IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS MARSHALL DIVISION

FUNCTION MEDIA, LLC * Civil Docket No. * 2:07-CV-279

VS.

* Marshall, Texas
* 
* January 25, 2010

GOOGLE, INC. * 8:20 A.M.

BEFORE $\frac{\text { TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL }}{\text { THE HONORABLE CHAD EVERINGHAM }}$ UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: MR. MAX TRIBBLE
MR. JOSEPH GRINSTEIN
Susman Godfrey
1000 Louisiana Street
Suite 5100
Houston, TX 77002
MR. JUSTIN NELSON
Susman Godfrey
1201 Third Avenue
Suite 3800
Seattle, WA 98101
MR. JEREMY BRANDON
Susman Godfrey
901 Main Street
Suite 5100
Dallas, TX 75202
MR. ROBERT PARKER
Parker, Bunt \& Ainsworth
100 East Ferguson
Suite 1114
Tyler, TX 75702
APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE:
COURT REPORTERS: MS. SUSAN SIMMONS, CSR
MS. SHELLY HOLMES, CSR
Official Court Reporters
100 East Houston, Suite 125
Marshall, TX 75670
903/935-3868
(Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography,
transcript produced on CAT system.)

```
APPEARANCES CONTINUED:
```

```
APPEARANCES CONTINUED:
```

            (Jury out.)
            of the jury in 2:07-CV-279.
        used that technology.
    FOR THE DEFENDANTS: MR. CHARLES VERHOEVEN
MS. AMY CANDIDO
Quinn Emanuel
50 California Street
22nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
MR. EDWARD DEFRANCO
Quinn Emanuel
51 Madison Avenue
22nd Floor
New York, NY 10010
MR. HARRY L. GILLAM
Gillam \& Smith
303 South Washington Avenue
Marshall, TX 75670
$P R O C E E D I N G S$
THE COURT: Be seated.
We're on the record outside the presence
I had an issue raised in chambers
regarding the extent to which $I$ would allow testimony
from the expert concerning the technology that was
included in the Carl Meyer agreement and whether Google
The Plaintiff had objected to that
testimony based on a ruling that $I$ had made at pretrial
related to the $30(b)(6)$ testimony that had been given
by -- by the Google corporate witnesses.
And so if you want to state your position briefly for the Plaintiff, then $I$ will allow the Defendant an opportunity to respond.

MR. GRINSTEIN: Your Honor, for the Plaintiff, Joe Grinstein.

Our position was is that we were denied the opportunity in fact discovery to inquire of Google about the nature of this technology, the value of it, the relevance of it to Google.

We asked those questions specifically of Mr. Chen in his $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ testimony. He gave us no answers.

Now in their rebuttal expert report, sort of long after fact discovery was even served, after the opening expert reports, Google tries to back-field this failure in fact discovery by having Mr. Lanning fill it in. And we believe that directly contradicts your Court's earlier order.

THE COURT: Okay. Google's response?
MR. VERHOEVEN: Your Honor, Mr. Verhoeven on behalf of Google.

We disagree with Plaintiff's counsel on
this. We disclosed Mr. Lanning's opinion in the Rule 26 report. We provided Mr. Lanning for deposition. The
testimony that we're proffering has to do with expert opinions concerning the technology claimed in the Meyer's patent and the relationship to that technology to the accused Google technology.

We followed the rules and provided his opinion under Rule 26 and offered Mr. Lanning for a deposition. We see no prejudice, and we think it's perfectly appropriate for Mr. Lanning to testify.

THE COURT: Okay. Those arguments mirror those that were given to me in chambers. Based on the ruling I made at pretrial, I'm going to exclude testimony on that issue.

We've still got about two more minutes.

Bring them in and have them seated at 8:30.

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
(Recess.)

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
(Jury in.)
THE COURT: Thank you. Please be seated.

Ladies and Gentlemen, thank you again for
being here timely. I hope each of you had a good weekend. We are going to continue this morning with the direct examination of Google's technical expert.

Proceed, Mr. Verhoeven.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Thank you, Your Honor. I have an updated binder --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: -- I'd like to pass out, if $I$ might, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Please.

Does the witness have a copy?
MR. VERHOEVEN: Yes, Your Honor. I put one up there earlier.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Please proceed.
MARK LANNING, DEFENDANT'S WITNESS, PREVIOUSLY SWORN

DIRECT EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)
BY MR. VERHOEVEN:
Q. Morning, Mr. Lanning.
A. Morning.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Okay. Charles, if we could put up DX Demo 160 , please.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Just to refresh where we left off on Friday afternoon, you -- Mr. Lanning, you had already talked about your first opinion of non-infringement with relation to what I'll refer to as at the creation step. And we'd finished that, and you moved on to the publishing two step.

Do you recall that, generally?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And you talked about this slide, but just so that we can refresh the jury on this, let's go back to this slide.

This is the claim language and the court's construction; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And can you just refresh the jury as to the starting point here of your analysis, the claim relating to the publishing-to element?
A. Yes. The publishing-to element, this is the exact language that's in the claim of Claim 1 of the - of the '025 patent, and -- and that's as shown at the top, which is -- I've highlighted the word to, which it means publishing to, one or more, of the selected internet media venues in the first box on the top.
Q. And the Court construed it in what way?
A. And the Court's construed it as I've shown on the middle box, which means placing or making available the customized electronic advertisement within the framework of and at each internet media venue so that it is accessible by end-users, consumers, viewers, or buyers.
Q. Okay.
A. And -- and --
Q. Go ahead.
A. And then because that construction includes the three words, internet media venue, the Court has also provided an instruction for what internet media venue is, and that's in the bottom box.

And internet media venues means internet locations where presentations are placed or made available to present the information within the framework of the media so that it is accessible by end-users, consumers, viewers, or buyers, which now putting that together means that you take the middle box and that definition and where it gets the internet media venues, that's publishing to internet locations.
Q. Now, for ease of reference, I'm going to refer to this element as the publishing-to element.

Do you understand me?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Okay. And did you have an opinion as to whether the publishing-to element in the asserted claims is met by Google's accused products?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Please tell the jury your opinion.
A. That the publishing-to element is not met by the Google products, because the Google products do not publish to each of the internet media venues or the internet locations.
Q. Okay. And you've prepared a demonstrative to help the jury understand.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next slide, 165 , please.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And you already started this, so I'm not going to ask you to go into as much detail, but could you summarize again so the jury can get refreshed on what you're talking about here?
A. Yes. There's two different pieces of information here I'd like to point out and remind you of.

The first is that there are houses with unique street addresses, and I think we're all familiar with how unique street addresses work a city, if we want to receive a package or mail. And also, there's the post office, which has the address above it, 101 Main Street. Up above that, $I$ finished talking about how the internet has unique addresses, and described that that top number you see with the periods is a typical internet address. And this was a little over 4 billion unique addresses that were initially defined.

In 1998, because the internet got so popular and so many addresses were being used, they expanded that to be more than a hundred times bigger than that
number now. And there's only -- about a few years ago, there were only about 6-1/2 billion people in the population worldwide. So now there's many more addresses, millions of addresses for every person in the world, to just make sure -- they wanted to make sure that every internet address was unique.
Q. Okay. And let's go to the next slide that you had prepared here, DX Demo 167.

And can you tell the jury what this is -- what you're showing here?

And you can just tell Charles when to move on to the next slide, if you'd like to, when you're ready.
A. Okay. Okay. I've had these slides prepared to explain this publishing-to in a little similar terms.

Every once in a while, my wife will look over my shoulder when $I^{\prime} m$ reading patents like these are and just shake her head and say they look like a foreign language when you read these -- these claims, and just walk away.

So what I thought I would do for this publishing-to limitation is provide an illustration. And I've added a new object down on the bottom right. That resembles a package. And I think we all realize if we were in Marshall, Texas, and wanted to deliver a package to the house on the bottom left with the address

987 Oak Drive, there are two basic ways that we could get that package to that house.

THE WITNESS: Next slide.
A. This way shows that we simply take the package to the post office, and then the post office delivers the package to the house on the bottom left.

THE WITNESS: Next slide, please.
A. But alternatively, we could just take the package directly to the house. No need for going through the post office.

THE WITNESS: Next slide.
A. Now --

THE WITNESS: If I could go back -- I'm sorry, Charles. If I could go back to the previous slide. There.
A. Now, if we could apply this to what the patents require by this publishing-to claim, taking the package at the bottom and thinking of that package as an advertisement, and if we were to think of the post Office as the internet media venue or the internet location and the houses on the left as the internet users, the package, the advertisement, would be placed or made available at the post office, and then the post office would deliver the package to the house.

So this is what the -- the patents are
describing or requiring by this claim, that the package
be placed or made available at the internet media venue,
and the internet media venue, in my simple example here,
would be the post office. Then the post office would
deliver it to the house.
THE WITNESS: Next slide, Charles.
MR. VERHOEVEN: Charles?
A. Now, this example is -- again, the package is
an advertisement, but this example is how the Google
system works.

The Google system does not place the ad on the internet media venue or at the post office. Instead, they place it directly at the house or directly on the end-users or internet user's browser.

That finishes that set --
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Okay.
A. -- of illustration.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Charles, let's go to DX
Demo 356.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) What does this show? What are you depicting here, Mr. Lanning?
A. I've had these slides created to add -- now, you can still see that the -- the parts of the slide are similar. You can think of the top right portion as being the post office, that cnn.com.

Now, cnn.com is an internet media venue, and if $I$ have an ad system that -- like is shown on the bottom right-hand corner of this slide, the ad system takes or publishes the advertisements to the internet media venue, which is in this example cnn.com.

Now, you can think of the green squares that are labeled used cars, fine jewelry, and eat at Joe's just like packages. The advertisement system is taking those or sending those to internet media venue.

And the internet media venue sends the advertisements to each of the internet users just like the post office would send the package to each of the homes.

THE WITNESS: Next slide.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) What does this slide depict, sir?
A. Taking this same example, the first thing I'd like to point out is in the top right, if you look at the CNN box, you see a dashed box around that page on the bottom right-hand corner. That's just a hole or a blank spot in the web page that CNN has left for advertisements.

THE WITNESS: Yes. And Charles has highlighted that for us now.
A. But that's -- so there's no package at the
internet media venue. Instead, the way that Google -the way the Google system does it is it delivers the packages or the advertisements directly to each of the different internet users as I've shown with the green boxes, and those ads could be different based on the content that the user is looking at.

So if the top person on the left was looking for a restaurant, then the advertisement eat at Joe's would show up. If the woman in the middle was looking at jewelry, then some type of fine jewelry advertisement would show up, and so on for the cars. If a person is looking at cars for sale, then Google would send an advertisement or a package directly to that user.
Q. So does this -- let's go back -- this is the Google system; is that what you're showing?
A. Yes, this is the Google system, and I've highlighted in red at the bottom of the page that Google just publishes the advertisements to the internet users, not -- not to the internet media venue.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Can we go back one slide, please, Charles?
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And this is a depiction from what you understand the Function Media's patents describe?
A. Yes, that's correct.

And this is the way they've described -- and I have them in red -- published to the internet media venue in the red text there.
Q. Okay. All right. Have you prepared any -did you do any testing on your own to -- to verify that this is the functionality of the Google patents as opposed to the -- excuse me -- of the Google products as opposed to the patents?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to DX Demo 157,
please.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And can you tell the jury what you've created here?
A. I've been talking about the -- my ranch website for my horses. What you see -- I've -- let me start over a little bit so $I$ don't confuse you.

I've -- I've made two different tests where I've actually modified my website so that it -- it actually simulates both of the different scenarios that we just talked about, about how the patents are described or what the patents require, and then how the Google system presents ads.

And this is actually -- I've taken the
stallions web page -- let me explain a little bit about
what's on this page. This is what you would see for this example, if you typed in tlranch.com on your computer, on your web server, this would come back to you. And what you see on the left-hand corner, you see three words that says home and stallions and bulls.

If a person were interested in my stallions, they would click on the stallions page, and this is what would be shown. So I have the pictures of two of my stallions. At the bottom, $I$ have the website -- or my logo for my ranch and the information for how someone can send me an e-mail, if they're interested.

And I've also included ads on the right-hand side of the page, and what they are --it's -- it's a little bit hard to read them, but they're different horse-oriented type ads that I've chosen. And one is about greener pastures, which is the Quarter Horse Association website; the middle one that says gifts. They make a lot of silver belt buckles and silver wear; and then the bottom has to do with the Paint Horse Journal.
Q. Now, when you did this test, is it correct you were acting as the publisher?
A. Yes, the Twisted L Ranch.

I'm the publisher of the Twisted L Ranch, or in this case, the Twisted L Ranch would be the internet
media venue.

So I actually modified my website and put this information on the server and requested this page at my browser, and then $I$ captured what $I$-- a typical internet user would see with this information.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next slide, please, DX Demo 162.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And what are you depicting here?
A. On this slide, again I'm showing the internet media venue on the right, which is my website page, not only the website page but with the advertisements included; the website ID, or my website identity is tlranch.com as shown on the bottom of the slide.

Now, that is the internet location, and people don't remember numbers like I showed you very well. If someone asked me what my website ID is, very few would remember that big long number with the periods that I showed you earlier. And so the internet has computers in it that will translate this internet address, this tl.ranch.com into that number that $I$ showed you with all the periods.

That way people can just remember the text at the bottom, if they want to go to my ranch, which is
much simpler.
And what I'm showing by this example is that
it's the same scenario as the packages, which are the
advertisements, are at the post office, which is my
internet media venue, and they're being transferred to
each of the internet users.
THE WITNESS: And, Charles, if you could
blow up the left-hand side on the internet users,
please.
A. And I'm showing here that I transfer, as the internet media venue, the ads all down to the different internet users. And they would see that all, and that would all be at the internet media venue or at the post office.

I know what ads are being transferred down, and I send those down to the users when they type in tlranch.com.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next slide, please. It's DX Demo 191.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) What are we showing here?
A. This is where $I^{\prime} m$ showing that if you take the claims, as they're required, that there's a computer controller that would publish the ads, that computer controller would publish the ads to my website or to my internet media venue.

Again, you can think of that -- those ads as the packages. This is the -- what's being required by this element of the claims as the publishing ads to the internet media venue.
Q. Okay. And did you do another test on --
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to DX Demo 158.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Okay. Mr. Lanning, can you tell the jury what they're looking at here?
A. Now, this is a second test that I've done where $I$ 've now modified my website for the second scenario or to make it work with the AdSense for Google product.

So I've now modified my website, and I've defined on my web page where the ads would go that are going to be published from Google. And this is representative of what is shown to a user using -- when they use the Google AdSense system, when they type in tlranch.com. Again, this is the second example.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Charles, could we
highlight the ads on the right so that the jurors can see that a little bit easier?
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Mr. Lanning, could you just explain to the jury what I've just highlighted?
A. Yes. What you've highlighted is the section for my web page where $I$ went in as the publisher. I'm the publisher in this instance, and $I$ have defined where I want the ad to be on my web page.

I didn't want it to be in the middle on top of the pictures for my stallions. I wanted it to be out of the way over on the right and not conflict or compete with my content of my website.

Now, I also defined the size of that ad, and I also defined the background to be white, and I've defined how I want the text to show up. And you can see the three different colors of the text for the ad. And so those would be considered the presentation rules of the internet media venue or the presentation rules in my website that I've defined as the publisher.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Can we go to the next
slide, DX Demo 163, please?
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And, Mr. Lanning, can you explain to the jury what this slide is showing?
A. Yes. As I implemented this on my website for how the Google AdSense system worked, the -- my website, if you look at the web page, does not include any ads like it did on the previous scenario or previous -previous example.

Instead, only my website content is there. There's nothing on the right-hand side of the page, which means the post office -- back to our illustration, our simple illustration, there's no packages in the post office.

I don't have any idea as the publisher what ads the Google system is going to send, because they're sending them directly to the internet users. They're using our simplified example. The Google system is sending the package directly to the house.

So if you look at the bottom right that says Google, that represents the Google AdSense system, and that Google system is sending the different advertisements or the different packages to each internet users.

