EXHIBIT 4


```
Page 1
                IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
 2
                  FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS
 3
 4
 5
            PHILIPS NORTH AMERICA
            LLC,
 6
                  Plaintiff,
 7
                  vs.
                                              Case No.
 8
                                          1:19-cv-11586-IT
            FITBIT, INC.,
 9
                  Defendant.
10
11
                 CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY
12
13
                      Videotaped Deposition of
14
                        THOMAS L. MARTIN, Ph.D.
15
                          Conducted Remotely
16
                       Tuesday, February 1, 2022
17
                             8:59 a.m. EST
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
     Job No. CS5029507
```



	Page 2
1	
2	
3	
4	The videotaped deposition of
5	THOMAS L. MARTIN, Ph.D., conducted remotely,
6	was stenographically reported by Lisa A.
7	Knight, Registered Diplomate Reporter,
8	Certified Realtime Reporter, and Realtime
9	Systems Administrator.
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	



	Page 3
1	APPEARANCES
	(Appearing remotely)
2	
3	ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFF:
	JOHN W. CUSTER, ESQUIRE
4	FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
_	111 Huntington Avenue
5	Suite 2500
6	Boston, Massachusetts 02199 617.226.3148
O	jcuster@foley.com
7	Jeastererer, .com
8	ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANT:
	DAVID J. SHAW, ESQUIRE
9	DESMARAIS LLP
	1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
10	Suite 200
	Washington, District of Columbia 20006
11	202.451.4900
	dshaw@desmaraisllp.com
12	HENDY I ADD EGOHEDE
13	HENRY L. ARD, ESQUIRE DESMARAIS LLP
13	230 Park Avenue
14	New York, New York 10169
	212.351.3400
15	hard@desmaraisllp.com
16	
17	ALSO PRESENT:
	MICHAEL BARANKOVICH, Videographer
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23 24	
∠ +	



	Page 306
1	substantially similar to each other. So the
2	tech sorry. Technically comparable
3	without being substantially similar.
4	MR. CUSTER: Okay. I have no
5	further questions.
6	FURTHER EXAMINATION
7	BY MR. SHAW:
8	Q. As you've used the phrase
9	"technically comparable" in your opinion that
LO	the '191 and '377 patents are technically
L1	comparable, what does the phrase "technically
L2	comparable" mean in that context, Doctor?
L3	MR. CUSTER: Objection to the
L4	extent it calls for a legal conclusion.
L5	A. So, you know, as I've laid out
L6	in the expert report, those two patents
L7	used they were a continuation of the same
L8	application. The specifications were nearly
L9	identical, in terms of both the text and
20	drawings. And they were directed towards the
21	same general type of technology, in terms of
22	monitoring health and exercise parameters.
23	(Simultaneous crosstalk.)
24	Q. You oh, I'm sorry. Go

