

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION

OPTIS WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC,  
OPTIS CELLULAR TECHNOLOGY, LLC,  
UNWIRED PLANET, LLC, UNWIRED  
PLANET INTERNATIONAL LIMITED, AND  
PANOPTIS PATENT MANAGEMENT, LLC,

*Plaintiffs,*

v.

APPLE INC.,

*Defendant.*

Case No. 2:19-cv-0066-JRG

---

**REBUTTAL EXPERT REPORT OF DR. VIJAY MADISETTI REGARDING  
INVALIDITY OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,102,833; INVALIDITY OF U.S. PATENT NO.  
8,411,557; AND INVALIDITY OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,019,332**

---

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY**

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_



Vijay Madiseti, Ph.D.

Dated: May 22, 2020

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Vijay Madiseti, Ph.D., and Optis Wireless Technology, LLC; Optis Cellular Technology, LLC; Unwired Planet, LLC; Unwired Planet International Limited; and PanOptis Patent Management, LLC (together, “PanOptis”) have retained me to investigate and opine on certain issues regarding U.S. Patent No. 8,102,833 (’833 patent), U.S. Patent No. 8,411,557 (’557 patent), and U.S. Patent No. 8,019,332 (’332 patent).

2. PanOptis has asked me to consider the opinions of Dr. Jonathan Wells regarding his expert report regarding validity of claims 1 and 8 of the ’833 patent. I have been retained as an independent technical expert by PanOptis to determine, among other things, whether claims 1 and 8 of the ’833 patent are valid. I was also asked to analyze the non-infringing alternatives and technical benefits related to the asserted claims. As part of my analysis, I have studied the patents-in-suit and the accused products. The opinions set forth in this report are based on my personal knowledge, experience in the field, and professional judgment, and I am prepared to testify competently about them if called as a witness during the trial in this matter.

3. Based on my investigation in this matter, I concluded that claims 1 and 8 of the ’833 patent are valid and that Apple has not met its burden to show otherwise.

4. PanOptis has asked me to consider the opinions of Mark Lanning regarding his expert report regarding validity of claims 1, 5, and 10 of the ’557 patent. I have been retained as an independent technical expert by PanOptis to determine, among other things, whether claims 1, 5, and 10 of the ’557 patent are valid. I was also asked to analyze the non-infringing alternatives and technical benefits related to the asserted claims. As part of my analysis, I have studied the patents-in-suit and the accused products. The opinions set forth in this report are based on my

personal knowledge, experience in the field, and professional judgment, and I am prepared to testify competently about them if called as a witness during the trial in this matter.

5. Based on my investigation in this matter, I concluded that claims 1, 5, and 10 of the '557 patent are valid and that Apple has not met its burden to show otherwise.

6. PanOptis has asked me to consider the opinions of Mr. Lanning regarding his expert report regarding validity of claims 1, 6, 7, and 10 of the '332 patent. I have been retained as an independent technical expert by PanOptis to determine, among other things, whether claims 1, 6, 7, 10 of the '332 patent are valid. I was also asked to analyze the non-infringing alternatives and technical benefits related to the asserted claims. As part of my analysis, I have studied the patents-in-suit and the accused products. The opinions set forth in this report are based on my personal knowledge, experience in the field, and professional judgment, and I am prepared to testify competently about them if called as a witness during the trial in this matter.

7. Based on my investigation in this matter, I concluded that claims 1, 6, 7, and 10 of the '332 patent are valid and that Apple has not met its burden to show otherwise.

8. I reserve the right to provide testimony at trial regarding the opinions expressed in this report. I also reserve the right to make demonstratives or other trial graphics regarding the opinions expressed in this report. I have based my report on information currently available to me, and if additional information becomes available, I reserve the right to continue my investigation. In light of new information, I may expand or modify my opinions. I may also supplement my opinion as new information becomes available, as Apple raises new issues or opinions, as Apple's experts raise new issues or opinions, or as the Court requests further opinions.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION

OPTIS WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC,  
OPTIS CELLULAR TECHNOLOGY, LLC,  
UNWIRED PLANET, LLC, UNWIRED  
PLANET INTERNATIONAL LIMITED, AND  
PANOPTIS PATENT MANAGEMENT, LLC,

*Plaintiffs,*

v.

APPLE INC.,

*Defendant.*

Case No. 2:19-cv-0066-JRG

---

**APPENDIX 3: REBUTTAL EXPERT REPORT OF DR. VIJAY MADISETTI**  
**REGARDING INVALIDITY OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,102,833**

---

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction.....	1
A. Identification of the '833 Patent and Scope of Opinion .....	1
B. Summary of Opinions.....	2
C. Materials Considered .....	3
II. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	3
III. Adoption of Opening Report and Prior Declarations .....	3
IV. Overview of the '833 Patent .....	3
A. The '833 Patent's Insights and Inventions.....	4
B. Priority Date.....	7
C. LG's Contributions Related to the '833 Patent.....	7
D. Asserted Claims .....	15
E. Claim Construction .....	17
V. Alleged Prior Art References Lack the '833 Patent's Insights.....	17
A. Qualifications as Prior Art .....	18
B. Qualcomm-037 .....	23
C. Cho.....	25
D. Samsung-094.....	26
E. Qualcomm-269 .....	27
F. Qualcomm-926 .....	30
G. Malladi '161.....	33
H. Malladi '367.....	38
VI. The '833 Patent's Asserted Claims are Not Obvious .....	42

# 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.