

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.

Petitioner,

v.

MASIMO CORPORATION,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2020-01538
U.S. Patent 10,588,554

DECLARATION OF VIJAY K. MADISETTI, PH.D.

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	12
	C. Obviousness.....	12
IV.	INTRODUCTION TO MASIMO’S ’554 PATENT.....	14
	A. The ’554 Patent	14
	B. Introduction To The Independent Claims Of The ’554 Patent	15
V.	THE PETITION’S PROPOSED COMBINATION.....	18
VI.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	18
VII.	GROUND 1 DOES NOT ESTABLISH OBVIOUSNESS	20
	A. Introduction To Ground 1	20
	1. Ohsaki Discloses A Pulse Rate Sensor With A Single Emitter And A Single Detector That Must Be Arranged Linearly On The Back Side Of The Wrist	20
	2. The Shape Of Ohsaki’s Board	21
	3. Mendelson ’799 Discloses A Circular Oxygen Saturation Sensor	24
	4. Petitioner’s Proposed Combination Of Ohsaki And Mendelson ’799.....	25

5.	Petitioner’s Proposed Motivation To Combine Ohsaki And Mendelson ’799	30
6.	Petitioner’s Proposed Addition Of A Third Reference—Schulz.....	31
7.	Petitioner’s Proposed Addition Of A Fourth Reference—Mendelson 2006.....	31
B.	A POSITA Would Have Understood That Ohsaki’s Rectangular Board Does Not Work With Mendelson ’799’s Radially Symmetric Circular Sensor Arrangement.....	32
1.	A POSITA Would Have Believed That Modifying Ohsaki’s Rectangular Board Would Eliminate The Advantages Ohsaki Teaches	32
2.	A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated To Add A Rectangular Board To Mendelson ’799’s Circular Sensor	39
C.	A POSITA Would Have Understood That Ohsaki’s Required Measurement Location Would Result In Weak Signals For Mendelson ’799’s Oxygen Saturation Measurements	44
D.	A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated To Adversely Impact The Optical Signal By Adding A Convex Lens To Mendelson ’799’s Sensor	49
1.	A POSITA Would Have Understood That A Convex Cover Directs Light To The Center Of The Sensor And Away From The Periphery	50
2.	A POSITA Would Have Sought To Avoid The Air Gaps Introduced By Ohsaki’s Rectangular Board.....	53
3.	A POSITA Would Not Have Selected A Convex Cover To Protect The Optical Elements	55

E.	A POSITA Would Not Have Decreased Signal Strength By Adding A Window Taught By Schulz.....	57
F.	Mendelson 2006, The Fourth Reference In The Combination, Further Undermines The Combination Of Ohsaki, Mendelson '799, and Schulz	65
G.	Dr. Kenny Does Not Provide Evidence Of An Expectation Of Success	68
H.	The Challenged Dependent Claims In Ground 1	69
1.	The Challenged Dependent Claims Are Not Obvious For The Same Reasons As The Independent Claims	69
2.	Claims 6 and 25.....	69
3.	Claim 28	72
VIII.	OATH	76

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 1-7 and 20-28 of U.S. Patent No. 10,588,554 (“the ’554 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.