Now, this is the actual performance of my test with my website, and the first picture we looked at -if we can just pop back to the first picture --

MR. VERHOEVEN: Can you tell us which?

THE WITNESS: Sorry. 158.
MR. VERHOEVEN: 158.

THE WITNESS: If we can highlight again,
Charles, the ad on the right.
A. This is a result as -- from my web browser, if I were an internet user. If you look -- and I have no
idea as the publisher what ads the Google system would choose to display on the web page when people typed in tlranch.com.

If you notice, this ad starts with Spanish horses. It has different types of horse videos and advertisement for taking pictures of horses. It goes down to the bottom to having monogrammed horse halters. I have no idea until I actually typed in tlranch.com what advertisements Google would choose for my website. This is one example.

I also typed in tlranch.com the next day and Google chose a different - completely different set of ads for the same website. This is where they're deciding based on content what ads should be shown on my website or my web page.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go back to DX Demo 163, please.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) So to summarize, you're saying that the Google system doesn't publish the ads to tlranch.com but instead publishes them directly to the internet users?
A. Yes. As shown by the -- on the bottom right, nothing goes to the internet media venue from the Google system. It's the same way as sending the packages
directly to the houses.

The post office or my internet media venue, because I'm the publisher, I know that none of those messages went to my website, to my internet media venue. They all went directly to users, and $I$ have no idea which ads were going to be displayed, how many were going to be displayed, and if any at all.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next slide, DX Demo 159.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Now, this is just the claim language we looked at Friday afternoon, right?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. So just to remind the jurors, there's the highlighted -- you see the highlighting there?
A. Yes.
Q. That's the element in the claim we're talking about?
A. Yes. This all started with the element that's in the claims, specifically Claim 1 of the 025 patent. This is the element that $I$ 've highlighted in the patent, which I'm saying that the Google system does not do.

And I have to also consider and use the Court's order of what that means to make sure that I'm using the full meaning. And that's shown on the right-hand side.
Q. Okay. And it's your opinion that the Google accused system, AdSense for Content and AdSense for Mobile, do not meet this element?
A. Yes. They just simply do not send the ads to the internet media venue.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next slide, DX Demo 179.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And this -- this highlights two other elements. Do you see those?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And can you explain to the jurors -- walk through those two elements for the jury, please?
A. These are two other elements that I believe the Google system does not do or does not meet the required elements of this claim.

The first -- and they're hard to read, so like the other slides, I've pulled them out in larger text on the right.

The first one says: Seller is prompted to input information to select one or more of the internet media venues. And -- and we know from the previous slide for construction, internet media venues are internet locations.

And then the second one that's -- the second limitation that's highlighted and shown on the right is the electronic advertisement is displayed on each of the one or more of the selected internet media venues.
Q. And it's your opinion that these elements are not met; is that what you said?
A. Yes, that's correct. The Google system does not perform these functions.
Q. And have you prepared some demonstratives to help explain that?
A. Yes, I have.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next
slide, DX Demo 357.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And can you walk us through -- this is a set of slides as I understand it; is that right, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Can you just walk us through? You can tell Charles to go to the next slide when you're ready. Can you just walk us through for the jury what you're showing here?
A. Okay. First off, now I've shown and I think we've seen some information about bass fishing before. Now I'm showing how the Google AdSense system really works, and it -- and the name of the product gives us a hint, because the name of the product is

AdSense for Content.

And the AdSense for Content means the content that's being viewed by the person at the computer on the web browser or on the web page. So on the first step, Google needs to do -- what the Google system needs to do is look at the -- analyze the page that the person is looking at to figure out the content or to give the system an idea of what is being looked at by the person. THE WITNESS: Next slide, Charles.
A. And I've signified that with this magnifying glass. Now, the magnifying glass is the Google system analyzing the content, and it comes up with words that are descriptive of the content that's being looked at by the user. And those words I've listed on the left-hand side of the page, which are bass, fishing, tackle box, spinner bait, rods, and boat.

Now, Google has these words that describe the content of what the internet user is looking at. The Google system goes to the next step.

THE WITNESS: Okay, Charles.
A. Now, the Google system -- what's represented by all the different colors on the right, you see all the different colored boxes on the right.

The Google ad system has millions of ads in its database that are stored, and it's -- what's
represented by the colored squares are different types
of ads.
So the first step that's performed by the
Google AdSense system is to take those descriptive words
of the content that are listed on the left that a person
is looking at on their web page and compare those words
with -- against those millions of ads that are in their
database to determine which ads are relevant.
I usually refer to that as a relevancy test,
which is the first hurdle that an ad needs to -- or that
all of this -- ads, the ones that are chosen, are
competing with -- with many other ads.
THE WITNESS: Okay. Next slide.
A. Now, what's shown by the blue squares is that
the Google system now has decided -- what's denoted by
the blue squares is these are the possible ads or the
relevant ads that match up with the words on the left:
Bass, fishing, tackle box, spinner bait, rods, and boat.
But now the Google system is not finished. There's
still one more big, significant step that needs to be
performed.
THE WITNESS: Okay, Charles.
A. That Google system conducts an auction of the
ads. And as we discussed on Friday, when a person
inserts an ad or when they create an ad, they provide a
bid. And this auction is similar to an auction that we might all attend, whether it's for antiques or something else, is that we might have a list of ads or information that we want, but it -- I -- I kind of messed that up and confused.

What has to happen and what's represented on this slide is the different ads and the amount that the advertisers have bid. And you can see that some of the ads have a single dollar sign, which means that's the least money. There's one ad on the left-hand side in the middle --

THE WITNESS: Charles, if you can highlight that one. If we can highlight -- maybe I've confused you. Yes, that one.
A. That's the ad with multiple dollar signs. That means an advertiser has bid a lot of money to have their ad used. There's other ads with less dollar signs.

Now that Google has looked at the auction, they figured out how many ads are going to be presented on the user's website.

THE WITNESS: Next slide, Charles.
MR. VERHOEVEN: Go ahead to the next
slide, Charles.
A. And I've represented that with the squares on
the left. Now, you can see that there's -- there's four squares on the left-hand side of the page that have a yellow box around them. That is used -- I've used that to signify which ads have won the auction.

And the first one that's shown has the one with the 5-dollar sign. And these four ads then are sent to the web page that the internet user is looking at.

THE WITNESS: Go ahead, Charles.
A. And that's shown -- and that's what those ads would look like. So that shows that they're -- how those ads are selected and how the auction is performed. And then the ads finally show up on the web page.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Now, this process that you just walked us through is a description about how AdSense for Content works, correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And how many times is this process performed by Google?
A. It's hard to believe, but this is done millions of times per second. It's done for every -every time a user displays a web page, Google does this to determine which ads are going to be shown on that web page.

So if there's a million people looking at web
pages that have AdSense's advertisements on them, the Google system needs to do this every time that web page is displayed.
Q. Okay. Now, have you prepared some demonstratives to take this system that you just described and apply it to the -- and illustrate it with relevance to the claim language we just looked at?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next
slide, DX Demo 363.
A. This --

MR. VERHOEVEN: Go ahead, Charles, and click it to the -- keep going. One more.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Okay. Mr. Lanning, can you explain to the jury what they're looking at here?
A. Well, the first thing that I'd like to point you to is the text at the bottom of this slide.

This is what $I$ believe is -- this is the claim language that -- and includes the claim language that Google does not allow advertisers to input information to select internet media venues and does not display ads on each selected internet media venue.

And now I'm going to go through an example to show you why I believe that's true.

And would you like me to walk through --
Q. Yes, please.
A. Now, I'm going through the full process as the expression goes, soup to nuts, or from beginning to end. In the first part of the process, we need to get an ad created. An advertiser needs to go to the Google AdWords interface and define their ad. And I'm showing that with the top left box on the slide that's labeled Google AdWords.

And this is where Google advertisers input ad information, keywords, placements, and bids. And we went through that in a lot of detail last friday afternoon.

And they also -- once they have that information, they've entered that information, they hit the enter key. And $I^{\prime} m$ showing that that information is going to the Google ad system by the dollar sign in the middle and the -- and the words lose weight fast.

THE WITNESS: Charles, if you could just kind of make sure everyone's looking at the right spot there.

Thank you.
A. So that information is going into the Google ad system.

Now, there's something different on this
slide. There's a red square over on the right with a
single dollar sign. Now, as I walk through the example,
that red square is going to represent this new ad that we just created. The dollar sign is representing just the -- a lower bid.

Remember, we had from one to five dollar signs.

THE WITNESS: Next slide, please.
A. Now this ad has to go into the Google database and be stored with millions of other ads that other advertisers have entered earlier.

THE WITNESS: Go ahead, Charles.
A. That's shown by the red square going into the database.

Now we've created an ad, and the Google AdSense system has stored that in the Google's ad database.

THE WITNESS: Next slide.
A. Okay. Now, I'm making the transition, because we're going through the process. Now that the ad is stored, now there's another person. And this slide represents a person that's viewing a website called free dieting.

And Google -- like I showed before, Google reads the content of this page to try to figure out the
best words to use for placing ads on this web page. And the best words that they've analyzed is shown by the words on the left-hand side.

THE WITNESS: Next page.
A. Now, this is the first hurdle, remember, that I talked about that the ad has to get across before it can go to the next step, which is auction, which I'll talk about in a minute. But this is the relevance hurdle.

The first thing that this ad with the red square has to do is it has to be chosen by the Google system that it's relevant or more relevant than many other ads. And that's being showed -- shown by the red box. All the other ads that it's competing with are shown by the blue boxes.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Charles.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Wait one second. Go back.

THE WITNESS: Sorry.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) So on this slide, did the advertiser's red ad make the first hurdle?
A. They don't always make it. A lot of times they don't. But to show and complete the illustration, I'm assuming for this illustration an example that the red box is selected by the Google system, that it's relevant, so that $I$ can show what happens on the next one.

It doesn't need to be the case. It's competing with a lot of different ads. There's a lot of times it's not.
Q. So just -- just to follow up on that, the ad that you showed was lose weight fast, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. The one that's represented by the red box?
A. That's correct.
Q. And the web page's contents, as represented on the left here, relate to that subject matter, losing weight?
A. The -- the words on the left are what were calculated or figured out by the Google system when it read the content that was signified by that magnifying glass.
Q. So the first step is Google determined that the red ad, lose weight fast, was relevant to the web page; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Next page, please.
A. Now, this is the next big hurdle that our new ad that's signified or shown by the red box has to pass
before it's shown on the internet user's site.

It has to go to an auction. Note that it's -it's a lot -- it only has a single dollar sign, and, again, there's other ads where other advertisers had bid more. But this ad, the red box representing our new ad, has a single dollar sign, and this is showing the ads that it's competing against.

THE WITNESS: Next slide.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) What does this depict, Mr. Lanning?
A. This depicts the four ads that are chosen as shown by the yellow around the blue boxes. So for the auction, only the ads which have the yellow squares around them have been chosen by the Google system to send to the user that's looking at that web page -- free dieting, fast dieting -- I've just forgotten the name of the web page, but it's the dieting web page.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Next slide, please.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And what does this show?
A. This shows that the four ads that are going to be sent to the web page that the user's looking at do not include the red box. The red box has lost out. It's over on the bottom, left-hand corner of the slide. The -- all of the blue ads that bid more are going to be
sent to the -- to this web page.

THE WITNESS: Next.
A. As shown -- as I'll show with this illustration, the animation takes these ads and moves them across to the web page.

And so what we can see by that is even though the new ad that's -- that's shown by the red box crossed the first hurdle of relevance in my example, it did not pass the auction. So, therefore, it did not get selected. So the user -- the user cannot select the ad to be presented or -- or -- I need to -- the user does not input information to select the internet media venue.

THE WITNESS: Maybe we can go to the next slide.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Sure.

THE WITNESS: It will be a lot easier. I'm thinking I might be losing you.

MR. VERHOEVEN: The next slide is DX Demo 179, please.
(By Mr. Verhoeven) So this is the claim language you started with on this -- these two elements, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.
A. So what's -- let's explain.

What I've explained the Google system does not do is that the seller is not prompted to input -- input information to select one or more of the internet media venues. And the electronic advertisement is not displayed on each of the selected internet media venues, because even though the advertisement might have made it past the first hurdle, if it didn't pass the auction, it would not be displayed; therefore, the seller cannot select the ad to be displayed on each of the one or more selected internet media venues.

MR. VERHOEVEN: All right. Let's go to
the next slide, DX Demo 354. This is just a summary slide.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And does this summarize your opinions with respect to the Google accused products and whether or not they infringe the two patents asserted in this case?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. And can you just summarize for the jurors your conclusions?
A. Yes. The -- the first part is what we cover -- what $I$ covered last Friday afternoon.

And that's the Google system does not permit advertisers to input information to create an electronic
advertisement customized to each of the selected internet media venues' presentation rules, which means that -- and as we talked about -- or as I described last Friday, the user that enters the ad, or the advertiser, does not -- is not allowed by the Google system to customize the ad in any way. All they do is enter the plain text.

The second point with the No. 2 is Google does not publish ads to internet media venues. Instead, Google sends ads directly to users.

Now, that point is the point that $I$ described with the simple illustration of the package. What I'm saying by this one is that Google does not send the package to the post office. Instead, Google sends ads directly to the users.

The third point is that Google does not allow advertisers to input information to select internet media venues and does not display ads on each selected internet media venue.

While the Google system allows advertisers to input information, they do not select the internet media venues. The Google system selects the -- or the Google system just provides ads to web pages that have already been selected by the user. And once they're selected, the Google system does not display ads on each selected
internet media venue.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Lanning.

Now, in addition to the issue of whether or not the Google accused products infringe or don't infringe each of the elements of the asserted claims, were you also asked to look into the issue of whether or not the two asserted Function Media patents were valid or invalid?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. And $I$ know you're not a lawyer, are you, sir?
A. No, I'm not.
Q. But did you have some understanding of the rules of the road with respect to the legal framework for assessing validity or invalidity in this case?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Okay. And have you prepared a slide to help walk through your understanding?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to DX Demo 197.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And all I want you to do is tell the jury your understanding as to the rules of the road here for the legal framework that you had in mind when you conducted your analysis.
A. Okay. There's two different legal doctrines
that are defined for determining -- that are used to
determine whether a patent is -- should be considered or
is considered valid or invalid in this case.
And there -- and those are called anticipation
and obviousness. Now, as I've shown here, the first
thing that you need to do or that $I$ need to do, when I'm
analyzing a patent to determine whether it's valid or
not, is -- the first thing I need to determine is what
date that the patent is entitled to, meaning if it's
invalid, some -- a system has to be out there being sold
or doing the functions of the patent before the
patent -- so I need -- the first thing I need to do is
determine what date should I use for the patent that
it's entitled to.
And then $I$ need to determine what -- whether
the -- there are systems out there that are publicly
available for sale or that have been sold or that are
publicly available and being operated that do the same
thing as the patents are describing.
And as then discussed before last week, this
invalidity is like infringement in that in order to show
invalidity for anticipation, $I$ need to show that the
system performs every claim element, not just some of
them, but $I$ need to show that the system, the prior art
system, needs to perform each and every claim element.
Q. So that's the first legal doctrine, right? Anticipation?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And just to summarize, what you're saying is if there were systems publicly available or sold before the priority date of the patents and those systems disclose everything claimed in the patents, then under your understanding, the patents would be invalid under anticipation?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And can you explain to the jury the next legal doctrine that you used when you analyzed this issue?
A. Yes. That - that doctrine is obviousness, as I've shown in the underlying bold text that says obviousness.

Again, for obviousness, I -- the first thing that I need to do is define -- determine the priority date or what date the patents are entitled to, which is the same bullet or the same first line under anticipation.

And then $I$ need to determine if a system doesn't do all the -- the claims or all the elements of a claim, would it be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art. And I'll explain what $I$ mean by a
person of ordinary skill in the art.
But would it be obvious to a person of
ordinary skill in the art to either modify that system
so that it had all of the limitations of the claim, or
combine it with other systems that have those lim -- had
the missing limitations so the end result of that system
would include all the limitations of the claim.
Q. Okay. And if you were to so find, then your understanding is the patent would be invalid for obviousness?
A. That's correct.
Q. And that's a separate legal doctrine from anticipation?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Okay. Now, you mentioned this phrase person of ordinary skill in the art.

