

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent of: Poeze et al.  
U.S. Patent No.: 10,292,628 Attorney Docket No.: 50095-00008IP1  
Issue Date: May 21, 2019  
Appl. Serial No.: 16/261,326  
Filing Date: January 29, 2019  
Title: MULTI-STREAM DATA COLLECTION SYSTEM FOR  
NONINVASIVE MEASUREMENT OF BLOOD  
CONSTITUENTS

**SECOND DECLARATION OF DR. THOMAS W. KENNY**

**Declaration**

I declare that all statements made herein on my own knowledge are true 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 under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code.

Dated: September 29, 2021 By: 

Thomas W. Kenny, Ph.D.

## Contents

I. GROUND 1A-1D RENDER OBVIOUS THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS.....	3
A. Inokawa’s lens enhances the light-gathering ability of Aizawa.....	3
B. A POSITA would have been motivated to add a second LED to Aizawa.....	31
C. A POSITA would have been motivated to modify Aizawa in view of Ohsaki to include a convex protrusion .....	33
II. GROUND 2A-2B RENDER OBVIOUS THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ...	36
A. A POSITA would have been motivated to modify Mendelson-1988 in view of Inokawa to add a lens.....	36
B. Mendelson-1988 in view of Inokawa includes the claimed cover.....	37
C. Mendelson-1988 in view of Inokawa renders obvious a “circular housing” .	40
D. Nishikawa is a supporting reference .....	40
III. CONCLUSION.....	41

1. This Declaration further expands the conclusions that I have formed based on my analysis, in addition to those provided in my first declaration (APPLE-1003, which is incorporated herein by reference in its entirety; “Original Declaration”). Consistent with my findings provided in my Original Declaration, and based upon my knowledge and experience and my review of the prior art publications listed above, a POSITA would have found that claims 1-30 (“the Challenged Claims”) of the ’628 patent are rendered obvious by at least the combination of as set forth in my Original Declaration.

## **I. GROUNDS 1A-1D RENDER OBVIOUS THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS**

2. As I further clarify below in response to Patent Owner’s arguments, claims 1-15, 17, 20-26, and 28 are rendered obvious by the combination of Aizawa and Inokawa (Ground 1A). For additional reasons as explained below, those same claims are further rendered obvious by the combination of Aizawa, Inokawa, and Ohsaki (Ground 1B).

### **A. Inokawa’s lens enhances the light-gathering ability of Aizawa**

3. As I previously explained in the Original Declaration, Inokawa *very generally* describes a “lens [that] makes it possible to increase the light-gathering ability” of a reflectance type pulse sensor, APPLE-1008, [0015], [0058], FIG. 2,

and, based on this disclosure, a POSITA would have been motivated to incorporate “an Inokawa-like lens into the cover of Aizawa to increase the light collection efficiency...” APPLE-1003, ¶¶91-96. In a significant extrapolation from the very simple and purely illustrative description in Inokawa, Patent Owner provides two incorrect arguments. First, Patent Owner claims that Inokawa’s disclosure is narrowly-limited to a particular lens that somehow is only capable of operation with peripheral emitters and a central detector. Second, the Patent Owner claims that the lens of Inokawa directs all incoming light rays “to the center of the sensor” and would “direct light *away* from the *periphery*-located detectors as in Aizawa,” regardless of the direction of light propagation of each ray, which is a violation of elementary laws of light propagation that would be familiar to a POSITA. POR, 16, 20; *see also* APPLE-1041, 40:4-11 (“...as I describe in my Declaration...if you have a convex surface...*all light reflected* or otherwise would be condensed or directed towards the center.”). Based on these two incorrect claims, the Patent Owner insists that there would be no motivation to combine.

4. Patent Owner’s misinformed understanding of Inokawa’s lens as well as lenses in general is demonstrated by their description of Inokawa’s lens 27 as “focus[ing] light from LEDs (21, 23)...*to a single detector (25) in the center*” and “direct[ing] incoming light *to the centrally located detector.*” POR, 14; *see also* APPLE-1042, 170:12-20 (“To be precise, my opinion is that...Inokawa’s convex

lens 27...would redirect light from the...measurement site towards the center.”); *see also* APPLE-1041, 40:4-11 (“...as I describe in my Declaration...if you have a convex surface...**all light** reflected or otherwise would be condensed or directed towards the center.”).

5. A correct understanding of Inokawa’s lens as well as of reflectance type pulse sensors in general (like those disclosed by each of Aizawa, Inokawa, and Mendelson-1988) readily exposes Patent Owner’s flawed rationale. Indeed, as I noted during deposition, a POSITA would understand that Inokawa’s lens generally improves “light concentration at pretty much all of the locations under the curvature of the lens,” as opposed to only at a single point at the center as asserted by Patent Owner. Ex. 2006, 164:8-16.

6. Among other things, because Inokawa is a reflectance-type pulse detector that receives diffuse, backscattered light from the measurement site, its lens cannot focus all incoming light at a single point. Ex. 2006, 163:12-164:2 (“A lens in general, when placed in the view of a diffuse optical source, doesn’t produce a single focal point.”). Indeed, as I previously explained, “light entering and returning from the tissue will follow many different random paths,” and there are “variations in the path associated with the randomness of the scattering.” Ex. 2020, ¶128. Reflectance type pulse detectors and oximeters, as in each of Aizawa, Inokawa, and Mendelson-1988, work in this manner, by detecting light that has

# 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.