CIV Supporting BLU
Declaration, Report

12/16 – 5/19 Weil, Gotshal & Manges (Technical Consulting)
Topics: Cloud Computing, Security

5/16 – 10/16 Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher (Patent Infringement, Validity)
EMC Corporation v. Pure Storage, Inc. 1:16-CV-00176-RGA Supporting EMC
Declaration, Report, Deposition

3/16 – 7/18 Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts (Technical Consulting)

Topics: Cellular Telephony, Power Generation Turbines

10/15 – 3/16 McKool Smith (Patent Infringement, Validity)
TCL Communication v. Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson 8:14-CV-00341 Supporting Ericsson

4/15 – 9/15 McKool Smith (Patent Infringement)
AT&T Intellectual Property v. Cox Communications 14-1106-GMS Supporting AT&T

3/15 – 3/15 Keker & Van Nest (Patent Infringement)
Round Rock Research, LLC v. Sandisk 1:12-cv-12569-SLR Supporting Sandisk

11/14 – 3/15 Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP (Patent Infringement)
NVidia v. Qualcomm / Samsung ITC 337-TA-932 Supporting Nvidia
Report, Deposition and Direct Testimony (ITC)

7/14 – 10/15 Keker & Van Nest (Trade Secrets)
Sandisk v. Hynix 1:14-cv-262078 Supporting Sandisk
Declaration

4/14 – 9/15 Latham & Watkins (Patent Infringement, Validity)
Market Track LLC v. ECRM, LLC 1:14-cv-4957 Supporting Market Track LLC.
Declaration, Report

4/14 – 12/14 McDermitt Will & Emory (Contract Dispute)
OneNeck v. Patrick 3:13-cv-00894 Supporting Patrick
Report, Deposition

4/14 – 6/14 Latham & Watkins (Patent Infringement)
InterDigital v. Samsung 1:13-cv-00008-RGA Supporting InterDigital

4/13 – 5/14 Latham & Watkins (Patent Infringement)
InterDigital v. Samsung ITC 337-TA-868 Supporting InterDigital
Report, Deposition and Direct Testimony (ITC)

3/13 – 11/13 McKool Smith (Patent Infringement)
Ericsson v. Samsung ITC 337-TA-862 Supporting Ericsson

Technical Advisor Experience

9/14 – 12/16 Kodiak Data, Inc
Technology and Strategic advisor (Cloud Container Technology)

4/16 – 5/19 ShieldX
Technology and Strategic advisor (Cloud Security Technology)

Areas of Consulting and Expertise

ASIC, FPGA and Full-Custom Design, Computer Architecture, Computer Bus, Datapath, Pipelines, Cache, Memory and IO Systems, Network Protocols and Appliances, Wireless Networks and Transmission Systems, Network Application and Content Security, Email Processing, Security and Content Management, Storage Protocols and Appliances, Clustering Protocols, Storage Systems, Media and Technology, Flash Device, Controller and System Technology, Flash Wear Management and Issues, Hardware Description Languages and Design, Software Programming Languages and Environments, Storage Compression, Encoding, Deduplication and Error Correction, Performance Monitoring and Analysis, Application and Infrastructure Performance Optimization, Public and Private Cloud Infrastructure, Data Center Architecture and Performance, Computer Graphics

Issued US Patents (68)

6,490,703 6,553,545 6,732,288 7,152,124 7,298,746 7,321,926 7,434,058 7,447,777
 7,584,262 7,657,104 7,689,614 7,730,011 7,774,604 7,814,327 7,818,326 7,899,828
 7,907,608 7,930,540 7,958,227 7,962,591 7,984,175 8,005,863 8,010,689 8,160,070
 8,166,307 8,176,049 8,200,026 8,214,599 8,214,608 8,271,794 8,285,961 8,301,635
 8,307,007 8,307,206 8,402,198 8,402,246 8,417,871 8,417,895 8,442,059 8,443,150
 8,463,800 8,504,537 8,548,170 8,554,774 8,560,693 8,635,416 8,650,362 8,656,039
 8,667,366 8,683,035 8,713,252 8,730,955 8,762,386 8,775,741 8,788,758 8,830,836
 8,832,384 8,838,850 8,959,288 8,972,689 9,069,676 9,092,471 9,094,338 9,195,407
 9,244,861 9,344,525 9,374,225 9,424,180

Patents have been cited over 2850 times in USPTO issued patent and as prior art in PTAB proceedings.

Education

BS Electrical Engineering, University of Florida

MS Electrical Engineering, Stanford

Employment History

5/14 – Current

Technical and Legal Consulting

1/13 – 4/14 Violin Memory

Sr. Director of Technology

Responsible for integration of Gridiron technology with Violin Memory storage environments, patent strategy and portfolio acquisitions, technical review of development, systems architecture and flash media technology.

