

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE INC.

Petitioner,

v.

MASIMO CORPORATION,

Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2020-01539  
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 .....	11
	C. Obviousness.....	12
IV.	INTRODUCTION TO MASIMO’S ’554 PATENT.....	13
	A. The ’554 Patent .....	13
	B. Introduction To The Independent Claims Of The ’554 Patent .....	14
V.	THE PETITION’S PROPOSED COMBINATIONS.....	17
VI.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	18
VII.	FOUNDATIONS 1 AND 2 DO NOT ESTABLISH OBVIOUSNESS.....	19
	A. Introduction To Ground 1 .....	19
	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 .....	19
	2. The Shape Of Ohsaki’s Board .....	21
	3. Aizawa Discloses A Circular Pulse Sensor .....	24
	4. Ground 1’s Proposed Motivation To Combine Four References .....	25

B.	A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated To Combine Ohsaki’s Board With Aizawa’s Sensor .....	29
1.	A POSITA Would Have Understood That Ohsaki’s Rectangular Board Would Not Work With Aizawa’s Circular Sensor Arrangement .....	31
2.	A POSITA Would Have Understood That Ohsaki’s Board Would Have Been Detrimental In Combination With Aizawa’s Sensor Because Ohsaki’s Board “Has A Tendency To Slip” At Aizawa’s Measurement Location On The Palm Side Of The Wrist, Near The Artery.....	40
3.	A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated To Reduce The Measured Optical Signal By Adding A Convex Lens To Aizawa’s Sensor.....	56
4.	A POSITA Would Not Have Selected A Convex Cover To Protect The Sensor’s Optical Elements .....	65
C.	Dr. Kenny Does Not Identify Any Viable Motivation To Add A Second Emitter To Aizawa’s Multi-Detector/Single Emitter Embodiment .....	67
D.	Dr. Kenny’s Motivation To Add Mendelson 2006 Undermines His Motivation To Add A Second Emitter In The Proposed Combination .....	75
E.	Dr. Kenny Does Not Provide Evidence Of An Expectation Of Success .....	78
F.	The Challenged Dependent Claims Are Nonobvious Over Ground 1 .....	79
1.	The Challenged Dependent Claims Are Nonobvious For The Same Reason As The Independent Claims .....	79
2.	Claim 28.....	79

VIII. GROUND 2 FAILS FOR AT LEAST THE SAME REASONS AS GROUND 1 .....82

    A. Claim 11 .....82

    B. Claim 13 .....83

    C. Claim 17 .....84

IX. OATH .....85

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 1-28 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.