

EXHIBIT 32

REDACTED VERSION

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TEXARKANA DIVISION**

MAXELL, LTD.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 5:19-cv-00036-RWS

**OPENING EXPERT REPORT OF DR. JOSEPH A. PARADISO REGARDING
INVALIDITY OF U.S. PATENT NOS. 6,748,317, 6,580,999, 6,430,498**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Qualifications.....	2
B. Previous Testimony	8
C. Materials Considered	8
D. Compensation	10
II. SUMMARY OF OPINIONS	10
III. RELEVANT LEGAL STANDARDS	11
A. Invalidity	11
B. Invention Date / Priority Date.....	11
C. Anticipation.....	13
D. Obviousness	14
E. Claim Construction	17
F. Patent-Eligibility	18
IV. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND	20
A. Navigation In Ancient Times.....	20
B. Annotating Maps With Direction Information	22
C. Compasses, Gyroscopes and Accelerometers.....	26
D. Early Electronic Navigation And Coordination Among Devices.....	30
E. Navigation Using GPS.....	33
F. Portable GPS Navigation Systems And Displays In The 1990s.....	37
G. Personal Handyphone System.....	41
V. BACKGROUND ON THE ASSERTED PATENTS	43
A. Overview Of The Asserted Patents.....	43
B. Prosecution Histories Of The Asserted Patents	48
1. '498 Patent Prosecution History	48
2. '999 Patent Prosecution History	49
3. '317 Patent Prosecution History	49
C. The Asserted Claims	50
1. '317 Patent - Claims 1, 17 (15).....	50
2. '999 Patent - Claim 3 (1)	51

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
3. '498 Patent - Claims 3 (1), 13 (10)	51
D. Claim Construction	52
1. Agreed Constructions.....	52
2. Parties' Proposed Claim Constructions And Court's Claim Constructions	53
E. Priority Date.....	54
F. Level Of Ordinary Skill In The Art	55
VI. INVALIDITY OF THE ASSERTED CLAIMS IN VIEW OF PRIOR ART	56
A. Summary Of Prior Art References.....	56
1. Cyberguide System (“Cyberguide”) And Related Publication, Cyberguide: A Mobile Context-Aware Tour Guide by Abowd et al. (“Abowd”)...	56
2. Garmin NavTalk (“NavTalk”)	62
3. Japanese Patent Publication No. JPH10-197277 to Maruyama et al. (“Maruyama”)...	73
4. U.S. Patent No. 6,067,502 to Hayashida et al. (“Hayashida”)	76
B. Obviousness: Combinations And Motivations To Combine	81
1. Summary Of Combinations And Motivations To Combine	81
2. NavTalk, In View Of Maruyama	84
3. NavTalk, In View Of Hayashida	103
4. Hayashida, In View Of Maruyama	114
5. Cyberguide Or Abowd, In View Of Hayashida.....	121
C. Secondary Considerations Of Non-Obviousness.....	138
VII. PATENT-ELIGIBILITY OF THE ASSERTED CLAIMS	145
VIII. CONCLUSION.....	155

[REDACTED]

these familiar elements, disclosed and/or embodied in the prior art listed above, to practice the asserted claims.

167. Below is a listing of combinations of references that would render obvious the Asserted Claims. I reserve the right to modify my identification of combinations to the extent that Maxell's opening expert report on infringement adopts claim interpretations that differ from those in Maxell's infringement contentions and in the Court's claim construction order.

- NavTalk, in view of Maruyama (all Asserted Claims)
- NavTalk, in view of Hayashida (all Asserted Claims)⁴⁰
- Hayashida, in view of Maruyama (all Asserted Claims)
- Cyberguide, in view of Hayashida (all Asserted Claims)⁴¹

168. Details of how these combinations would be formed and reasons for their combination are described below.

2. NavTalk, In View Of Maruyama

169. A PHOSITA would have found it obvious and been motivated to modify NavTalk with the teachings of Maruyama. As detailed below, both references are directed to portable navigation devices with GPS capability and date from the same time period. To the extent NavTalk does not disclose either (1) a compass, gyroscope, or other component that qualifies as a "device for getting a direction information denoting an orientation of said portable terminal" under the Court's construction of that term or (2) a PHS as required by the Court's constructions of "a device for getting a location information of another portable terminal" and "a device for

⁴⁰ This combination applies under Maxell's apparent and broad interpretation that any mobile device is an equivalent to a PHS.

⁴¹ This combination applies under Maxell's apparent and broad interpretation that any mobile device is an equivalent to a PHS.