9/08 – 12/12 Gridiron Systems (acquired by Violin Memory)

Office of the CTO, Chief Architect

Gridiron Systems developed an in-line caching appliance for storage area networks using NAND Flash as a caching media. By deploying transparently within a fibre channel network, the appliance allows an existing storage system to operate at solid-state speeds without the need to reconfigure applications, servers or storage and with no data migration or changes to the storage configuration. Responsible for flash technology, adaptive caching, analytics and behavioral modeling, machine learning using Bayesian networks and clustering analytics.

8/07 – 9/08 Strangways

President, CEO

Lead team that designed and sold data leakage protection technology and design consulting to customers including SendMail Inc, IronPort (CSCO), Reconnex (MFE) and Autonomic Networks. Specialized in adaptive lexical parsing to handle webmail reconstruction and parsing for content scanning and policy enforcement.

8/07 - 9/08 Intellectual Property Consultant

Patent analysis consulting service for expert witnesses and patent portfolio evaluations. Infringement analysis and read citations from existing product literature, technical documents and corporate presentations.

8/03 – 8/07 Reconnex (Acquired by McAfee Corp)

Founder, Chief Architect, Director of Engineering

Lead technical development of Reconnex Data Leakage Protection security product with industry first gigabit-speed capture, document and content registration capability, real-time image analysis and classification, heuristic and policy-driven enforcement and data usage analytics. Reconnex technology allows enterprise IT staff to monitor their networks for illicit use of intellectual property or proprietary information and provides the enforcement capability and pattern analysis to aid in policy development.

3/01 – 5/03 Extreme Networks

Logic Design Manager

Lead hardware team supporting hardware and firmware elements of the acquired WebStacks product line. Switch design manager for stackables.

3/00 – 3/01 WebStacks (Acquired by Extreme Networks)

Architect

Developed TCP and HTTP proxy appliances using multiple FPGA-based protocol and semantic processing engines, TCAM search engines and embedded processing elements. Standards-based protocol analysis and handling in silicon for all layers of OSI stack.

12/97 – 3/00 Intel Corporation

Design Engineer

Power and Leakage modeling for future processors and processes. Analysis and development of bulk decoupling strategies and in-die process parameter skew. Developed first circuit to accurately determine the specific process parameter responsible for a yield deficiency.

Publications

Article for ComputerWorld

<http://www.computerworld.com.au/author/1205198773/erik-de-la-iglesia/articles>

Data leakage prevention: Port dependence dangers

Creative Storage Conference

[http://www.creativestorage.org/2011/book/erik de la iglesia.pdf](http://www.creativestorage.org/2011/book/erik%20de%20la%20iglesia.pdf)

Revolutionizing Streaming and Post-Production with Solid State Appliances

Flash Memory Summit 2011 (speaker)

[http://www.flashmemorysummit.com/English/Collaterals/Proceedings/2011/20110810_T1B_del aIglesia.pdf](http://www.flashmemorysummit.com/English/Collaterals/Proceedings/2011/20110810_T1B_del%20aIglesia.pdf)

MLC Flash for Enterprise Storage Performance

Flash Memory Summit 2012 (speaker)

http://www.flashmemorysummit.com/English/Collaterals/Proceedings/2012/20120822_TG21_Iglesia.pdf

Driving Down Healthcare Costs with Flash

Flash Memory Summit 2012 (speaker)

http://www.flashmemorysummit.com/English/Collaterals/Proceedings/2012/20120823_S301C_Iglesia.pdf

Abstracting the Flash Translation Layer for Enterprise-ready MLC

Storage Network Industry Association

https://www.snia.org/sites/default/education/tutorials/2012/spring/solid/Erik-delalglesia_Comparing_Three_Homes_SSD.pdf

Comparing the Three Homes for SSD in the Infrastructure

VMWare User Group Meetings (Melbourne and Sydney Australia Feb 2014)

Mission-Critical Enterprise Applications

Speaker at Vendor, Industry and User Group Events

- Oct 2011 – SF SQL Server User Group – How to Accelerate Your SQL Server Data Warehouse Workloads
- Feb 2012 - Northern California Oracle User Group – Increase Performance of Existing Oracle RAC
- October 2012 – New York Oracle User Group – Increase Performance of Existing Oracle RAC
- 2012 - Rocky Mountain Oracle User Group
- April 2012 Collaborate 12: Independent Oracle User Group – Get Exadata-class performance out of your existing Oracle RAC
- Assorted Vendor Conferences such as VM World, EMC World and Intel Developer's Forum conference