Is that a legal term?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next slide.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Do you have an opinion as to what a person of ordinary skill in the art would be in this case with these patents?
A. Yes, I do. And I've provided that opinion earlier in my expert reports, and that's what you see on this slide.

As you can see, there's two or three sections for my definition. It wasn't just a real quick definition of person that writes software. It's a little more detailed than that.

There's three sections. One is they have a college degree. The second section is -- is describing the experience they need to have with a whole bunch of different acronyms that look like a foreign language, probably, to you. And then the third bullet is different types of experience. I will describe this later. If I say an internet engineering professional or one of ordinary skill, this is the definition that I'm referring to.
Q. Okay. So just for completeness, then, it's your -- as you state on this slide, it's your opinion that a person of ordinary skill would have a bachelor's or master's level of college degree in computer science, computer engineering or equivalent; is that right?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And can you just put into the record your opinion as to what this second element would be, the experience that would be -- that a person of ordinary skill would have?
A. Okay. In the -- the -- the second bullet or the second paragraph on this slide, I've described the two years of experience in design, generation, configuration, and serving of web page content using one or more website creation tools and be familiar with the operation and functionality provided by each of the following internet suite protocols.

Let me stop there and explain what $I$ mean by that.

This person I'm saying is not only -- the first bullet is saying it's a person with a college degree in computer science. That's typically where they'd learn how to write software programs. So this is a programmer or a person with a programming degree is the first bullet.

The second bullet says it's not enough for that person just to have a -- a college degree. They need to have some experience so they really know how to do this. And the experience they need to have is with how to create a website, like my tlranch.com, and how that website is published and created. And they also need to be familiar with the internet protocols, which are the internet -- which are the protocols or the rules used for the website to communicate with all the different users' computers.

To give you an idea, that IPv4 or IPv6. The IPv4 means Internet Protocol Version 4. Now, Internet Protocol Version 4 is the one version of the protocol that was initially defined that had a little over 4 billion addresses.

The IP Version 6 would be known to one of ordinary skill, someone that has experience of the newer version that came out in 1998, which then expanded those number of addresses to a lot bigger.

The others are -- so the protocols include TCP and UDP, IPv4 or IPv6, http, Java programming language, or JavaScript, and one or more versions of HTML, or its variance, for example, XHTML and XML. So there's a lot of different languages and experience that a person needs to have to be one of ordinary skill in the art.
Q. And very briefly, the last bullet, can you explain what you're describing there?
A. Yes. The patents also included requirements for inventory systems and producing tickets and ticketing systems. So I've included this requirement for a person to have experience in online transaction processing systems. What that means is inventory.

If you were to buy a ticket for a sporting event, the online transaction processing system needs to make sure it takes that seat out of the inventory so
they don't double-book the seat. Or if you make a reservation for a hotel or a motel, those are the type of systems, online transactions.

They have to do that quickly so that two people don't get the same seat or the same room somewhere. And that includes databases and database configuration, synchronization, and management for performing real-time inventory control.
Q. Go ahead and have a drink of water.
A. My mouth got dry. Sorry.
Q. There's a lot of talking here.

Ready?
A. Okay. Yes.
Q. Now, did you do any research or investigation -- let me withdraw the question.

So we've covered sort of your understanding of the rules of the road on this issue of validity, right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And so the next question is, did you do -with those rules of the road in mind, did you do any research or investigation into the issue of whether the two asserted patents here were new or unique or were valid or invalid?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Can you explain to the jury what you did --
what research and investigation you did?
A. Well, the first thing I did, as I explained on Friday, is $I$ analyzed the patents and their claims. That required me to go through them multiple times to understand exactly in my mind what the patents were describing and what the claims were requiring.

And then $I$ did my own investigation about -and went online, on to the internet, and looked for systems that existed for the public before these patents -- before the priority date of these patents.

And I also looked back to remember what I would call the state of the art or how things really worked and what was available at the time of these patents, in the 2000 timeframe.

The internet and computers have really changed in the last two -- or ten years, since 2000. We're now in 2010. So I have to take my mind back and I look at different information to make sure that my mind is synchronized back to the way things were, the state of the art in 2000 .

I also then investigated over a hundred different documents which described different systems that were available.

I also looked at -- I think that -- I was just thinking.
Q. Did you read any transcripts?
A. Yes. There were deposition transcripts for -from people. Their depositions were taken in this case for some of the prior art systems, and I've read those deposition transcripts by the people that were involved by these systems.
Q. Okay. And as a result of your investigation and analysis of this issue, Mr. Lanning, have you formed an opinion as to whether or not either of the two patents asserted in this case are valid?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Can you please tell the jury your opinion.
A. That the Function Media patent, specifically the '025 patent and the '059 patent, are invalid because there were systems out there doing the same thing before these patents were -- before the priority date of these patents.
Q. And have you identified some systems that you think were doing the same thing?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And can you please tell the jury what systems you've identified.
A. There's three systems that I've identified -at least three systems.

The first system was built by a company called
AdForce.

The second system was built by a company called DoubleClick.

And the third system was built by a company called NetGravity.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Charles, if we could put up DX demo 200 .
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) What are we looking at here, Mr. Lanning?
A. There were multiple documents that $I$ used to get an understanding of the systems. What is represented here is one document for each of those systems.

The first document you see is the cover page for the user guide for the AdForce system.

The second one says -- that says Doubleclick next to it, the page that I'm showing there is the DART user manual.

And the third --
Q. Let me just interrupt you. You said DoubleClick and then you said DART. I just don't want the jury to get confused.

What is the relationship between Doubleclick and DART?
A. Right. As you probably figured out by now,
engineers love acronyms. And so the Doubleclick was the company. The DART was the name they came up with for their overall advertising and publishing system. And we'll talk about that in more detail. Sorry for slipping in the DART on you, but that was the name that they referred to the overall ad processing system.

And the final document that I'm showing you is the NetGravity -- one of the documents from the NetGravity system.
Q. So let's walk through each of these and your analysis of them and start with the AdForce system. MR. VERHOEVEN: Next slide, please, Charles.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And can you just describe -- so depicted on here is the AdForce user guide 2.6 ; is that right, sir?
A. That's correct.
Q. This is -- this is the document. Do you have a copy of this document?
A. Yes, I do. And I've tried to print it on its original size so that you can see.

This is what a user of the AdForce system would use to understand the AdForce system. And we'll go through this in more detail.
Q. Now, can you start -- we'll go through the

AdForce system and apply it to the claims, but can you start generally by just generally telling the jury what was the AdForce system, Version 2.6?
A. Sure. The Ad -- the AdForce system was an internet advertising system that had multiple interfaces and multiple databases.

It had an interface for publishers where they could define their internet media venue and the presentation rules for their internet media venue.

It also had a second interface for advertisers or sellers that could define their advertisements.

And it had databases to store this information for both publishers and advertisers. And the overall AdForce system published ads to users -- the internet user of web pages.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next
slide, please.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And what are you depicting here, Mr. Lanning?
A. Well, let's start in the middle. In the middle, we see the '025 patent, and I've -- I referred to earlier the priority dates or the date that the patent was entitled to.

For the '025 patent -- you can see right
underneath the letters, '025 patent, is a 1/10/99. And that's showing the priority date for the '025 patent, which is January 10th --
Q. That says '99.
A. Just a second. I need to look at something.
Q. Okay. Take your time.
A. This is the priority date for the 025 patent, which is January 10th, 1999.

Going to the right for the '059 patent would be July 11th, 2002. It is shown with the date underneath the '059.

As shown by the AdForce system, which is on the left and highlighted, the AdForce system was being sold and was in use before the function -- both of the Function Media patents, as shown by this slide.

And that's one of the requirements that $I$ need to show, is that it was the prior art or this system was on sale or being sold and used before the priority date of these patents.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next
slide, please, DX demo 403.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And this is a picture of the user manual here, this document here.
A. Yes, it is. And what I've blown up on the
screen is the copyright date of 1998 that's on the first
page of the -- of the document.
MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next
slide, DX demo 204 .
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And this, on the left-hand side, it looks like it's Page $2-4$ of the user manual.

Can you read that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And can you describe what you're showing here to the jury, please.
A. This is actually out of the user manual. This is Page 2-4. So what you're seeing on the screen is just this page out of the user manual.

And there's two pieces of information that I'd like you to refer -- that I'd like you to refer to on looking at this slide.

First, the bottom part of this slide that's right out of this manual also says: Copyright, AdForce, 1998.

On the right-hand side that I've blown up, the text that says: Delivering over one billion ads per month to leading sites, including Netscape and GeoCities, this is the actual web force -- a page from the actual AdForce website, which is giving the latest news.

And so this is telling people that come to the AdForce website, that the AdForce system was not only being sold, but it was in use and it was sending over one billion ads out per month.
Q. Okay. Now, you've taken -- is it correct that you've taken the AdForce -- the results of your information with respect to AdForce and applied them to the claim elements in the asserted claims in this case?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Okay. Let's walk through that.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next
slide.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And this is just Claim 1 of the '025 patent, which we've seen several times, right?
A. Yes, it is. My job and my analysis is, I needed to show that the AdForce system actually used or performed each of the functions.

So I've provided a checklist here so that we can walk through it so that $I$ can show you that the AdForce system performed each of these requirements of this claim.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next
slide, DX demo 206.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And it looks like on the
left, you have Claim 1 (a), the first element in Claim
1; is that right?
A. That's the preamble.
Q. And then what are we looking at on the right-hand side?
A. And on the right-hand side is, again, another page that's from Chapter 1 of this user guide. I'm just putting it up on the screen so you can see, but this is the actual page.

And this page is describing on Chapter 1, the introduction, that AdForce is a full-service advertising solution designed to create manage, target, and report advertising on the worldwide web.

Now, when you see worldwide web, you can
translate that into internet. The worldwide web and internet are synonymous type terms.
Q. Now, you've heard of Dr. Rhyne, the Plaintiff's expert in this case, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And he submitted a report on the issue of validity, correct?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. Are you aware of whether or not Dr. Rhyne disputes that this element is present in AdForce?
A. I don't believe Dr. Rhyne disputes this
element, no.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next slide.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) So you -- what does this check represent?
A. What is shown on this slide is, I've now shown that the preamble of the claim or the first part of Claim 1 is -- is performed by the AdForce system. So the checkmark denotes I've -- I've already shown that, but that's done by AdForce.
Q. So the next element is 1 (b). That's the first interface element, which we've already looked at, correct?
A. Yes.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next slide.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And what are we looking at here, Mr. Lanning?
A. Okay. This, again, is -- or it's similar to what we looked at before, but this is the claim language from that element.

And the construction is: The rules to be set by a media venue for using and creating advertisements to be published on that media venue.

And examples are, as I've shown in the bottom box, applying background color, comparing ad size.

You know, so we don't get lost here, we're at the first interface on these patent claims that's referring to the publisher interface. So using my example earlier, this would be for the publisher or the internet media venue, if you will.

This -- this would apply to me if $I$ were Twisted L Ranch, so this is the first interface.
Q. And the first interface, the -- the publisher is prompted to input presentation rules, correct?
A. Yes. As the claim at the top, where it says 1 (b) says: A first interface to the computer system through which each of the internet media venues -- and that's what $I$ just referred to; that's the publisher, the internet media venue; that would be Twisted L Ranch in my earlier example -- is prompted to input presentation rules for the internet media venue for displaying electronic advertisements on the internet media venue.

And those presentation rules, examples of those presentation rules are at the bottom, applying background, color, and comparing ad size.
Q. Okay. So this would be the publisher, and the publisher would choose things like ad size and background color of the ads and things like that?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay.
A. That's like I showed you on my website, that I was choosing the background color of white for the area of ads; I decided what the size should be and where it's located. Those are examples of presentation rules. MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next slide, please, DX demo 209.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Okay. And on the left, it looks like you've reproduced the claim language for element (b); is that right?
A. That's correct, so that we can all keep track of which element we're talking about. There's a lot of different elements here in these claims.
Q. And what are we looking at on the right-hand side?
A. On the right-hand side, this is another page from the AdForce user guide. And if we look at the top right or the middle right --

THE WITNESS: Charles, if we can highlight a little bit where it says ad sizes on the right-hand size.
A. We just discussed that the presentation rules would be ad size. This is where a publisher can define
the ad size.
That $468 x 60$ probably doesn't mean anything to you, but the way that ad sizes are typically defined is in pixels, which you can think of a pixel being a dot on the screen.

So this is 468 pixels wide and 60 pixels tall. If $I$ wanted a different size ad, $I$ could choose one of those other dimensions that you see. And this box goes down and provides a lot of different sized ads.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Okay.

THE WITNESS: If we can go back.
A. The next box is that -- you can see the box that has the small red square around it in the middle that says Java ready. This is another definition or presentation rule for a publisher to define, do I want the programming language or -- or ads which require the programming language Java on my site.

If I click it, that's okay. If I unclick it, that means my presentation rule is, $I$ don't want any ads that require the Java programming image.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next slide.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And what are you illustrating here, Mr. Lanning?
A. What I'm illustrating here is to make sure that we orient ourselves correctly with the claim and where this claim fits in the AdForce system.

Again, the first interface is the publisher interface, which is shown by the computer on the top right. And you see a box that's coming out of that computer that's labeled publisher on the top right. THE WITNESS: Charles, if we can kind of show that over on the right-hand. Sorry. No, not that one. Over on the right-hand side, there where it says ad size.
A. That's that $468 \times 60$ where I'm defining the number of pixels in my ad, and I'm saying that it's Java ready.

So this shows how the AdForce system fits in the claim and -- and that these -- this claim limitation is being met by the AdForce system.

THE WITNESS: Okay, Charles.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Now, this page we looked at --

MR. VERHOEVEN: Go back one slide, please, Charles. There's a bigger picture of it.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) So this page we're looking at on the right, for the record, is it correct that this is from an exhibit in evidence, DX 403?
A. That's correct.
Q. And the control number is G5629; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to DX demo 211.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And here we have

Claim 1 (b) still on the left and a different page on the right. Can you tell the jury what you're showing here?
A. Yes. Again, this is a different page out of the AdForce user manual. This is going to look a lot more complex to you. Again, it looks like a foreign language, but this is the type of information that a publisher would see.

And so this is further support that the publisher can define the presentation rules. And I've highlighted two areas or two examples of presentation rules, and the --

THE WITNESS: Charles, the first box -or both of them, yeah. If you can get both of them, that's good.
A. This is, again, the width $468 \times 60$. And on the right, we see a new -- a new parameter, a new attribute they call it that we haven't talked about before, and
that's frame border.
Right now the frame border for this ad is zero, which means there's no frame border. It's like a picture frame around a picture.

If $I$ wanted to change that presentation rule where $I$ just wanted to have a frame border, all $I$ would do is change that zero into a one and then save it, and then my ad would -- on the AdForce system would have a border around it.
Q. Now, we talked about a person of ordinary skill in the art. Do you remember that generally?
A. Yes.
Q. Would a person of ordinary skill understand how to put in this frame border?
A. Yes. This is -- these are standard html-type attributes. So one of ordinary skill in the art would know or be familiar with over a hundred different attributes that you could use to describe your website and different presentation rules as well.

So even though this looks somewhat cryptic to you, one of ordinary skill in the art, this would be pretty familiar to them.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to DX demo 213, please. I'm going two slides over, because we need to
speed up a little bit.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Can you explain to the jury what slide we're looking at here, Mr. Lanning?
A. Yes. This is from a -- another AdForce document that's describing specifically to publishers how to set background and color. You see --

THE WITNESS: Yes, Charles. If you can highlight the background color.
A. It's typically referred to as BG color. BG stands for background. This is an example for how a publisher would set the presentation style for the background color of their ad.

If I wanted different colors, this is where I would set it.

