

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

IMMERSION CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-01372
Patent No. 8,659,571

DECLARATION OF YON VISELL, PH.D.
IN SUPPORT OF IMMERSION CORPORATION'S
PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. SUMMARY OF OPINIONS 1

III. QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE..... 2

IV. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART 5

V. LEGAL PRINCIPLES..... 6

 A. Claim Construction..... 6

 B. Anticipation 7

 C. Obviousness..... 8

VI. THE '571 PATENT 8

VII. GROUND 1: BURROUGH DOES NOT RENDER CLAIMS 1-4,
6, 23-26 AND 28 OBVIOUS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) 11

 A. Burrough does not disclose or render obvious claim 1
 because two gesture signals are not used to form a single
 dynamic interaction parameter 12

 1. Burrough does not teach generating a dynamic
 interaction parameter using a first gesture signal and a
 second gesture signal 12

 2. Dr. Baudisch’s argument that multiple Tinfo signals
 could constitute the claimed gesture signals is
 inaccurate 21

 B. Burrough does not disclose or render obvious claim 1
 because it does not teach “generating” a “dynamic interaction
 parameter” 24

 C. Burrough Does Not Render Obvious Claim 1 Because There
 Is No Evidence a POSITA Would Have Modified Burrough..... 28

D. Burrough Does Not Disclose Or Render Obvious Claim 2
Because the Supposed “Gesture Signals” of Claim 1 Do Not
Include Magnitude And Direction..... 29

VIII. CONCLUSION..... 32

1. I, Yon Visell, declare as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

2. I have been engaged by Immersion Corporation (“Immersion”) as an expert in connection with matters raised in the Petition for Inter Partes Review (“Petition”) of U.S. Patent No. 8,659,571 (the “’571 patent”) filed by Apple Inc. (“Apple” or “Petitioner”).

3. This declaration is based on the information currently available to me. To the extent that additional information becomes available, I reserve the right to continue my investigation and study, which may include a review of documents and information that may be produced, as well as testimony from depositions that have not yet been taken.

II. SUMMARY OF OPINIONS

4. The ’571 patent is entitled “Interactivity Model for Shared Feedback on Mobile Devices.” The ’571 patent is directed to a novel way of producing haptic effects in electronic devices. The fundamental insight that is described and claimed in the ’571 patent is that the user’s gesture interactions with the device need to be tracked and analyzed in order to properly synchronize haptic feedback with a user’s input. Reflecting this focus, the claims specify that both a first *and* a second gesture signal (each based on a user’s gestural inputs) are used to generate something called a “dynamic interaction parameter.”

5. The Board instituted trial on Petitioner's Ground 1, concerning claims 1-4, 6, 23-26, and 28 of the '571 patent. Institution Decision at 45. Petitioner's Ground 1 challenges these claims as obvious under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in light of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2010-0156818 to Burrough et al. ("Burrough"), Ex. 1005. Based on studying the petition and the exhibits cited in the petition as well as other documents, it is my opinion that claims 1-4, 6, 23-26, and 28 of the '571 patent are not rendered obvious by Burrough.

III. QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

6. I obtained my Ph.D. degree in Electrical and Computer Engineering from McGill University in 2011. Before that, I received my MA in Physics from the University of Texas at Austin in 1999, and my BA in Physics from Wesleyan University in 1995.

7. Since 2015, I have worked as an Assistant Professor at UCSB. From 2013 to 2015, I worked as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering at Drexel University.

8. At UCSB, I lead the RE Touch Lab as its Director and Principal Investigator. The RE Touch Lab includes six Ph.D. students and numerous affiliated researchers and undergraduate students. Some of the topics that my teams at the RE Touch Lab have explored include computational perception, such

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.