

Filed on behalf of Valencell, Inc.

By: Justin B. Kimble (JKimble-IPR@bcpc-law.com)
Nicholas C Kliewer (nkliewer@bcpc-law.com)
Jonathan H. Rastegar (jrastegar@bcpc-law.com)
Bragalone Conroy PC
2200 Ross Ave.
Suite 4500 – West
Dallas, TX 75201
Tel: 214.785.6670
Fax: 214.786.6680

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

VALENCELL, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-00319
U.S. Patent No. 8,923,941

**DECLARATION OF LUCA POLLONINI IN SUPPORT OF PATENT
OWNER RESPONSE TO PETITION**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Case IPR2017-00319
Patent 8,923,941

**Patent Owner Response to Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent
No. 8,923,941**

Declaration of Dr. Luca Pollonini

I, Luca Pollonini, do hereby declare and state, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America, that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and correct and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code.

Executed on September 22, 2017, at Manvel, Texas.



Luca Pollonini

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION 4

 A. Engagement..... 4

 B. Background and Qualifications..... 5

 C. Compensation..... 7

 D. Information Considered..... 8

I. LEGAL STANDARDS 9

 A. Obviousness 10

II. THE '941 PATENT 16

 A. Effective Filing Date of the '941 Patent Claims 16

 B. Overview of the '941 Patent..... 16

 C. Grounds in the Petition..... 19

 D. Prior Art Asserted..... 21

 1. Luo..... 21

 2. Craw..... 23

 3. Mault..... 24

 4. Al-Ali..... 25

 E. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art 26

 F. Claim Construction 29

 1. “PPG sensor” 30

III. PATENTABILITY ANALYSIS OF THE '941 PATENT 31

 A. The combination of Luo and Craw does not render obvious a respiration rate that can be extracted from PPG signals..... 31

 B. The combination of Luo and Craw does not render obvious the step of processing signals into a serial data output. 33

 C. The motivation to combine Luo and Craw..... 36

 D. The combination of Mault and Al-Ali does not disclose the method of claim 1 being performed in a single monitoring device. 37

 E. The combination of Mault and Al-Ali does not render obvious a respiration rate that can be extracted from PPG signals..... 39

 F. The combination of Mault and Al-Ali does not render obvious the step of processing signals into a serial data output. 40

 G. A POSA would not have had a motivation to combine Mault with Al-Ali. 42

INTRODUCTION

A. Engagement

1. My name is Dr. Luca Pollonini. I have been asked to submit this declaration on behalf of Valencell, Inc. (“Valencell” or “Patent Owner”) in connection with Patent Owner’s response (the “Response”) to the petition (the “Petition”) of Apple Inc. (“Apple” or “Petitioner”) for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 8,923,941 (“the ’941 patent”). Valencell’s Response, I understand, is being submitted to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB” or the “Board”) of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“PTO” or “USPTO”) in this proceeding having case number IPR2017-00319.

2. I have been retained as a technical expert by Petitioner to study and provide my opinions on the technology claimed in, and the patentability or nonpatentability of, claims 1, 2, and 6-21 of the ’941 patent. I understand that two separate *inter partes* reviews have been instituted on the ’941 patent. My opinions in this declaration will concern those claims instituted in case number IPR2017-00319: claims 1, 2, and 6-13.

3. As part of my study, I have reviewed and am familiar with the specification of the ’941 patent. I understand that the ’941 patent has been provided as Exhibit 1001. Previously, Patent Owner filed its Preliminary Response (Paper 6, referred to as the “Preliminary Response”) to the Petition (Paper 2, referred to as the

“Petition”). And the Board issued its Decision (Paper 10, referred to and cited to as the “Decision”), which instituted review based on the finding that there was a reasonable likelihood that the Petitioner would prevail as to claims 1, 2, and 6-13 of the '941 patent.

B. Background and Qualifications

4. I expect to testify regarding my background, qualifications, and experience relevant to the issues in this *inter partes* review proceeding.

5. In this section, I discuss my educational background, work experience, and other relevant qualifications. My curriculum vitae is attached as **Appendix A**.

6. I have over seventeen years of experience in biomedical optics, which I matured both in academia and industry. I am currently an Assistant Professor of Engineering Technology at the University of Houston, where I direct the Optical BioImaging Laboratory. My research activity is focused on the design, development and validation of optical devices and instruments for non-invasive sensing of physiological parameters of interest in healthcare. In particular, my lab operates in the field of optical brain imaging for measurement of cerebral blood flow, wearable optical sensors for early detection of pressure ulcers, and other applications based on near infrared spectroscopy.

7. I have also co-founded two companies, Nirox (established in 2005 in Italy) and Performance Athlytics (established in 2013 in Texas), both of which are

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.