THE WITNESS: The next slide, please.

Oh, no. I don't have a next slide, so let me -- I -- I thought $I$ might have one that makes it a little easier.
A. But the BG color -- and you see the zeros, that means that in this case, they want a background color black. That's what that means.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: All right. Let's go to the next slide.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And so you put a check under element (b). Can you explain to the jury why you
put that check there?
A. Yes. This -- this means that $I$ believe, and I've done an analysis, that the AdForce system performs this limitation, which is shown by (b).
Q. All right.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next one.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Limitation (c): First database restoring the presentation rules input by the internet media venues through the first interface.

And what are we looking at here?

MR. VERHOEVEN: For the record, this is

DX demo 215.
A. I'm sorry. I'm seeing a different page number on the bottom than what you said.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) 215?
A. Oh, I see it now. Sorry. It's down --
Q. That's okay.
A. -- way down in the bottom. I was looking at the other numbers. All right. Yes, it is 215.

This is another page of the AdForce user manual, which is describing that there's two different databases in the AdForce system. I've highlighted one of the databases that is website management. That's the database for the publishers.

The other database is for the advertisers,
which we'll talk about in a little bit.
Q. And this -- so far, are these pictures we've been looking at out of this manual?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And this one is from Page 5443; is that right?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Now, do you know whether Plaintiff's expert, Dr. Rhyne, disputes that the element (c) of Claim 1 is met by AdForce?
A. He does not dispute that it's met.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next slide.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) So you put a check on (c); is that right?
A. Yes. That (c) has shown that it has the database.
Q. Okay. Let's go to (d), the next element, which is the second interface we've seen testimony about already, right?
A. Yes.

MR. VERHOEVEN: And going to DX demo 218 for the record, this is an illustration from an exhibit in evidence, DX 403, Page 5542.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Mr. Lanning, can you tell us what we're looking at here?
A. Yes. If we look on the left side of the page, this is the claim limitation that I've labeled (d).

Now, this limitation has two parts to it, so I want to show you each of those parts.

The first part is -- I've highlighted in red -- the seller's prompted to input information to select one or more of the internet media venues.

Now, we've gone to the second interface, and that's referring to the advertiser interface. So now we've left the publisher interface, and we've gone to the advertiser interface.

And this is describing what the advertiser -the patent refers to it as the seller, and I use those terms interchangeably for the seller or the advertiser.

So the first step I need to show is that the AdForce system prompts the seller to input information to select one or more of the internet media venues.

THE WITNESS: So if we can go back to the slide.
A. What you see on the right is another page right from the AdForce user guide where the advertiser looks at the different internet media venues, and those are listed by -- where you see Ad-Tech, Alpha Web

Services, those are all different internet media venues.

And all the advertiser needs to do is just check the ones that they want to select for their ad. So this is where the advertiser is selecting the internet media venues, okay?
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Go to the next slide.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) What are we looking at here, Mr. Lanning.

MR. VERHOEVEN: It says DX demo 219 for the record.
A. This is just to orient ourselves with the system. And as I explained earlier, we've left the publisher, which is shown by the top box on the right, top computer, and now we're at the bottom on the bottom right, which is the advertiser.

And we have the AdForce system or the computer controller of the AdForce system in the middle.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next slide, DX demo 220.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Can you explain to the jury what we're looking at here, sir.
A. Yes. Remember I said that there were two parts to this limitation? This is the second part where
the seller is prompted to input information to create electronic advertisement for the publication to the selected internet media venues. And you see that, and that's highlighted in red.

THE WITNESS: Okay, Charles. If we can go back to the --
A. This is another page out of the AdForce user manual that's out of the advertiser section.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And let me just interrupt you. For the record, you're looking at DX 403 in evidence, Page 5535?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Okay. Go ahead.
A. What I'd like to address your attention to first is the top part of this screen menu that says creative selection.

Now, creative, in terms, is an advertisement.

That's what a lot of the advertisers refer to as an advertisement. So when you see the word creative, creative means advertisement.

And this is the creative section, and this is where --

THE WITNESS: If we can go back, Charles now.
A. And they're prompted to input information to select the internet media venues. And that's what this -- this slide is doing with the -- the different ad sizes that they have.
Q. Now, you've highlighted the second part of Claim 1 (d): Prompted to input information to create an electronic advertisement.

I think the last -- in your testimony jut now, you talked about selecting. Does this show anything with respect to the second part, prompting information -- let me start over.
A. Sorry.
Q. Prompted to input information to create an electronic advertisement?
A. Yes. What you see -- and this is the creative, and that's what $I$ was referring to.

And right underneath the two words at the top are creating size, style, and file. So this is input to create an advertisement.

And the ad size is over on the -- right there is -- that's describing what screen we're looking at to the user. And then ad sizes, and then also where you see the ad styles then if you -- yeah -- I'm talking a little faster than the computer here, so -- okay.

So for ad styles in the middle, you see the letters GIF 89. Now, that probably wouldn't mean too
much to you, but to one of ordinary skill, that same picture or an image.

So if $I$ have an ad that's a picture of
something, that's the way I would do that. If I selected down to Java Applet, the $J-A-V-A$, that would be different types of information to create.

If $I$ typed -- if $I$ selected html script, that could be something as basic as a text ad that $I$ would be entering to create, and that would be information to create an electronic advertisement.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next
slide, DX demo 226.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And you've checked element (d)?
A. Yes. Following the same logic as before, the (d), that second interface, has been shown on the AdForce system.
Q. Based on the documents we looked at?
A. Yes.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next element, element (e), the second database. Next slide.
A. As I discussed earlier, the AdForce system provided two different types of databases. Before I highlighted in red the website, now I'm highlighting
advertising.
So this shows that it has an advertising
database or a database to store the advertiser
information.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And do you know whether Plaintiff's technical expert, Dr. Rhyne, disputes that this element (e) is met in the AdForce system?
A. He has not disputed this element.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: So let's go to the next slide.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) So you've checked off (e)?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. So let's go to the last element of Claim 1, the computer controller element.
A. Yes.

MR. VERHOEVEN: And let's go to the next slide, please.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Can you tell the jury, what are we looking at here?
A. This is another page from the AdForce user manual that's describing how the overall system works. And I've use this page to illustrate the claim language or - of that element (f) that we saw on the table.
Q. Let me just interrupt for one second.

So what we're looking at is a page from DX 403 in evidence, Page 5639; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Go ahead.
A. And I've highlighted to show that the AdForce system performed the element that $I$ have shown have shown with the small letter (f). I've highlighted this description of the AdForce system.

And it says: When a user views a web page, the web tag makes a request to the AdForce server for an advertisement, which is then delivered to the user, which is describing the -- how the overall AdForce system sends advertisements to the user.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next
slide, please.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Now, you've checked the last Claim 1 of the '025 patent, element (f)?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you explain to the jury your opinion with respect to element (f)?
A. That the AdForce systems meets this element as well.
Q. So is it your opinion that all of the elements of Claim 1 of the '025 patent are anticipated by
AdForce?
A. Yes. As I've shown with the checkmarks for every one of the preamble and every one of the elements of Claim 1, the AdForce system performs the functionality, as required by Claim 1 of the patents -or sorry. I shouldn't say patents. It's Claim 1 of the '025 patent.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next
slide. This is DX demo 341.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Now, this is really complicated. Can you explain to the jury why you had this one created?
A. Yes. The patent claims -- this is one of the charts that $I$ drew initially when $I$ started analyzing the patents, because the claims have multiple dependencies in some areas, and there's a lot of different claims.

So in order to understand where the claims are at and which other claims a claim might depend on, I generated this chart.

And I've also used this -- or am going to use this same chart today to walk through and make sure we have the checklist of the claims that we walked through to show that the AdForce system performs the function of
these other claims as well.
Q. Now, the -- this demonstrative exhibit lists six claims in blue, correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And what are the -- why are there six claims in blue?
A. Because these are claims that I've already described as we've walked through.
Q. Well, you've described Claim 1. Is it correct that the other -- the other five blue claims are also asserted claims?
A. Yes. That -- they're asserted. It gets a little confusing, that, but Function Media has asserted the claims that are in blue. But that doesn't mean that is the only claims $I$ need to analyze.

For instance, if they assert Claim 20--
Claim 20 is shown over on the left-hand side of the screen -- Claim 20 also depends on Claim 6.

THE WITNESS: And, Charles, just to make sure everyone's kind of with us, this chart can look kind of complicated -- if we kind of --
A. So there's Claim 20. That's an asserted claim, but in order for me to show that the AdForce system invalidates Claim 20 or that it performs all of the functions that are required by Claim 20 , $I$ not only
have to look at the text for Claim 20 and the claim language for it, but $I$ also have to look at Claim 6, and then Claim 6 depends on Claim 1 .

And so that's what this chart is showing, the different claims.
Q. Okay. And you've got checkmarks on Claim 20 and Claim 6, as well as Claim 1. Why do you have checkmarks on those two claims?
A. Because those claims, we've already -- I've already described that functionality for Claim 1 , and so I've put a checkmark.

For instance, on Claim 20, it requires information entered by a seller target, an IMV. We didn't have enough room in the box, so I abbreviated internet media venue to be IMV.

And so I believe I've already shown that the AdForce system performs that functionality, so I've put a checkmark in there.

And Claim 6, this is a self-interface -- or sorry.

Claim 6 says that it's a second interface, is self-serve. Well, self-serve means a person can go through it, in my mind, without an expert or somebody sitting with them.

And that's what these menu screens that we've
walked through that are in the AdForce user guide show, so I've checked Claim 6 to show that I've already proven that and shown you that.
Q. So is it your opinion that dependent Claim 20 is in -- is also anticipated by the AdForce system?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Let's go to asserted Claim 52 on the other side of the exhibit, which describes color standards and depends on Claim 47 and Claim 1 .

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you summarize for the jury your opinion with respect to Claim 52?
A. And so Claim 52 requires color standards, and it requires -- and so it's dependent -- and I've shown that the different color standards are included.

Claim 47 includes design or style standards that are automatically applied or compared to the ad, and I've shown that those are performed by the AdForce system, and so I've put a check in the Claim 47 there.
Q. And this is based on the documents we've already looked at?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. So there's three other asserted claims on the bottom here. Let's start with Claim 37, which
depends on four other claims, 36,32 , and 31 and 1 .
Just for the interest of time here, you put
checkmarks on Claims 1, 31, and 32. Does that mean that
you believe you've already shown evidence that those are
met?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. So let's just talk about the ones that don't have checkmarks, Claims 36 and 37.

Are you with me?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you prepared a slide with respect to those two claims?
A. Yes, I have.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next
slide, DX demo 240 .
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And if you could tell the jury what we're looking at here.
A. This is another page out -- or it's -- it's the same page that $I$ showed you earlier from the AdForce manual, which shows the AdForce system performs the requirements of Claims 36 and 37 .

Specifically, that the --

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Charles.
A. -- the computer system of Claim 32, wherein the self-serve interface for the internet media venue
prompts the internet media venue for a choice of advertisement types.

Now, this slide is showing -- and then let me finish 37 while he has that blown up.

In the computer system for Claim 36, wherein the choice of advertisement includes a text, so I have to show that the publisher can choose different advertisement types that they want shown on their web page and that one of those types in 37 is a text ad.

THE WITNESS: And if we can go back
quickly to the page.
A. Now, what one of ordinary skill, a person would understand as a publisher looking at this page, if I did not want to include text, I would choose the top part and -- of all of the text that you see.

THE WITNESS: Charles, if we could
highlight the part that says html tag, the first -- no. Sorry. Yes, that's an html tag, but what I'm referring to is a little lower than that, for all of that --
A. There's the html tag. If I chose that, then text would not be included, because to the left of that text, it says GIFs only, meaning images only.

So I would not be able -- I could choose, as a publisher, that test would not be included; however, if
I chose the text below that --
THE WITNESS: If you can highlight the
text right below -- there.
A. If I chose all of that information below that and pasted that into my web page or my website, then text ads would be included.

So both of the Claims 36 and 37 are performed by the AdForce system.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And for the record, this is the same screen shot we looked at early from DX 403 in evidence, Page 5643, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go back to the next slide, DX demo 342.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And it looks like you put a check on Claims 37 and 36 ; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And that represents that you believe those elements are met by AdForce?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Let's go to the last asserted claim here, Claim 90, on the bottom right, and you've checked -- already checked Claims 1, 47, 45, and 62. Why have you done that?
A. And 31 is also checked.

47, it's a little confusing with this.
THE WITNESS: If you see that it turns to the left after 45, Charles, that's what I'm referring to.
A. It goes from 45 to 31, then to Claim 1. Not from 45 to 47. You see that little black line where I turned left at 45?
Q. I misspoke. I apologize, Mr. Lanning.
A. Okay.
Q. So just to set the record straight, Claim 90 depends on four other claims, 62, 45, 31, and 1; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you've checked off $62,45,31$, and 1. Why did you do that?
A. Because I believe that I've already shown that the AdForce system performs the functionality of these claims.
Q. So that leaves Claim 90.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next
slide, DX demo 251.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And can you explain -- and for the record, this is depicting Claim 90 on the left, and on the right is an image from DX -- Exhibit DX 403
in evidence, Page 5634; is that correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Now, can you describe for the jury what we're looking at here --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and how it applies to Claim 90.
A. Claim 90 requires the addition of distribution factors.

THE WITNESS: And if we can highlight down towards the -- if we -- if we look at apply or compare the internet media venue distribution factors.
A. Do you see the words distribution factors? This is a new part of -- of what's being claimed. So what I need to show that the AdForce system performs is that it actually does this function for distribution factors.

THE WITNESS: If we can pop back to the -- to the page.
A. Now, down on the bottom of the page, I've listed ad size as being a distribution factor. And AdForce allowed a publisher to specify the ad size.

THE WITNESS: Okay. If we can leave that, Charles, but then up -- highlight where it says ad sizes on the screen over on the right.
A. It's highlighted in black on the actual -- do
you see where it's ad sizes? We've looked at that before. That would be the $468 x 60$ that's highlighted in black.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) All right.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next slide, DX demo 344.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) This is the same chart. And do you believe Claim 90 should have a check on it, too?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. We don't have a check on that, but you think there should be one on there; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next
slide, DX demo 345.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) What are you depicting here, Mr. Lanning?
A. That Claim 179 is another independent claim, but with the equal sign, I'm saying it's essentially the same as Claim 1, and, therefore, the AdForce system performs the functionality of Claim 179.
Q. Based on the same analysis you've already provided to the jury?
A. That's correct.
Q. And asserted Claim 231?
A. Claim 231 is -- what I'm showing here is essentially the same as Claim 52. And the checkmark in the box on the right is denoting that $\quad$ believe that the AdForce system performs that functionality of Claim 231 as well.
Q. Okay. We're almost through all the asserted claims. We have one more claim to go.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next
slide, DX demo 254.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) What are we looking at here, Mr. Lanning?
A. We switched gears a little bit. We've switched patents. So we've just -- I've just finished all of the asserted claims and their associated claims for the '059 (sic) patent.

Now, this checklist is showing Claim 1 for the '059 patent. Claim 1 for the '059 patent is a little different, and you can see now -- and now I have checkmarks for most of the elements of the letters, but there's areas where $I$ don't have checkmarks, and so I believe $I$ haven't shown yet that the AdForce system performs the functionality.

So all, in my mind, we need to go through are the -- the ones that do not have a checkmark. So (a) is
the first one we need to go through, which is referred to the preamble.
Q. Okay. We don't have a lot of time, so let's keep going as fast as we can here.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Next slide, DX demo 255.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) What does this show?
A. This shows that the preamble is met and that there's a third party or an agency that provides the advertising for the software -- or for the advertisers. That's what this claim for the '059 requires with the new parts in it.
Q. And for the record, you're referring to Page 5441 of DX -- Exhibit DX 403 in evidence?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next
slide, DX demo 256.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) What are we looking at here?
A. This is the next element that $I$ listed as (d) that's different in the 059 patent than the -- Claim 1 of the '025. And it's requiring that the seller is prompted to input information identifying the seller. And I've shown this as another page out of AdForce where the person needs to identify themselves with a log in
with a name and a password.
Q. This is -- we're looking at a page out of the user manual?
A. That's correct.
Q. And -- and the person entered Elvis underscore Doe and then a password?
A. Yes. And the stars are the password, but systems typically don't display your password so the people can see it. MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next slide, DX demo 257.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) What are we looking at here, Mr. Lanning?
A. This element requires -- you have a third interface. We've already talked about a first interface, a second. This is a third interface. And the third interface requires the third-party professional, which is a -- like an agency that would provide the ads.

