

EXHIBIT 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

PHILIPS NORTH AMERICA LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

FITBIT LLC,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 1:19-cv-11586-FDS

REBUTTAL EXPERT REPORT OF DR. THOMAS MARTIN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. SUMMARY OF THE ASSERTED PATENT 2

 A. U.S. PATENT NO. 8,277,3772

III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART 3

IV. LEGAL STANDARDS 4

V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS..... 6

VI. Priority of the asserted claims..... 7

VII. VALIDITY UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101 7

 A. LEGAL STANDARDS7

VIII. U.S. PATENT NO. 8,277,377 IS NOT INVALID..... 8

 A. PROSECUTION HISTORY OF THE '377 PATENT.....8

 B. OVERVIEW OF PRIOR ART14

 1. U.S. Patent No. 5,598,849 (“Browne”)..... 14

 2. U.S. Patent No. 6,434,403 (“Ausems”)..... 17

 3. U.S. Patent No. 6,587,684 (“Hsu”) 18

 4. U.S. Patent No. 6,059,692 (“Hickman”).....21

 5. U.S. Patent No. 6,519,241 (“Theimer”)24

 6. U.S. Patent No. 6,560,443 (“Vaisanan”).....25

 7. U.S. Patent No. 6,690,178 (“Mault”).....26

 8. WO 99/41682 (“Dean”).....27

 9. iFit.....28

 a. iFit.com Chirp-Based Programs29

 b. Built-In Pulse Programs32

 c. The Pulse Programs Were Distinct From the Chirp-Based iFit.com Workout Programs34

 d. Sending Exercise Data to iFit.com36

C. THE ASSERTED CLAIMS OF THE '377 PATENT ARE NOT RENDERED OBVIOUS BY BROWNE IN VIEW OF AUSEMS AND HSU41

1. There is no motivation to modify Browne with Ausems and Hsu.....41
2. Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Browne in View of Ausems and Hsu.45
3. Claims 4, 5, 6, 9, and 12 are not rendered obvious by Browne in view of Ausems and Hsu.48

D. THE ASSERTED CLAIMS OF THE '377 PATENT ARE NOT RENDERED OBVIOUS BY HICKMAN IN VIEW OF THEIMER AND VAISANEN48

1. There is no motivation to modify Hickman with Theimer and Vaisanen.48
2. Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Hickman in View of Theimer.50
3. Claims 4, 5, 6, 9, and 12 are not rendered obvious by Hickman in View of Theimer and Vaisanen.52

E. THE ASSERTED CLAIMS OF THE '377 PATENT ARE NOT RENDERED OBVIOUS BY MAULT IN VIEW OF DEAN OR HSU53

4. Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Mault in view of Dean or Hsu.....53
4. Claims 4, 5, 6, 9, and 12 are not rendered obvious by Mault in view of Dean or Hsu.58

F. THE ASSERTED CLAIMS OF THE '377 PATENT ARE NOT RENDERED OBVIOUS BY IFIT IN VIEW OF AUSEMS AND DEAN OR BY IFIT IN VIEW OF AUSEMS AND HSU59

1. There is no motivation to modify iFit with Ausems and Dean or to modify iFit with Ausems and Hsu.....59
2. Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by iFit in view of Ausems and Dean or iFit in view of Ausems and Hsu.....63
3. Claims 4, 5, 6, 9, and 12 are not rendered obvious by iFit in view of Ausems and Dean or iFit in view of Ausems and Hsu.71

G. THE ASSERTED CLAIMS OF THE '377 PATENT ARE DIRECTED TO PATENT ELIGIBLE SUBJECT MATTER...71



1.	Web Enabled Wireless Phone Technology was Particularly Limited in 1999	73
2.	The Asserted Claims of the '377 Patent Provide Multiple Inventive Concepts	75
3.	Interactive Exercise Monitoring As Claimed by the '377 Patent Was Not Well Known Nor Conventional	78
4.	Web-Enabled Wireless Phones As Claimed by the '377 Patent Were Not Well Known Nor Conventional	81
5.	Downloading An Application From A Remote Server As Claimed by the '377 Patent Was Not Well Known Nor Conventional.....	83
6.	Dr. Paradiso's Opinions Regarding Rendering User Interfaces On Web-Enabled Wireless Phones Ignores the Ordered Combination of Steps that Reflect the Inventive Contributions of Claim 1 of the '377 Patent.....	86
7.	Gathering Exercise and Physiologic Status Data While A Subject is Exercising As Claimed by the '377 Patent Was Not Well Known Nor Conventional	88
8.	Coupling A Web-Enabled Wireless Phone To Exercise Data Gathering Devices And Transferring Data Between Devices Using Either Wired Connections Or Short-Range Wireless Communications Including Infrared And RF Communication Protocols As Claimed by the '377 Patent Was Not Well Known Nor Conventional	91
9.	Sending Data Over the Internet to Back-End Servers for Further Processing, and Receiving and Displaying Calculated Responses From Such Servers, As Claimed by the '377 Patent Was Not Well Known Nor Conventional.....	95
H.	THE ASSERTED CLAIMS OF THE '377 PATENT COVERS MULTIPLE SERVERS AND ARE NOT INDEFINITE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112	97
I.	CLAIM 1 OF THE '377 PATENT IS NOT "SUBSTANTIALLY SIMILAR" TO CLAIM 1 OF EUROPEAN PATENT NO. 1 247 229.....	99
IX.	Reservation	101

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.