

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

APPLE INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

IMMERSION CORPORATION,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2016-00896  
Patent No. 8,659,571

---

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	SUMMARY OF OPINIONS .....	1
III.	QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE.....	3
IV.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	6
V.	LEGAL PRINCIPLES.....	7
	A. Claim Construction .....	7
	B. Anticipation .....	8
	C. Obviousness.....	9
VI.	THE '571 PATENT.....	9
VII.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	12
	A. “gesture signal” (claims 1-7, 23-29) .....	12
	B. “dynamic interaction parameter” (claims 1, 4-7, 12, 15-18, 23, 26-29) .....	13
	C. “vector signal” (claims 2, 13, 24).....	14
VIII.	GROUND 1: POUPYREV DOES NOT RENDER CLAIMS 1-4, 7, 23-26 and 29 OBVIOUS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) .....	14
	A. Poupyrev does not disclose or render obvious claim 1 .....	14
	B. Poupyrev does not disclose or render obvious claim 2.....	22
	C. Poupyrev does not disclose or render obvious claim 3.....	24
	D. Poupyrev does not disclose or render obvious claim 4.....	24
	E. Poupyrev does not disclose or render obvious claim 7.....	25
	F. Poupyrev does not disclose or render obvious claims 23-26 or 29.....	26

IX. GROUNDS 2-3: POUPYREV IN VIEW OF OTHER  
REFERENCES DOES NOT RENDER CLAIMS 5-6 AND 27-28  
OBVIOUS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) ..... 27

X. CONCLUSION..... 27

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.” The petition challenges claims 1-7 and 23-29 of the ’571 patent.

5. The petition raises three grounds, each based on obviousness under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Ground 1 argues that claims 1-4, 7, 23-26 and 29 of the ’571 patent are obvious in light of U.S. Patent No. 7,952,566 (“Poupyrev”), Ex. 1013. 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, 7, 23-26 and 29 of the ’571 patent are not rendered obvious by Poupyrev.

6. Ground 2 argues that claims 5 and 27 are obvious in light of Poupyrev and A FORCE FEEDBACK PROGRAMMING PRIMER by Louis Rosenberg (“Primer”), Ex. 1017. Based on studying the petition and the exhibits cited in the petition as well as other documents, it is my opinion that claims 5 and 27 are not rendered obvious by Poupyrev in view of Primer.

7. Ground 3 argues that claims 6 and 28 are obvious in light of Poupyrev and Canadian Patent App. No 2,059,893 A1 (“Tecot”), Ex. 1015. Based on studying the petition and the exhibits cited in the petition as well as other documents, it is my opinion that claims 6 and 28 are not rendered obvious by Poupyrev in view of Tecot.

8. Grounds 4 and 5 argue invalidity of claims 1-6 and 23-29 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,734,373 (“Rosenberg ‘373,” Ex. 1004) alone, or in combination

# 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.