And what is shown by this page --
THE WITNESS: If we can --
A. What is shown by both of these pages from the AdForce user guide is that this -- this claim limitation is met. And they are the same page or very similar pages to what I've shown you before.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next slide, DX demo 258.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) We're back to the claim chart for the ' 059 , and can you summarize your opinion with respect to whether AdForce anticipates each and every element of Claim 1 of the '059 patent?
A. Yes. The AdForce system performs each and every limitation of the -- Claim 1 of the '059 patent, as I've shown here, with the checkmarks on the right-hand side next to each one of those elements of Claim 1 .

MR. VERHOEVEN: Your Honor, I'm going to switch subjects. Is now a good time?

THE COURT: It is.

Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to
break now for our morning recess. Please be back ready to come in the courtroom at 10:30.

Remember my prior instructions, and don't
talk about the case. Have a nice break.

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
(Jury out.)
THE COURT: All right. Court's in
recess.
MR. VERHOEVEN: I have one question. I
can do it after the break.
THE COURT: That's okay.
MR. VERHOEVEN: Side-bar, please. Sorry.
Just a point of order, Mr. Lanning may want to talk
about Dr. Rhyne's rebuttal points. I'm assuming I
have -- I should cover that now, and -- and $I$ won't be
permitted to call him after Dr. Rhyne testifies, but
I -- I would like to do it the other way, if $I$ could.
THE COURT: Are you going to restrict it
to things he's identified in his report?
MR. VERHOEVEN: I'm going to restrict it
to his testimony, so it might even be less than that,
so -- it probably would be more efficient, I think.
THE COURT: Okay. Any objection?
MR. GRINSTEIN: None, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Then we'll proceed
that way.
MR. VERHOEVEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Recess.)
COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
(Jury in.)
THE COURT: Please be seated.
Continue.
MR. VERHOEVEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Mr. Lanning, let's switch
to the second reference that you referred to. The first one was AdForce, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And the second one was this DoubleClick and DART system; is that right?
A. Yes, sir.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Charles, could you go to DX Demo 259, DoubleClick DART system.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And, Mr. Lanning, can you please describe for the jury -- before we go into the -the claim elements, just generally, what is -- what is the DoubleClick DART system?
A. Like the AdForce system, the DoubleClick DART system was an internet advertising system that provided interfaces to publishers and advertisers. It was a competitor to AdForce system at the time.
Q. And this says DFA, DART for Advertisers; DFP, DART for Publishers.

Can you -- can you explain what you're referring to there?
A. Yes. The DoubleClick DART system is the overall advertising system, and then the DoubleClick company decided to split the software up into two -- at least two different modules that were referred to DART for Advertisers, the DFA, that would be the software for
advertisers; and DFP, DART for Publishers, that would be for the publishers internet media venues.
Q. And do those two applications work together?
A. Yes, they did.
Q. Can you explain that to the jury?
A. Yes. They were integrated together. The module would be sent to an advertiser, the software module, to install on their computer or to use if they wanted to do advertising, define advertisements.

If a publisher wanted to define their internet media venue or the portions of their website and their presentation rules, they would use the DFP product. But both of those were integrated into one system so that if any part of the back end system that did all the ad processing failed, then both DFA and DFP would fail as well.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next slide, DX Demo 260.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Can you please tell the jury what you're illustrating here?
A. I'm illustrating here that the DART system was out being sold and was actually performing -- producing these ads in 1998, which, as shown by this slide, is before the priority date of the '025 patent of January 10th, 1999, and the '059 patent of July 11th, 2002 .
Q. All right. MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next slide.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) This is the claim chart for Claim 1 of the '025 patent, right?
A. Yes, for DoubleClick.
Q. And you're going to walk through this with the evidence?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Next slide, DX Demo 263.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) This has Claim $1(a)$, element (a), on the left and some documents on the right.

Can you please explain to the jury what you're illustrating here, Mr. Lanning?
A. Yes. What we're going to do now is we're going to -- we're going to go through these same claim limitations for Claim 1 as $I$ did earlier for the AdForce system. It's just that $I$ need to show that the -- I need to show that DART's -- let me start all over, since I messed that all up.

I need to show that DoubleClick's DART system performs the functionality that's required by the patent claims just like the AdForce system.

And what's shown on this slide is it's defining the preamble in both the DART for Advertisers document that's shown on the top, which explains in the final sentence that ads can be placed on any site on the worldwide web, which is the internet.

And here's the definition on the bottom right that DART stands for. It stands for dynamic advertising, reporting, and targeting. And it explains that it's the ad server that powers the Doubleclick network.
Q. In your opinion, is that element of Claim $1(a)$ met by the DART system?
A. Yes, sir.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to -- I'm going
to skip some slides, Charles, in the interest of time. Let's go to DX Demo 265.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And on the left-hand side of this slide, you've got element (b) of Claim 1, right?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And then what are we looking at on the right-hand side?
A. On the right-hand side, the DART system performs similarly to the AdForce system. This might look familiar to you of what we looked at earlier, but this is defining the publisher preferences for the first
interface.

And I've shown the publisher and I've shown two examples: Frame border equals one and background color equals green that goes in to the DART computer controller.
Q. So this is similar to what we looked at with AdForce?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And for the record, the documents we're looking at -- or the first one on the top is -- is it correct that that's DX370 in evidence at Page 4062?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And the one on the bottom is, correct, it has DX149 in evidence, Page 3560?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next
slide, DX Demo 266.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And, again, we have Claim $1(b)$ on the left-hand side, and is it correct that you're illustrating a page screen from DX -- Exhibit DX370 in evidence, Page 4062?
A. Yes. This is a page from one of the DART manuals that $I$ used that's explaining how background color for the advertisement is set.

In this case, it's a white background color with all the Fs that you see.
Q. Okay. Is it your opinion that element (b) of Claim 1 of the '025 patent is disclosed in the DART system?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to DX Demo 268.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And here we have on the left-hand side, element (c) of Claim 1, and then on the right-hand side, it looks like this is a depiction of a page from Exhibit DX149 in evidence, Page 3519 ; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Can you please explain to the jury what
they're looking at here and how it applies to
Claim $1(\mathrm{c}) ?$
A. This information is from a DART manual, a DART document; describes the ad database, which meets claim (c) of this limitation.
Q. Okay. And is it your opinion that claim -- we withdraw that question.

Is it your opinion that element (c) of Claim 1 is met by the Doubleclick DART system?
A. Yes, sir.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to DX Demo 270, please.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And here on the left-hand side, we have element (d) of Claim 1 and a couple of documents.

For the record, the first one is Exhibit DX373 in evidence, Page 4627; is that right?
A. That's correct, yes, sir.
Q. And the second one is Exhibit DX594 in evidence, with a big, long number; the end of it is 209-11.

Do you see that?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. Can you explain to the jury what -what these documents are and how they relate to your opinion?
A. Yes. They were two -- two parts to element (d) as we discussed in AdForce -- for the AdForce system.

This is showing -- the highlighted portion that's shown is showing how the DART system meets this claim requirement.

And also on the right is an example -- it's hard to read, $I$ know -- but this is an example of the menu interface that was supplied to the -- the second
interface or the advertiser interface.
Q. What does that menu interface show?
A. It shows the requirements for this -- for this claim element.

THE WITNESS: If we could go back to
the --
MR. VERHOEVEN: If you could go back, Charles.
A. It's -- it's showing an example of how the seller is prompted to input information to select one or more of the internet media venues.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And this highlighted language here, you highlighted that there, right?
A. Yes.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Can we highlight that
box?
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And can you explain to the jury why you highlighted that?
A. It's because this -- this says and it explains to the -- to the seller how they can buy and target different websites with the text, the buy-site pages to which ad placement is targeted.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to DX Demo 272, please.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And on the left -- on this
exhibit -- excuse me. On the left on this slide is
Claim 1, element (c), the second part; is that right?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. That's the information to create an
electronic --
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And on the right, you've got two documents. The first is Exhibit DX373 in evidence, Page 4625, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And the second is Exhibit DX594 in evidence, the same page we looked at, 209-11?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Can you explain to the jury how these pages relate to the second part of element (d) of Claim 1 ? THE WITNESS: If we can highlight the yellow portion that's highlighted in the first document.
A. This describes how an advertiser is prompted to create information, an electronic advertisement for publications for the internet media venues.

If you see, there's two areas here, but I'd like to point you to the bottom part where it says ad HTML. The description for that, HTML stands for hypertext metalanguage (sic), which means that's the language used by the website advertisers and publishers,

HTML text of an enhanced creative.

And remember that creative is another word used for an advertisement.
Q. Okay. And do you have an opinion as to whether or not element (d) of Claim 1 is disclosed by the Doubleclick DART system?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. What's your opinion?
A. That it is disclosed.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to DX Demo 274,
please.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And on the left of this slide, we have element (e) of Claim 1 , second to the last element.

In the right-hand slide, we have a page out of Exhibit DX373 in evidence, Page 4607; is that correct?
A. That's correct, yes, sir.
Q. Can you please explain to the jury what you're showing here?
A. This is a page out of a DART document which describes that the -- there's a database on the DART system for storing the information input by the seller.
Q. And do you have an opinion --
A. Excuse me.
Q. That's okay. Would you like to take a drink
of water?
A. I'm doing too much talking.
Q. I'm going real fast. I apologize.
A. Okay. Sorry.
Q. Let's go to -- all right. Do you have an opinion as to whether element (e) of Claim 1 is disclosed by the Doubleclick DART system?
A. Yes. The DART system discloses this system as well.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to DX Demo 276, please.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And here again on the left-hand side is the final element of Claim 1 of the '025 patent, element (f). And on the right-hand side, it appears that this is an illustration from Exhibit DX149 in evidence, Page 3560 ; is that correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Can you please explain to the jury what we're looking at here?
A. This is another page from a DART document which is describing the process that's required by this claim element of how the ads -- the computer controler of the DART system publishes the electronic ads.
Q. Okay. And the next slide, DX Demo 276 (a), also has element (f) of Claim 1 with the separate
document on the right. This is a page from Exhibit
DX596 in evidence, Page No. 40242; is that correct?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And can you please explain to the jury what we're looking at here and how it applies to element (f) of Claim $1 ?$
A. This is describing how the database and how the -- well, let me start over so I don't go too fast here.

The bottom diagram or -- or picture on the bottom that says site's web server, that's the internet media venue. And then you also have on the right, DFA AdServers; that's the advertisement.

So this is a picture that I've selected to just show that the DART system integrates the web servers or the web publishers with the ads on the system.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go back to that slide.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Mr. Lanning, do you have an opinion as to whether element (f) of Claim 1 of the '025 patent is met by the Doubleclick DART system?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. What's your opinion?
A. And that is the DART system meets this element as well.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to slide DX Demo 277.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Okay. This is Claim 1 with all the elements. You have got checks on every element. Can you summarize for the jury your opinion with respect to whether Claim 1 of the $\mathbf{~} 025$ patent is anticipated by the DoubleClick DART system?
A. With all the check marks that I've shown on the right-hand side of this screen, similarly the way we did for -- the way I did for AdForce is -- my opinion is, is that all of the limitations of Claim 1 of the '025 patent are met by the DoubleClick DART system.
Q. All right.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next
slide, DX Demo 346.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) This is this complicated slide we looked at before. In the interest of time, I'm just going to go through the boxes that aren't checked.

Is it fair to say that the boxes that aren't checked, in your opinion, you've already shown evidence that those elements are met?
A. Yes. The way -- in the same way that $I$ described for the AdForce system for this complicated chart is the boxes that are checked, I believe that I've
already shown by the screen shots and the different pages of the DART manual.
Q. Okay. And you've got -- Claim 36 and 37 isn't checked yet.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next slide, DX Demo 347.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) We've got 36 and 37 on the left-hand side. On the right-hand side, you've got a document -- a page from the document. It appears to be Exhibit DX149 in evidence, Page 3573; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And can you please explain to the jury how this page relates to whether Claims 36 and 37 are met?
A. Yes. This page describes -- well, first off, the Claims 36 and 37, what's new about them or what's different than the previous claims is that they require that the self-serve interface for the internet media venue, which is the first interface, prompts the internet media venue for a choice of advertisement types in 36, and then one of those advertisement types in 37 needs to be a text advertisement.

As I've shown by the blow-out from the page, from the DART document, is this talks about -- this describes ad categories, which is a scroll box that lists the categories in which each ad can be placed.
Q. And in your opinion, does the DART - Doubleclick DART system disclose the additional elements that are claimed in Claim 36 and 37?
A. Yes, sir.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to DX Demo 349.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Okay. Another box that wasn't checked was Claim -- Dependent Claim 28.

Do you remember that?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And we've got that on the left. On the right, we have a page from page DX373 in evidence, Page No. 4623, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Can you please explain to the jury how this page relates to Claim 28?
A. Claim 28 requires that the seller be able to input advertising content to create a text advertisement, meaning of just characters, letters, and numbers.

As you can see by the highlighted part, as soon as we have it blown up here, is that select the insertion order type. This is where the advertisers selecting the insertion order type, and this serves text instead of banners.

If you see where it says click command, and
then it says hyphen, serves text instead of banners, that meets the requirement for Claim 28.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Now let's go to DX
Demo 351.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) This is -- this is the last box that wasn't checked in the dependent claim chart we looked at, Claim 90.

And on the right, you've got another DoubleClick DART document. And the question $I$ have is: Can you explain to the jury what -- how this document relates to Claim 90?
A. Yes. As I described for the AdForce system, Claim 90 requires that the publisher be able to define publi -- or comparison -- let me start over.

That the -- that the publisher is able to
define presentation rules, which include the distribution factors. And keyword targeting is a distribution factor, as I've listed on the bottom. And the DART publisher was allowed to specify keywords.

And that's what's being described by this keyword targeting out of the DART DoubleClick document. MR. VERHOEVEN: For the record, I'll just state that on DX Demo 351, the excerpt is -- the document is from DX149 in evidence, 3537.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) In your opinion, does the Doubleclick DART system disclose the additional elements of Claim 90?
A. Yes, sir.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next slide, DX Demo 352.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) So now all the boxes are checked?
A. Yes.
Q. Does that accurately reflect your opinion that the Doubleclick DART system discloses all these elements?
A. Yes, it does. MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next slide, DX Demo 353.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Now, we've already testified as to this slide with respect to AdForce that Claim 179 is subsequently equivalent to Claim 1; 231 is subsequently equivalent to Claim 52.

Is that your same opinion with respect to the DART system?
A. Yes.
Q. So it's your opinion that 179 and 231 are disclosed for the same reasons that Claim 1 and Claim 52 are met?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Last claim, '059 patent, DX Demo 296.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Now, this patent -- this claim is the same as the earlier ones, except it has that third party; is that right?
A. Yes. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Okay. Let's quickly go through and see what your opinion is to whether the third party is disclosed. MR. VERHOEVEN: Claim 236 -- or Slide DX2 97.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Can you tell us what we're looking at here?
A. This is that page from the DART documentation, DoubleClick DART system documentation.

