

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

VALVE CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

IMMERSION CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

Case No. TBD

Patent No. 8,749,507

**DECLARATION OF JEAN RENARD WARD
IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR
INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,749,507**

Valve Exhibit 1003 Valve v. Immersion
--

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
A.	Engagement	1
B.	Background and Qualifications	2
C.	Bases of My Opinions and Materials Considered.....	9
D.	My Understanding of Patent Law	10
1.	Legal Standard for Anticipation.....	12
2.	Legal Standards of Obviousness	13
II.	DESCRIPTION OF THE RELEVANT FIELD AND THE RELEVANT TIME FRAME.....	16
III.	PERSON HAVING ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	17
IV.	PRIMARY REFERENCES CONSIDERED	19
V.	SUMMARY OF MY OPINIONS	20
VI.	TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND.....	20
A.	An Overview of Touchpads and Similar Devices.....	20
B.	An Overview of Haptics.....	31
VII.	THE '507 PATENT.....	37
A.	'507 Patent Embodiments.....	37
B.	Challenged Claims.....	40
C.	Prosecution History	41
D.	Apple IPRs.....	46
VIII.	CLAIM INTERPRETATION	47
A.	“determining a press if... a first interval has elapsed”.....	47
1.	Claim language.....	48
2.	Specification.....	49
a.	Fig. 2 Embodiment.....	49
b.	Fig. 3 Embodiment.....	52
B.	ITC Constructions	56
IX.	UNPATENTABILITY ANALYSIS	57

A. Ground 1: Astala+Shahoian Renders Obvious Claims 1-18.....	58
1. Astala.....	58
2. Shahoian	60
3. Reasons to Combine Astala and Shahoian.....	61
4. Claim 1	70
a. 1[PRE]: “A method comprising:”	70
b. [1A]: “receiving contact data from an input device”	70
i. Claim Terms	70
(1) “input device”	70
(2) “contact data”	70
ii. Astala+Shahoian meets [1A].	71
c. [1B]: “determining an interaction with a displayed object on a screen based on the contact data”	72
d. [1C]: “responsive to determining the interaction, determining a gesture based on the contact data comprising”	72
e. [1D]: “determining a pressure and a change in pressure based on the contact data”	74
i. “determining a pressure”	74
ii. “determining... a change in pressure”	74
f. [1E]: “determining a press if”	75
g. [1E1]: “the pressure is greater than a pressure threshold”	75
h. [1E2]: “the change in pressure is greater than a change in pressure threshold”	76
i. Astala+Shahoian Determining Whether a Pressure Reduction Exceeds a Threshold Meets [1E2].....	76
ii. Obvious To Add A Pressure-Change Determination to Astala’s Step 710.	79
i. [1E3]: “a first interval has elapsed”	80
i. Astala+Shahoian Meets [1E3] Under the Proper Construction.....	80

ii.	An Obvious Modification of Astala+Shahoian Meets The IPR2016-01777 Construction.....	81
j.	[1F]: “responsive to determining the gesture, outputting a haptic effect.”	82
5.	Claim 2	83
a.	Pseudo pressure.....	83
b.	Actual pressure.....	84
6.	Claim 3	85
7.	Claim 4	85
8.	Claim 5	85
9.	Claim 6	87
10.	Claim 7	88
a.	Preamble.....	88
b.	Limitation [7A]	88
c.	Limitation [7B]	89
d.	Limitation [7C]	90
11.	Claim 8	90
12.	Claim 9.	92
a.	Astala+Shahoian Uses Non-Transitory CRM With Program Code Executed by a Processor.	92
b.	Astala+Shahoia’s Program Code Causes a Processor to Perform [9A]-[9F]’s Method Steps.....	94
13.	Claims 10-13.	94
14.	Claim 14.	95
a.	Astala+Shahoian’s System Has a Processor and CRM	95
b.	Astala+Shahoia’s Processor is Configured to Perform [14C]-[14H].....	95
15.	Claims 15-18.	96
B.	Ground 2: Keely+Kolmykov-Zotov Renders Obvious Claims 1, 6- 9, 13-14, and 18.	96
1.	Keely.....	96

2. Kolmykov-Zotov	97
3. Keely+Kolmykov-Zotov	98
a. Reasons to combine	98
b. Reasonable expectation of success	100
c. Keely+Kolmykov-Zotov	101
4. Claim 1	101
a. Preamble.....	101
b. Limitation [1A]	102
c. Limitation [1B]	103
d. Limitation [1C]	105
e. Limitation [1D]	105
f. Limitation [1E].....	108
g. Limitations [1E1]-[1E2].....	109
i. Pressure	110
ii. Pressure change.....	113
h. Limitation [1E3].....	114
i. Determining a Press ([1E]-[1E3]).....	115
(1) Keely+Kolmykov-Zotov Meets the Proper Construction.....	115
(2) Keely+Kolmykov-Zotov Meets a Narrower Construction.....	116
j. Limitation [1F]	118
5. Claim 6	119
6. Claim 7	120
a. Preamble.....	120
b. Limitation [7A]	121
c. Limitations [7B]-[7C]	122
7. Claim 8	123
a. “filter”	123
b. Keely+Kolmykov-Zotov meets claim 8.	123

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.