

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE INC.

Petitioner,

v.

MASIMO CORPORATION,

Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2020-01520  
U.S. Patent 10,258,265

---

**DECLARATION OF VIJAY K. MADISETTI, PH.D.**

MASIMO 2004

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|      |                                                                                              |    |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| I.   | QUALIFICATIONS .....                                                                         | 1  |
| II.  | MATERIALS CONSIDERED .....                                                                   | 8  |
| III. | UNDERSTANDING OF PATENT LAW .....                                                            | 10 |
|      | A. Level Of Ordinary Skill In The Art.....                                                   | 10 |
|      | B. Claim Construction.....                                                                   | 11 |
|      | C. Obviousness.....                                                                          | 12 |
| IV.  | INTRODUCTION TO MASIMO’S TECHNOLOGY .....                                                    | 13 |
|      | A. The ’265 Patent .....                                                                     | 13 |
|      | B. Introduction To The Independent Claims Of The ’265<br>Patent .....                        | 14 |
| V.   | THE PETITION’S PROPOSED COMBINATIONS.....                                                    | 17 |
| VI.  | LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....                                                     | 19 |
| VII. | GROUND 1A-1E DO NOT ESTABLISH<br>OBVIOUSNESS.....                                            | 21 |
|      | A. Introduction To Ground 1A.....                                                            | 21 |
|      | 1. Aizawa Uses Peripherally Located Detectors<br>Around A Single Centrally Located LED.....  | 21 |
|      | 2. Inokawa Uses Peripherally Located LEDs<br>Around A Single Centrally Located Detector..... | 23 |
|      | 3. Ground 1A’s Proposed Combination Of<br>Aizawa And Inokawa.....                            | 24 |
|      | B. Ground 1A Does Not Establish Obviousness .....                                            | 26 |

|       |                                                                                                           |    |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1.    | A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated To Combine Inokawa’s Convex Lens With Aizawa’s Sensor.....         | 26 |
| 2.    | A POSITA Would Not Have Added A Second LED To Aizawa .....                                                | 49 |
| C.    | The Remaining Challenged Dependent Claims Are Nonobvious Over Ground 1A .....                             | 55 |
| D.    | Ground 1B Does Not Establish Obviousness For The Same Reason As Ground 1A And For Additional Reasons..... | 55 |
| 1.    | Ohsaki Does Not Fix The Problems With Ground 1A’s Proposed Aizawa-Inokawa Combination.....                | 56 |
| 2.    | A POSITA Would Have Understood That Ohsaki’s Board Would Not Prevent Slipping With Aizawa’s Device .....  | 57 |
| E.    | The Challenged Dependent Claims Are Nonobvious Over Ground 1B.....                                        | 60 |
| F.    | Grounds 1C-1E Fail For The Same Reasons As Ground 1A .....                                                | 61 |
| VIII. | GROUND 2A-2C DO NOT ESTABLISH OBVIOUSNESS.....                                                            | 61 |
| A.    | Introduction To Ground 2A.....                                                                            | 61 |
| 1.    | Mendelson-1988 Uses Peripherally Located Detectors Around Centrally Located LEDs.....                     | 61 |
| 2.    | Ground 2A’s Proposed Combination Of Mendelson-1988 And Inokawa.....                                       | 62 |
| B.    | Ground 2A Does Not Establish Obviousness .....                                                            | 64 |

|     |                                                                                                                                                                                                |    |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1.  | Ground 2A Does Not Demonstrate A Motivation To Combine Mendelson-1988 And Inokawa, And Does Not Establish A Reasonable Expectation Of Success .....                                            | 64 |
| 2.  | Ground 2A’s Proposed Combination Does Not Include The Claimed Cover .....                                                                                                                      | 68 |
| 3.  | Ground 2A’s Proposed Combination Of Mendelson-1988 And Inokawa Does Not Have The Claimed “Circular Wall” That “Creates A Gap Between The Surface And The Light Permeable Cover” (Claim 3)..... | 71 |
| 4.  | Ground 2A’s Proposed Combination Of Mendelson-1988 And Inokawa Does Not Have A “Circular” Wall (Claim 3) Or “Circular Housing With A Raised Edge” (Claim 26).....                              | 74 |
| 5.  | Dr. Kenny Relies On References Not Identified As Part Of Ground 2A With No Analysis Of Any Motivation To Combine.....                                                                          | 76 |
| C.  | The Challenged Dependent Claims Are Nonobvious Over Ground 2A.....                                                                                                                             | 78 |
| D.  | Grounds 2B-2C Fail For The Same Reason As Ground 2A .....                                                                                                                                      | 78 |
| IX. | OATH .....                                                                                                                                                                                     | 79 |

I, Vijay K Madiseti, Ph.D., declare as follows:

1. I have been retained by counsel for Patent Owner Masimo Corporation (“Masimo”) as an independent expert witness in this proceeding. I have been asked to provide my opinions regarding the Petition in this action and the declaration offered by Thomas W. Kenny, Ph.D., (Ex. 1003) challenging the patentability of claims 1-4, 6-14, and 16-30 of U.S. Patent No. 10,258,265 (“the ’265 Patent”). I am being compensated at my usual and customary rate for the time I spend working on this proceeding, and my compensation is not affected by its outcome.

### **I. QUALIFICATIONS**

2. My qualifications are set forth in my curriculum vitae, a copy of which is included as Exhibit 2005. A summary of my qualifications follows.

3. I am a professor in Electrical and Computer Engineering at the Georgia Institute of Technology (“Georgia Tech”). I have worked in the area of digital signal processing, wireless communications, computer engineering, integrated circuit design, and software engineering for over 25 years, and have authored, co-authored, or edited several books and numerous peer-reviewed technical papers in these area.

4. I obtained my Ph.D. in Electrical Engineering and Computer Science at the University of California, Berkeley, in 1989. While there, I received the

# 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.