THE WITNESS: Charles, if we can
highlight in parenthesis at the bottom where it's blown up where it says advertiser or agency.
A. This third-party professional is equivalent to an agency or an ad agency. And this is what is described in this DART document that agencies, or third-party professionals, are supported and used by the DART system.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And this, for the record,
is DX373 in evidence, Page 4607?
A. Yes, sir.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next
slide, DX Demo 298.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) What are we looking at here?
A. This requires the seller to input information identifying the seller, and that's what's shown by the box that says log in to DART for advertisers. That's the log in for the seller.
Q. And can you explain to the jury how that relates to element (d) of Claim 1?
A. Yes. In element (d), if we look at the last part of the claim element, it says: Which a seller is prompted to input information identifying the seller. And so if you are logged into the DART system, it would be similar to a log-in screen that $I$ showed you for the AdForce system, where there would be typically a user name and then a password. And that's what they mean -what is meant by this page of the document that says log in to DART for advertisers.
Q. For the record, this is Exhibit DX373 in evidence, Page 4610, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Is it your opinion that element (d) of Claim 1
is met by the Doubleclick DART system?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Of the '059 patent?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to DX Demo 299.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) This is element (f) of

Claim 1 of the '059 patent, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And there's two documents that you're disclosing on the right. The first is Exhibit DX373 in evidence, Page 4627, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And the second is Exhibit DX594 in evidence, Page 209-11?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Can you please describe -- explain to the jury why you put these documents up and how they relate to element (f) of Claim 1?
A. Yes. These are two different pages of the DART documents which support that the DART system performed the functionality as required by the third-party professionals prompted to input information to select one or more of the internet media venues.

And that's shown by the buy-site page, the
highlighted portion, which is the buy-site page as to which the ad is targeted.

I read that wrong. Let me -- let me correct that.

The buy-site pages to which the ad placement is targeted.
Q. Okay. And the second document on the right?
A. That's an example of the menu interface that -- that is used in the DART system as I discussed before.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to DX Demo 300.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Here we've highlighted -you've highlighted the bottom part of element (f) of the ' 059 patent.

And on the right-hand side, for the record, you have Exhibit DX373 in evidence, Page 4625. And, again, Exhibit DX594 in evidence, Page 209-11, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Can you please explain to the jury why you brought those two pages up and how they relate to this highlighted bottom portion of element (f) of Claim 1 of the ' 059 patent?
A. Yes. This is the second portion which is where the -- the seller, the agency, is prompted to
create.

THE WITNESS: And, Charles, if you would, if you could include the -- the line -- the row below the highlighted yellow that says ad HTML.
A. These -- these two statements that are included in the DART document support that the DART system performs this functionality of prompting the seller to input information, or the agency in this case, which would be the third interface, to create an electronic advertisement for the seller -- for publication for the selected internet media venues.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Next slide, DX Demo 301.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) This is a depiction of all of the elements of Claim 1 of the ' 059 patent. You've put check marks on each of them?
A. Yes. As I've shown by all the check marks to the right, this is for the '059 patent, Claim 1, that the DART system performs all the functionality required by Claim 1 of the 059 patent.
Q. So we've been through all of the asserted claims of the two patents.

Can you summarize for the jury, again, your opinion as to whether or not the DoubleClick DART system anticipates those claims?
A. Yes. The DART Doubleclick system performs all of the elements of all the asserted claims of the '025 patent and all the elements of Claim 1 of the' 059 patent. Therefore, I believe both the DART -- the Doubleclick DART system invalidates both of these asserted patents.
Q. Now, you had a third reference that you refer to at the beginning of your testimony on the issue of validity or invalidity.

Do you remember that?
A. That's correct, the NetGravity reference.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to DX Demo 302 .
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And this is -- can you just describe for the jury, generally, before we go into the specifics, what is NetGravity and what is AdServer?
A. The NetGravity -- NetGravity had an online internet advertising system as well. AdServer was the name of their product that produced these ads.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next
slide, DX Demo 302(a).
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) What are you depicting here?
A. I'm depicting here that the -- like the
AdForce system and the DART system, that the NetGravity
AdServer system was in use and being sold in 1998, which
is before the priority dates of both the '025 and '059
patent.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: And let's go to the next slide, DX Demo 303.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Can you tell the jury what we're looking at here?
A. Yes. This is the description in the ad server, NetGravity's AdServer documentation, which describes the requirements of the preamble for Claim 1.

And $I$ can highlight -- maybe $I$ should just read that part that's highlighted: This guide is designed to give the AdMaster a quick overview of how to create, schedule, run, and report ads served on a website using AdServer 3.0.

And $I$-- you can see probably the rest of it unless you'd like me to read it. My voice is about ready to go.
Q. Okay. And we're looking, just for the record, at Exhibit DX422 in evidence, Page 7160, right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next
slide, DX Demo 304.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And we're looking at Exhibit DX422 in evidence, Page 164, and then another pull-out from Page 188; is that right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And can you please explain to the jury what we're looking at here?
A. This is a menu from the ad server, NetGravity's AdServer program, which is providing the first interface, which is the publisher to present or input where it's prompting the publisher to input the presentation rules for the internet media venue on its website.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next slide, DX Demo 305.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) On the left, you have element (c) of Claim 1 of the '025 patent. On the right is Exhibit DX422 in evidence, Page 226, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Can you please explain to the jurors what you're showing here?
A. This is from another -- or another page of the NetGravity AdServer product documentation, which defines that they use what is referred to as relational databases. And they're listing the types of databases
that are used by the AdServer product, which meets this first -- which meets this limitation of a first database.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next
slide, DX Demo 306.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) In here you've got a couple of pages and some pull-outs. For the record, it looks like it's Exhibit DX882 in evidence; is that right?
A. That's correct. Yes, sir.
Q. Can you walk us -- can you please explain to the jury what you're showing here?
A. Yes. The NetGravity AdServer program had every limitation of this asserted claims, except for one, and -- and that -- and that element that's missing is what's referred to as the seller interface or the second interface.

And so this -- this reference I'm referring to as being obvious, as I discussed earlier, because not all of the elements have been met by the NetGravity AdServer program.

What this slide is showing is quotes from documents. I'm showing pages of documents from a person named Tom Shields, and as I've described on the top of this slide, Tom Shields was the creator of the NetGravity AdServer product. These notes were in 1996.

Now, the part that's missing from the NetGravity AdServer program and -- not program but product -- is a way for a seller to just log in and for the programmer for the product to prompt a seller for input.

This is -- these are documents where -- that were personal documents of Tom Shields where he's listing the need of users of the AdServer product, that they needed to have a log-in interface for sellers. THE WITNESS: And if we could highlight the top -- the quote that's in red, please, Charles.
A. It says: Advertisers and agencies. These products -- the products of these servers will probably only differ in UI. What that means is user interface, meaning the products are the same. All it is, is they're going to differ in the user interface or the log-in screen.

And then he goes on to say in his internal notes: The base functionality will remain the same as the rep firms connect and aggregate information from many sites and place ads across them.

So he's saying and the way I interpret this and understand his testimony from his deposition is that all the functionality was already in the AdServer system for the seller. It was just the publishers were entering information for the seller. There wasn't a
separate log-in interface.

And $I$ know time is short, but the other quote is also support for it was well-known by the NetGravity people that this functionality of allowing a seller to log in was much requested, known, as I've shown in the text in the red: Automatic mechanism for accepting media from advertisers directly has been much requested.

What he means by that is he knows in 1996 that
they need to have a log in where advertisers can directly log in to the advertising system as we saw on the AdForce and the DoubleClick DART system. It's just that NetGravity was missing that log-in interface.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) So do you have an opinion, based on your review of the evidence, as to whether it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill to add that interface to the NetGravity system at the time of the patent -- of the priority dates?
A. Yes, I do. It would have been obvious, and this wasn't -- isn't just hypothetical. It's actually listed by the creator of the product, that they understand -- they know what it is. It's a matter of just implementing it on the NetGravity AdServer system.
Q. Thank you.
A. And so, therefore, the NetGravity AdServer system would be obvious or render the Function Media
patents invalid due to obviousness.
Q. All right.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the remaining
elements of Claim 1, DX Demo 307 , please.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And this is, for the record, a depiction of a page from Exhibit DX405 in evidence, Page No. 8128, correct?
A. That's correct, yes, sir.
Q. Can you please explain to the jury what you're depicting here and how it relates to element (d) of Claim 1?
A. To show obviousness, as I discussed earlier, I can describe obviousness in two ways.

Would it have been obvious to the people working on the system to modify the current system? So I just finished showing you that it was obvious to the creator of the NetGravity AdServer system that they needed to modify the system.

The other part or way that $I$ can show obviousness is to show that it can be combined with other systems where it's missing. This, again, is not a hypothetical situation.

What this text is showing, this -- I'm trying not to confuse you. This is an AdForce document for AdForce advertisers explaining to them how an AdForce
advertiser can connect with the NetGravity AdServer
program.

So you can log in as a seller of the AdForce system, create your ad, and then it can be published on the NetGravity AdServer program. So that's another way that this seller interface can be provided in the NetGravity system. It could be combined with the AdForce system.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next
slide, DX Demo 308.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) This is element (e) of Claim 1 of the '025 patent. We're looking at Exhibit DX422 in evidence, Page 218, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Can you please explain to the jury what you're showing here?
A. This is support from the NetGravity AdServer documentation that a second database is included in the NetGravity AdServer product.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next
slide, DX Demo 309.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And on the left-hand side is element (f) of Claim 1 of the '025 patent. And on
the right appears to be a depiction of the page from Exhibit DX422 in evidence, Page 187.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Can you please describe for the jury what you're showing here?
A. Yes. I needed to show that the NetGravity AdServer system performed the functionality as required by element (f). And this is one -- one of the pages that describes how the NetGravity AdServer system operated.

And this is consistent with what's being required by this element, and that's what this page is showing.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to DX Demo 310.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Can you please explain to the jurors what you're illustrating on this slide, Mr. Lanning?
A. Yes. This -- this slide also has excerpts from other NetGravity AdServer documentation. As you can see with the titles that are in red, the NetGravity text ads could be created on the NetGravity AdServer system as well as creating custom HTML ads, which we described earlier is a type of text ad.
Q. Okay. And for the record, you're illustrating Exhibit DX422, Page 185 and Page -- they're both Page

185, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to the next
slide, DX Demo 311.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) This is a depiction of Exhibit DX422 in evidence, Page 164 , correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Can you please explain to the jury what you're -- what you're showing here?
A. This is another page from the AdServer documentation, which shows that the AdServer system supported as self-serve menu-driven interface.

You can see by the different inputs that were provided here that it would be self-serve, that the user would just either enter the information or click on the information they wanted.

MR. VERHOEVEN: Let's go to DX Demo 312 .
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) And this is a depiction of Exhibit DX422, Page 188, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And can you please explain to the jury what you're showing here?
A. This page is describing -- this, again, is another page out of the NetGravity AdServer document
that's describing how custom styles are created.
Q. Okay. And you -- you have the heading design or style standards. Why do you have that there?
A. Because these are the way that the -- let me just -- design or style standards.

THE WITNESS: And if we look at -- if we can just highlight, Charles, quickly, under the red text on the first paragraph -- or first and second ones. Yes, something like that is good.
A. This is saying, in addition to using predefined styles, you can create your own custom styles that conform to the design of your site.

So this is defining how the ad -- the AdServer -- AdServer system supports a publisher entering their presentation rules.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) Okay.

MR. VERHOEVEN: And let's go to the next slide, DX Demo 313.
Q. (By Mr. Verhoeven) This is a depiction of Exhibit DX 422, Page 163, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And can you please explain to the jury what you're illustrating here.
A. The title that I've included on this site is targeting media venues in red. It's creating a
targeting profile. This is where the seller can target specific websites or select internet media venues.
Q. Now, Mr. Lanning, do you -- in summary, with respect to the AdServer product we're looking at here, do you have an opinion as to whether that product, either alone or in combination, would render the asserted claims of the two patents that Function Media is asserting in this case obvious?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And can you please tell the jury what your opinion is.
A. My opinion is, is the NetGravity AdServer product renders the claims of -- the asserted claims of the '025 patent and Claim 1 of the '059 patent obvious, and for two reasons.

The first reason is, is that the NetGravity AdServer system could be modified as I showed you with the Tom Shields quotations. He knew what needed to be modified and how; and secondly, that it could be combined with the AdServer system to provide the seller interface.

So it's met all of the requirements of the claims due to obviousness or because of obviousness.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Lanning. MR. VERHOEVEN: I have nothing further.

THE COURT: Cross-examination.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. GRINSTEIN:
Q. Morning, Mr. Lanning.
A. Good morning.
Q. I understand your voice is cracking a little bit, so if you need to stop at any time, take a drink, just let me know.
A. Great. Thanks. Appreciate it.
Q. I want to make sure we can hear you.

I want to start by asking you just a couple questions about your background, Mr. Lanning. I think we heard on direct that you've had a long career in the military and in industry; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. But you don't have a master's degree; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. You don't have a Ph.D.; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. You've never taught full time at a university; is that right?
A. No, I have not.
Q. You have not published any articles in any peer-reviewed academic journals; is that correct?
A. No, that's not correct. I've published two articles.
Q. What are those two articles?
A. They were two different articles for how -I'm trying to figure out the best way to summarize very technical articles, but in the cellular network, how different SIM cards are selected and managed for the most part.
Q. Those are in peer-reviewed academic journals?
A. Not in academic journals. Sorry. I heard the part where you said published.
Q. No. My question was, have you been published
in peer-reviewed academic journals?
A. No, sir.
Q. And have you ever written a textbook?
A. No, sir.
Q. Now, you are a member of the IEEE
organization; is that correct?
A. That's correct, yes, sir.
Q. But you are not a fellow in the IEEE like Dr.

Rhyne is, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you are not a patent agent; is that correct?
A. No, sir, I'm not.
Q. And you've never been an inventor on any patents; is that correct?
A. That's correct, yes, sir.
Q. And just like every expert -- every other expert in this case, you are being paid for your time that you've worked on this case; is that correct?
A. Yes, sir, I am.
Q. I assume you don't see anything wrong with that, right?
A. No, sir.
Q. Let's talk about your noninfringement opinions first, okay?
A. Okay.

MR. GRINSTEIN: And can we go to Slide DX demo 161.
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) I want to talk about this particular slide. It was on the issue of creation.

Do you remember this slide?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And you used this slide to support your reading of Claim 1 that Claim 1 requires that the seller itself enter information to create an electronic ad that is itself customized to each of the selected internet media venue's presentation rules, right?
A. I don't think that's quite accurate, if I

```
heard you correctly. I think you've mischaracterized.
    Did you use the word selected? Did I not hear
    it or --
    Q. I'm sorry. Let me say it again.
        You used this slide to support your
interpretation of Claim 1 of the '025 patent that the
seller itself creates an ad or enters information to
create an ad that is customized to the -- in a form
customized to each of the selected internet media venues
'presentation rules; is that right?
    A. Let me just classify. I'm reading the slide
as you're asking the question, and each time you're
missing some words. Can we agree that that's the slide
I used, or is there something different you're asking
me --
Q. Well, what was the argument you were making with respect to the slide?
A. The argument that \(I\) was using for the slide is -- is what's shown on the slide; that the seller is prompted to input information to -- and then \(I\) go down to the bottom where it's the Court's creation -- create an electronic advertisement for publication in a form customized to each of the selected internet media venue's presentation rules.
Q. So let me give you an example. Say there's a
```

media venue. We'll call it travel.com. And travel.com
has a presentation rule, and that presentation rule is,
I want ads that have a purple background.
Are you with me?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. The way you read this claim and this claim
element is that the seller has to enter information into
the seller interface that is an advertisement with a
purple background to comply with travel.com's rule; is
that fair?
A. Yes, sir, $\quad$ believe so.
Q. Okay. So in the AdForce system, sellers created advertisements -- they entered information to create advertisements that were in a form customized to each of the selected internet media presentation rules, correct?
A. Yes. They met this claim, yes.
Q. Okay. And in the Doubleclick system, the way the DoubleClick system worked is that sellers entered information into the system to create an electronic advertisement in a form customized to each of the selected internet media presentation rules, right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. So in the AdForce system, if the publisher wanted a purple ad, then the AdForce seller created a
purple ad for that publisher, right?
A. No, I wouldn't agree with that.
Q. Isn't that what you just said how this claim works?
A. Yes, that is.
Q. Okay. So in order for AdForce to meet the restrictions and elements of this claim, an AdForce seller would have to create a purple ad if the AdForce publisher wanted purple, right?
A. No. Sorry. I wouldn't agree with that.
Q. Where did I go wrong?
A. Because as Dr. Rhyne explained, that if this -- the best way $I$ can explain it is, this is the same way the Google system works, is that information is entered -- I think I need to stop for a minute. So I guess I'm getting a little tired.
Q. I'm sorry. Do you need a minute?
A. If I could just have a minute.
Q. Sure.
A. I've been going here for quite a while.
Q. Take any time you need, sir.
A. Okay. If you can reask the question and let me try to give it a start. Let me try to get a little energy back here.
Q. Okay. I guess what I'm trying to get at, Mr.

Lanning, is, with respect to infringement, you said that what has to happen is a seller has to create a purple ad because the media venue wants purple.

And so I'm trying to understand if you're applying consistent interpretation with respect to validity.

So my question is, in an AdForce system, if the publisher wants a purple ad, does the seller in the AdForce system create a purple ad?
A. Not exactly, no.
Q. Okay. So you're reading your invalidity references differently than the way you're reading your infringement evidence; is that right?
A. No, sir, that's not right. I'm reading them both the same.
Q. Well, I guess I don't understand. If you're saying that in order to infringe this claim, to infringe the Function Media claim, a seller has to create a purple ad to make the purple internet media venue happy, then why isn't the same case in AdForce that the seller has to create a purple ad to make the AdForce publisher -- purple publisher happy?
A. Because this is the same way that the Google system works. And as Dr. Rhyne explained his criteria for infringement, that the way the Google system worked,
it was sufficient just to enter some information.
And so the -- both the AdServer -- or the AdForce system and the DoubleClick DART system work in the same way that Google does in creating this ad. So that is consistent with the interpretation that Dr. Rhyne has used to show infringement of the Google products.
Q. Okay. So you are applying Dr. Rhyne's understanding of how the claims operate when you're discussing invalidity, but you're applying a different understanding of how the claims operate when you're discussing infringement; is that fair?
A. No, that's not fair. I'm consistent with what I understand and interpret the claims to be.

MR. GRINSTEIN: Can I see the next
demonstrative, Matt, please? Oh, no. There we go.
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) This just Claim 1 of the '025 patent.

Do you see that, Mr. Lanning?
A. Yes, I do. Yes, sir.
Q. You would agree with me that if the jury finds
that each of these elements of Claim 1 of the ' 025 patent is met by the Google system, then Google infringes, right?
A. If each and every element -- if the jury
finds -- if you find that each and every element is met by the Google system, then the Google system would infringe this claim.
Q. And so if Google adds some additional features to its AdSense system that are not claimed, but it still does everything -- each and every thing that is discussed in Claim 1 of the $\quad 025$ patent, Google still infringes, right?
A. It -- that's correct, yes, sir. It doesn't matter if they have additional functionality. What the analysis needs to provide is, does the Google system meet each and every limitation of the claim? They can have extra functionality, and that's okay.
Q. Okay. So if Google ads some bells and whistles to AdSense, like auctions or things like that, as long as the jury finds that each and every element of this claim is met, those auctions and things like content matching and all of that doesn't impact infringement, right?
A. I wouldn't agree with your question, sir, because $I$ believe what you refer to as the bells and whistles describe the way the Google system works, which is showing that Google does not infringe this claim.
Q. Now, you agree -- you would agree, wouldn't you, that Google has a first interface -- a first
interface for the internet media venues.
You agree with that, right?
A. There is a first interface. Are you just asking me about the first three words, a first interface, or what are asking me specifically?
Q. Actually, $I$ want to ask you, you would agree with me that AdSense is -- qualifies as a first interface to the Google computer system, wouldn't you?
A. The AdSense interface would be a first interface to the computer system. Without reading the rest of the limitation, I would agree with that part, yes.
Q. And actually, you agree with the next part of the limitation, and that is, internet media venues in the Google system are prompted to enter presentation rules.

You agree with that, right?
A. Yes. That's correct, yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And you'd agree that this interface in the Google system, it prompts.

You agree, right?
A. Yes. Those are menu prompt interfaces.
Q. And you agreed on Friday -- in fact, you
testified on Friday that in AdSense, things like color and font and other sorts of things qualify as
presentation rules, right?
A. Now, we need to be clear so that we don't confuse -- or so that $I$ don't get confused and the jury as well.

When you say AdSense, which interface are you referring to?
Q. The AdSense interface.
A. And so that would be the publisher interface.
Q. Yes, sir.
A. Okay. And the first interface.

So, yes, the AdSense interface allows the publisher to define presentation rules, as I've shown -showed by my website and background information and things like that. I would agree with that, yes.
Q. And some of those presentation rules include things like color, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And I didn't hear you dispute in your
testimony that there is a first database storing the presentation rules in the Google system.

Did you -- did you say anything about that to Mr. Verhoeven -- to -- to your lawyer?
A. I don't dispute that the Google system has a first database for -- for storing the present -- for storing the presentation rules. They've had a database for storing the presentation rules since November of 2007.
Q. I didn't hear you provide any testimony about any dates, November 2007 or November -- not November 2007 during your direct testimony. Did you?
A. No, sir.
Q. And you would also agree that in Google, there is a second interface for sellers, and that interface is called AdWords.

You would agree with me about that?
A. There's a second interface for sellers to input information, as $I$ showed on multiple slides, that's referred to as Google's AdWords product, yes.
Q. And you'd agree that that interface prompts, right?
A. Yes, I would. Yes, sir.
Q. And you'd also agree, of course, that there's a second database that stores information that has been input into AdWords; is that fair?
A. Yes. Since -- since November 2007, yes.
Q. There wasn't a second database for ads information in the Google system before November 2007 ?
A. You know, I have that wrong. I was -- I was thinking of the publisher interface. So the answer to your question is yes, without any qualification to the date.
Q. Okay. You're doing okay, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Let's talk next about this issue of creation, if you wouldn't mind.

MR. GRINSTEIN: And I'd like to look at
Defendant's Demonstrative 17. Actually, can you roll it back, please, Matt? It's Defendant's Demonstrative 16. Excuse me.
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) Were you here for openings?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Opening arguments?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And so you saw Google's attorney put this specific demonstrative up during openings?
A. I was sitting over in the corner, so it was hard for me to see, but $I$ believe this is one of the slides, yes.
Q. And this demonstrative is attempting to explain Google's position on how the '025 patent operates; is that fair?
A. I wouldn't characterize this slide as how the '025 -- how the Google -- I wouldn't characterize this slide the way you have. This is -- this is showing something different from that.
Q. It says '025 patent at the top, right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And it says that the first media interface, that the media venues input rules.

Is that what it's attempting to show?
A. Yes, it is. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. Now, let's look at Google's next slide, and we've got a first -- a media interface called -- a media venue -- excuse me -- called travel.com.

Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And, apparently, travel.com has got a rule, and it says: I want a purple ad. And so here Google has depicted that the seller has created a purple ad.

Do you see that?
A. I'm just kind of -- I'm looking at this slide. This slide is somewhat new to me. I haven't studied this slide. So if $I$ can just take a second to read it through.

Okay. Now I -- now I know what the information is on the slide. If you wouldn't -- if you can ask me the question again.
Q. Sure. This is depicting Google's argument that at the seller interface, the seller creates a purple ad, because travel.com had a purple presentation
rule; is that fair?
A. I don't know if that slide -- if that's what's being depicted by this -- this slide. This is not one of my slides that $I$ used. So I'm -- I'm not sure the series of the slides.

But $I$ will agree with you that there are internet media venues on the right-hand side and a seller on the left, and there are two different colors of ads. But this could be used to depict what's actually presented at the internet media venue when it's displayed, so I'm not sure.
Q. Let me ask you this question, Mr. Lanning: Your view of the way that the '025 patent operates is that a seller at seller interface somehow has to find out the internet media venue presentation rules and then enters information to create an ad that is customized to those rules that the seller found out? Yes or no.
A. You're -- you're using a lot of nontechnical language, so $I$ need to interpret that for a little bit. What do you mean that they found out -- that's -that's -- I'm not trying to be difficult. You're just using language that wouldn't be clear to me and probably wouldn't be clear to others.
Q. Well, how does this -- in the way you view the system, how does the seller create an ad that is
customized to the presentation rules of an internet media venue, if the seller doesn't know what those presentation rules are?
A. Are you saying the seller does that? In other words -- I guess that's where I'm a little confused with your question. I -- I don't -- I don't know how to answer your question, because $I$ don't understand your question.
Q. You told me earlier that your view of the patents and the way the '025 patent works is that if the internet media venue, travel.com, wants a purple ad, then the seller, at the seller interface, has to enter information to create a purple ad.

That was your testimony 10 minutes ago, right?
A. I don't know if that's exactly, but $I$ would agree that the seller needs to enter information. Now, let's just be clear with the claim. The seller is prompted to input information to create an electronic advertisement customized to each of the selected internet media venues. That's my testimony.
Q. Okay. And so if the internet media venue has a purple presentation rule, does the seller, at the seller interface, based on your understanding of how the claim operates, have to enter information to create a purple ad?
A. They would need to input information to create the purple ad, yes.
Q. So how did they find out that the internet media venue's rule was purple?
A. That -- the seller interface would understand that, and that's incorporated with the system. And when you ask, how would they find out, that's the part I'm having the problem with.

Are you talking about the person, or are you talking about the seller interface or the computer controller, is why --
Q. I'm talking about the seller who has to input that information for the purple ad.
A. But the seller is inputting information to create an ad that's customized to each of the selected internet media venues.

So the system -- the seller wouldn't know all of the different presentation rules.
Q. Ah. So the seller inputs information, but the system later figures out the presentation rules and applies them to make the ad comply, right?
A. No, sir, that's not correct.
Q. Okay. Tell me where in the claim it indicates to you -- any information, any language, or any definition that this Court has provided where it would
tell the seller, hey, the internet media venue's
presentation rule is purple ad, so, seller, you need to
enter information to create a purple ad.
Where is that disclosed in the language of the
claim or in the claim definitions?
A. Okay. If we can look back -- there's -there's two places.

The first, the seller -- if we can look -- do you want me to just say it by memory, or do we want to look at --
Q. Well -- well, here's the claim right here. And, Mr. Lanning, I don't see anything that says, at the seller interface, the seller is informed of presentation rules, do you?
A. Sorry. I can only see the very top part of that that says '025.

And your -- your question is, is -- is -- now that $I$ can see it, now, your question -- I can't see you, but $I$ can hear you.
Q. There you go.
A. Okay. Now -- sorry -- your question is, now that $I$ can see the claim?
Q. My question is, is -- does the claim ever mention informing the seller of the internet media venue rules? Do you see those in the claim?
A. I do not see the words informing the seller in these claims, no, in these claims.
Q. And do you see those words -- have you seen those words in any claim construction, any claim definition that you've applied in this case, Mr. Lanning?
A. No, sir. Informing the seller is not in this claim.

MR. GRINSTEIN: Let's take a look at the definition -- the definition of processing, please, Matt. I think it's -- there we go.
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) Now, this is a claim term that the Court did define. It says: Processing electronic advertisement in compliance with the presentation rules of the internet media venue.

Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do. Yes, sir.
Q. So, Mr. Lanning, if the seller has already created an ad that's purple because the internet media venue wanted that ad to be purple, then why does the computer controller, in the last element of the claim, need to process that ad and make it comply with the purple rule?
A. Well, that's real clear by the patents. The patents describe why that's done.

There's only one type of customization that's described by the patents, and the patent specification describes that a final redundant customization is performed to make sure all of the latest presentation rules have been applied.

And it also says that no tampering has occurred.

So there could be there's new presentation rules that come up at any time. There could be the -the seller interface could have an older set of presentation rules.

So this is applying a final check, which is a redundant check, and applying the customized electronic advertisement.

Note that in the Court's construction that Judge Everingham has provided to us, that this is down -- just so to orient yourselves, we're going -- and you're probably not as familiar with the claims as we are, but this is the last element that I've described as element (f).

And the Court's construction is that this systematic sequence of mathematical and/or logical operations is performed -- logical operations on -- upon the customized electronic advertisement.

Well, what that means to me and is described
by the patents is a custom advertisement has to exist. And the only place where that customized advertisement could exist is in the seller interface when they provide a custom advertisement.

And this is a final check that's a redundant check and application of the presentation rules by the system according to the internet media venues that are selected.
Q. Are you finished with your answer, Mr. Lanning?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. So you're saying that when it does processing in the final element, it's doing error checking?
A. That might be one of the operations it's doing. It's not saying that it's -- it's not described by the patent as error checking. It's simply applying the latest presentation rules or the most current for the internet media venues, and it describes it as being a redundant step.

It also says in the specification for the patents that this step is performed to check to make sure that there has been no tampering by the seller of the advertisement.
Q. Mr. Lanning, if you could just try to answer my questions directly, it will probably help your
voice --
A. I apologize.
Q. -- if you just keep your answer to my question.
A. Okay.
Q. So let me ask this question: In this element
-- this description -- Court's construction of
processing, it doesn't use the word redundant, does it?

Do you see the word redundant there?
A. No. Redundant is not in there, no.
Q. Do you see the word error checking or the phrase error checking?
A. No, sir, I do not.
Q. The Court says: Process the electronic ad to make it comply.

```
            Do you see that, make it comply?
```

A. Yes, sir, I do.
Q. The Court didn't write make sure it complies, did it?
A. No, it did not.
Q. That's what you're basically arguing, isn't it?
A. No, sir, it isn't.
Q. Let's -- let me -- let me ask you this
question: If a seller entered an ad into the -- into
the claim described by the Function Media patents, and that ad had errors, it didn't comply with the publisher's presentation rules, is it your testimony that in the last element, element (f), the processing, the computer controller would fix it?
A. It would make sure it complies.
Q. That would be fixing it, right?
A. Yes. That would be making sure it complies where if it did not -- not necessarily fixing it. If it did have errors or it did not -- if the ad did not comply with the presentation rules of the internet media venues, then this step would fix it, yes.
Q. Okay. So, for example, if a publisher's rule was that $I$ want a purple ad and the seller entered a green ad, you would agree with me that in this processing step --

MR. GRINSTEIN: Matt, can you go back one?
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) -- you would agree with me that in this processing step, the central controller would make that wrongly green to purple. That's what it says, right?
A. I wouldn't agree with you totally, and $I$ can explain, if you'd like, but I'll just leave it at I don't agree with your statement, no, sir.
Q. Okay. So your testimony is that if an ad comes in that does not comply with the presentation rules of the internet media venues, then the system will ignore this claim construction and won't make it comply?
A. No, sir.
Q. Is that your testimony?
A. No, sir, that's not my testimony either.
Q. And just to be clear, in the Google AdSense system, there are Google software modules that apply publisher presentation rules to advertising information that has been input by sellers, right?
A. The Google system applies presentation rules as the final step before it's transmitted to internet -internet media venues or an internet location.

I misspoke. It's not internet media venues. Before it applies to the internet locations, as I described with multiple slides earlier.
Q. So in the Google system, if a publisher wants a red ad, the Google system applies the red color to the information that's been input by the seller to give that publisher that -- that red ad they want, right?
A. As the last step before the Google system sends the ad to the internet location, it will apply the publisher's presentation rules or the internet media venues presentation rules.
Q. And in your testimony earlier, $I$ think on Friday, you indicated to Google's lawyer that the AdSense -- or I'm sorry -- AdWords interface, sellers do not input information that is already customized to an internet media venue's presentation rules, right, sir?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. But Google eventually has a computer process that runs -- that makes that information comply with those rules, right?
A. Separate from the seller interface and seller input, yes.
Q. Okay. And so you could say that Google was correcting errors, couldn't you?
A. No, sir, because there's no errors to create in the first place, because the seller is not allowed to input any information. So there wouldn't be any -- any way that the seller could enter the errors in the first place.
Q. Well, if the seller -- if an internet media venue wanted a purple ad and the seller entered an ad that wasn't purple, the Google computer processor would fix that, wouldn't it?
A. No, sir, I wouldn't agree with that.
Q. Let me talk to you about the next issue, which is selection.

The way you read the claims of the '025 patent -- excuse me -- is that they require that advertisements appear on every single site which sellers have input information to select for; is that fair?
A. If you can show me the claim text or something you're referring to, I'll make sure I'm answering the right question.
Q. Well, I'm trying to understand the testimony you gave this morning, and so let me give you an example.

The way you understand this patent is, if a seller inputs information to select 10 websites, then you say this patent requires that the advertisement gets published to all 10 of those websites every one of the selected internet media venues.

Is that your testimony?
A. Yes. I believe the language specifically is, to each of the selected internet menus -- internet media venues, which to means, to me, every selected internet media venue.
Q. And just so we can use an example, because these things are a lot easier to understand with examples, sellers select -- enters information to select 10 websites. That means -- if the system is following this claim, that means the ad has to be published to all

10 -- every one of those 10 websites, right?
That's how you understand the claim?
A. Now, we're not talking about the Google system anymore. You're just asking me about the claim.
Q. Right.
A. Yes, that's the way $I$ understand it, that the advertisement be displayed on each of the selected internet media venues.
Q. And your argument about non-infringement is that in the Google system, the ads don't get displayed on every single website that a seller selects. And you cited things like this auction process and the content matching, all those sort of things, right?
A. Well, I think you've mischaracterized my testimony from this morning. There's multiple reasons, I believe, that the Google system doesn't meet the select limitation.
Q. I'm just asking you about this one, Mr. Lanning. And in this particular limit -- this particular argument that you made this morning -- or maybe I misheard it, so you can -- you can correct me.

The argument $I$ thought you made this morning was that the Google system does not infringe because it does not guarantee to a seller that their ads are going to be delivered to each and every website internet media
venue that a seller enters information to select.

Was that what you were saying this morning?
A. That's only half correct. There's two parts to what I've said.
Q. I'm only asking you about that part. Did I get that part right?
A. For that part, yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And so the -- the idea is, is that sellers can sometimes get denied in the Google system.

They could want to go to cnn.com, but the
Google system can tell them no; is that fair?
A. No, it isn't. That totally mischaracterizes the way the Google system work.
Q. A seller can input a site target for cnn.com, but their ad may not appear on cnn.com; is that fair?
A. That's a -- that's a -- you're saying something different now. Google doesn't reject any ad. It just simply doesn't present -- doesn't display it.
Q. Isn't that the same way that the claims of the ' 025 patent work, Mr. Lanning?
A. No.
Q. Yes or no?
A. Isn't that the same way? I --
Q. Don't the claims of the '025 patent work the same way, Mr. Lanning? Yes or no.
A. Same way as what? Can you be specific? Because we've talked about a lot of things. When you say the same way --
Q. Don't the claims of the '025 patent also provide that every one of the internet media venues for which the seller has input information to select won't necessarily get an ad? Isn't that right?
A. No, sir. I absolutely disagree with that.
Q. Okay. Now, in doing your analysis of infringement, you looked at every claim that Function Media has asserted, right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. You had to, because you had to understand whether or not those claims were infringed; is that fair?
A. Yes. Just to explain, initially, I didn't know - -

THE COURT: Well, you --

THE WITNESS: Sorry. Sorry.

THE COURT: If you could restrict your
answer to yes or no --

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: -- your lawyer will get a
chance to ask you that.
THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) So I take it you looked at Claim 90; is that right?
A. Yes. As I've shown multiple times, yes, sir. MR. GRINSTEIN: Matt, can $I$ have the claim chart to Claim 90?
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) And this has got a bunch of claims down at the bottom, but let's take a look at the claim at top, okay, Mr. Lanning?
A. Okay.
Q. The claim at top says: The computer system, blah, blah, blah, wherein the internet media venue presentation rules comprise distribution factors further comprising a computer program distribution filter to automatically apply or compare the internet media venue distribution factors to the information input by the seller or the advertisement to determine whether to publish the advertisement to the internet media venue.

Have I read that correctly?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And it says right here that this filter determines whether to publish.

Do you see that language?
A. I don't see the word whether to publish anywhere.
Q. Whether to publish.
A. Oh, sorry. Now I do see it. Sorry. Determine whether to publish the advertisement to the internet media venue.
Q. And the information that that filter is using to determine whether to publish is information that was input by the internet media venues, right? That's what the claim says, right?
A. Yes. That's - that's -- those are the words of the claim that you're pointing out. I agree with that.
Q. And so whether to publish, it could be yes, let's publish, or it could be no, let's not publish, fair?
A. To make sure $I$ answer your question correctly, we'd need to talk about the other dependent claims. As you show on your chart, there's other claims involved with this as well.
Q. I'm only asking you about this clause right here (indicates), Mr. Lanning. And that clause says whether it's going to apply the distribution factors to determine whether to publish.

That plainly means to determine yes, publish, or no, don't publish. That's fair, isn't it, Mr. Lanning?
A. Yes, it is. That's what that claim -- we're agreeing that that's what that claim says, yes, sir.
Q. So when a seller got to this claim, claim 90, and they didn't put 10 media venues that they wanted to select to publish to, Claim 90 says, no, no, no, you don't necessarily get all 10 , because this distribution filter could tell you, no, we're not going to publish there.

That's fair, isn't it?
A. Yes. I believe that's accurate, yes, sir.
Q. So you're wrong, Mr. Lanning, when you say that the claims of the '025 patent require that the ad get published to each and every internet media venue that the seller selects, because Claim 90 tells you that the seller sometimes gets vetoed; isn't that right?
A. No, sir, because the -- no, sir, I don't agree with that.
Q. Tell me where $I$ went wrong.
A. Because the Court's construction requires that the ad be displayed on each of the selected internet media venues.
Q. That's each of the selected internet media venues that were selected by the computer system; isn't that right, Mr. Lanning?
A. No. That were collected -- that were selected by the seller at the seller interface.
Q. So are you saying that Claim 90 right here can't possibly be right, because it contradicts the Court's claim construction?
A. No, that's not my testimony at all.
Q. Okay. So reconcile these two competing things for us, Mr. Lanning.

If you're saying that the court requires that the ads get published to every internet media venue, and on the other hand, this claim plainly says sometimes the internet media venues can veto publishing, how do those two things fit together?
A. Now you're asking me to reconcile, so to me, that's more of an open-ended question. I can't answer that with a yes or no.

So the way that I would look at that is I would understand what the Court's construction was for Claim 1, and specifically, for the last limitation of Claim 1 for the processing and publishing to.

If we can look at that construction, $I$ can explain that construction, and then how $I$ reconcile is also look at the other dependent claims.

I didn't just take this claim, as I explained earlier, in isolation. I need to take this claim and consider it with Claim 1 and all of the other claims that you have listed below that claim.
Q. Is that the fullest and best answer you can give to my question, Mr. Lanning?
A. Without you putting the slides up where I can describe the Court's construction for processing and publishing to, yes, sir, it is.
Q. Okay. I appreciate that. Thank you. Let's move to the next issue, which is publishing. I think we've called it sort of generally publishing. And let me start by asking you what you agree on.

You would agree that a website is an internet media venue, correct?
A. Yes. I believe I've said that multiple times today.
Q. Okay. And you would also agree that in the Google AdSense system, Google displays ads on websites, right?
A. No, sir, I wouldn't agree with that.
Q. You wouldn't agree with that?
A. No, sir.
Q. I'd like to take a look at some slides that you put up in your own -- your own direct examination. First of all --

MR. GRINSTEIN: I think it's Slide 360,

DX Demo 360.
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) This is a slide you
yourself put up, and it says: Google conducts an auction to determine which ads will be displayed on the web page.

The ad -- the slide you put up said displayed on the web page, didn't it?
A. Yes, that's correct.

MR. GRINSTEIN: Can $I$ see the next slide?
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) Then you put up another slide, and it says: And displays the winning ads on the web page.

You put that slide up, too, didn't you?
A. Yes, sir, I did.
Q. Were you here for the testimony of

Ms. Wojcicki?
A. No, I was not.
Q. Okay. Experts could have -- I mean, you could
have been here. You weren't excluded, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. So -- well, let me show you what Ms. Wojcicki said on this particular issue.

Do you know that in trial here a couple of days ago, Ms. Wojcicki said that Google serves ads on the site? Were you aware of that?
A. No, I wasn't, but --
Q. That's all I'm asking. Were you aware of

```
that?
```

A. This is the first time I'm seeing this information.
Q. Okay. Then I bet the next one is the first time you've seen this, what Ms. Wojcicki said a little later: Google will serve ads on my site. Were you aware that she said that?
A. No, sir.
Q. So despite what you put in your slides and despite what Ms. Wojcicki says, you'll still say that Google does not display ads on websites?

Is that your testimony?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Okay. Well, will you agree with me that Google publishes ads to websites?
A. No, sir, I would not.
Q. All right. Well, maybe you don't know about some of them or Ms. Wojcicki's testimony.

So were you aware that Ms. Wojcicki testified
that you found the right ads, and then AdSense served them to this page? Were you aware that she said that?
A. No, I wasn't.
Q. Let me show you some Google documents. Maybe this will help your opinion.

MR. GRINSTEIN: Your Honor, may I
approach?
THE COURT: Yes.
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) Mr. Lanning, while I'm handing this out, in the interest of time, first, let me ask you, do you know what a $10-\mathrm{K}$ is?
A. There's a lot of different $10-\mathrm{K}$ terminology. One is a smaller marathon, but $I$ don't know if that's what you're asking me about.

Can you be more specific?
Q. Do you know what it means when a company files a 10-K?
A. In general, I do, yes.
Q. $10-\mathrm{K}$ is a statement that a company files with the Securities and Exchange Commission; is that right?
A. I believe so. I'm not an accountant, so I don't -- or -- nor a tax person, so I don't know all the specifics of that.
Q. Well, you've worked in industry, right?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And so you're aware that there are severe penalties, criminal, civil penalties that a company can -- can suffer if they say something false in a $10-\mathrm{K}$ ? Have you heard that before?
A. No, I haven't. I don't know, but I would assume that a company should be reasonable and truthful
about what they submit.
Q. Mr. Lanning, can you turn to Exhibit 1047 in
your book.
A. (Complies.)
Q. And this is Google's 10-K from 2008. And you can see up on the top, this particular document was filed --
A. Just a minute.
Q. I'm very sorry.
A. It's a large binder with a lot of documents.

Okay. I have it now.
Q. You can see up on the top that this particular document was filed with the United States Securities and Exchange.

Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And I would like you to turn to the bottom of Page 11.
A. (Complies.)

MR. GRINSTEIN: Matt, can you blow that up?
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) Bottom of Page 11 is a paragraph that Google wrote to the securities and Exchange Commission called AdSense Contextual Advertising Technology.

Do you see that?
A. Yes, sir, I do.
Q. And the last sentence on Page 11 says: Upon receiving a request, our software examines the content of web pages and performs a matching process that identifies advertisements that we --

MR. GRINSTEIN: Next page, please.
Q. (By Mr. Grinstein) -- believe are relevant to the content of the specific web page. The relevant ads are then returned to the web page in response to the request.

Were you aware that Google had made that statement to the SEC in its 2008 form 10-K?
A. No, sir. This is the first time I'm seeing this document.
Q. So just so I can understand your opinion, Mr. Lanning, even though there's evidence that Google itself admits that ads are displayed on websites and even though there's evidence that Google itself admits that ads are sent to websites, you still dispute that in the language of the claims, Google isn't placing ads at websites?

Is that your testimony?
A. Well, it's -- I can answer yes or no to two parts.

First off, $I$ do not agree with the premise of your question that Google is saying that ads are published to websites. Web pages are different than websites.

And so I do not agree that I'm in conflict at all with what Google is saying on these documents.
Q. Okay. So when Google sends an ad to a web page, that's totally different, in your mind, than sending to a website?
A. Oh, definitely, yes.
Q. Okay. So who has the web page? Where does the web page exist?
A. You're using nontechnical language. Who has the web page? What do you mean by that?
Q. When Google sent an ad to the web page, where is the ad getting sent?
A. The -- the text, the way I interpret the text that I'm seeing, is this is the way that people of ordinary skill refer to sending the ad to the internet user or the end user. When they say they're sending it to the web page, this is the same way of saying, in my analogy, that I'm sending the package directly to the internet user.

I'm sending it to the web page that's being displayed, not the website that's the internet media venue.
Q. Okay. So your testimony is, is that Google can send an ad to a web page, and that is not the same -- that is not sending it to a website. That's your testimony?
A. Yes. I'm saying, the way that I've seen these statements that you've shown me, these statements are used -- the way people use these statements in the industry and as I'm speaking to other technical people, when they say show an ad on the web page, they're referring to sending the ad directly to the web page that's being displayed by the user, not to the website.
Q. The web page is just part of the website, right?
A. I have web pages on my website, but this language that you've highlighted is referring to the web pages that are being displayed by the user.
Q. And by the way, Ms. Wojcicki, in her testimony, she says that Google displays ads on websites. She didn't use the term web page. But you don't credit that testimony.

Is that your testimony?
A. I don't have all the context of what she was using, but $I$ don't have any reason at all -- it wouldn't change my testimony at all that the Google ads clearly send the advertise -- the Google system -- excuse me - the Google system sends ads directly to the internet user or the web page that's being displayed.
Q. Mr. Lanning, I think we've used cnn.com a lot in this case. I think even a couple of your slides use cnn.com as an example.

Do you recall that?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Is it your testimony that an internet media venue like cnn.com has a single IP address that serves all the content from that particular internet media venue?
A. No. There would be -- for large websites, they can -- it could be just one, like my website has just one, but there could be multiple internet addresses that are used by an internet media venue.
Q. Let me show you a picture of cnn.com. You see that? It looks like cnn.com, right?
A. It says CNN. Looks like it, yes.
Q. Do you know what happens if you block, at your browser, all the content from a domain that's called turner. com when you -- when you surf to cnn.com? Do you know what happens?
A. No. I haven't performed any of those tests, so I wouldn't know the way CNN implemented their
website.
Q. Let me show you what happens when you block all the other content, and you only display in your browser the contents from the cnn.com IP address. That's what you get. Does that surprise you, Mr. Lanning?
A. No, it does not.
Q. It doesn't surprise you, because in modern websites, content in those websites is assembled from a variety of different servers with a variety of different IP addresses; isn't that right?
A. No. That -- you -- you -- no, sir, I wouldn't agree with that.
Q. Well, in this particular website, I've blocked everything except the cnn.com IP address. And is it your testimony that if someone asked you on a street, does that look like the cnn.com website, you would say, yeah, that does look like it?
A. No, it's not. I would say it looks like the CNN website with somebody blocking a lot of information.
Q. Blocking a lot of information from IP addresses other than cnn.com, right?
A. I don't know anything about CNN. I haven't
been included, so $I$ can't answer your question.
Q. Now, your ranch website ran AdSense ads for a
while. Is that an experiment you performed?
A. Yes, it did.
Q. And if $I$ were to type the IP address of your ranch website into my browser, I would have gotten some -- I would have seen some Google ads, right?
A. Yes, you would see on your browser some Google ads.
Q. But your testimony is that those ads were never placed at your website, because they didn't live in the servers that provided the content to your website?

Is that your testimony?
A. Yes, but my website never saw those ads.
Q. Now --

THE COURT: Well, now it's lunchtime.
Ladies and Gentlemen, be back ready to come in the courtroom at 1:15. Have a nice lunch, and remember my prior instructions. Don't talk about the case.

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
(Jury out.)
THE COURT: All right. We'll be in recess until 1:15.

I believe that my clerk e-mailed copies of the draft jury instructions and verdict form to counsel over the weekend. I'll see your delegation, as

1
it is, at 12:45 for the charge conference, okay?
Y'all send whoever is in charge of giving
me your inputs to those drafts downstairs to my chambers
at 12: 45. That will give them a chance to grab a quick
bite before we get started, and we'll be back ready to
go at 1:15 before the jury.
(Recess.)
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