

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FITBIT, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

VALENCELL, INC.,
Patent Owner

IPR2017-00319
U.S. Patent No. 8,923,941

PETITIONER'S OPENING BRIEF ON REMAND

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Technical Background.....	1
III. Procedural Background	2
IV. Claims 3-5 Are Obvious From Luo, Craw and Wolf	4
A. Claim 1 Has Already Been Found Invalid Based on Luo and Craw	4
B. Claim 3 Is Rendered Obvious by Luo and Craw	5
C. Claims 4-5 Are Rendered Obvious by Luo, Craw, and Wolf.....	8
V. Claim 3 Is Obvious in View of Mault, Al-Ali, and Lee.....	9
VI. Conclusion	10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

Accenture Global Servs., GmbH v. Guidewire Software, Inc.,
728 F.3d 1336 (Fed Cir. 2013)4

Fitbit, Inc. v. Valencell, Inc.,
964 F.3d 1112 (Fed. Cir. 2020) 3, 6, 10

MaxLinear, Inc. v. CF CRESPE LLC,
880 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2018)5

SAS Inst., Inc. v. Iancu,
138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018).....2

I. Introduction

This IPR is the last one remaining from a series of IPRs filed by Apple Inc. (“Apple”) and joined by Petitioner Fitbit, Inc. (“Fitbit”). In every other IPR, this Board found the claims of Patent Owner Valencell, Inc. (“Valencell”) unpatentable, and the Federal Circuit has since affirmed the Board’s decisions. Even in this IPR, the Board issued a final written decision finding claims 1-2 and 6-13 of U.S. Patent No. 8,923,941 (“’941 patent”) unpatentable. Valencell did not appeal that decision.

Dependent claims 3-5 add little to the subject matter already found obvious and invalid in claim 1. Indeed, Valencell never previously argued these claims were patentable for any reason other than their dependency on claim 1, and the Board concluded that Fitbit’s prior art discloses the limitations recited in claim 3 in a separate IPR on claims 14-21 of the ’941 patent. In view of the petitioned grounds, the Board should find claims 3-5 invalid.

II. Technical Background

The ’941 patent is directed to processing signals from a PPG sensor and a motion sensor into serial data output containing physiological and motion information. ’941 patent at Abstract. This physiological information may include heart rate, and the motion information may include current running speed. *Id.* at 23:49-54, 23:63-66. Claim 1 of the ’941 patent, which has already been invalidated, is directed to this core concept. Dependent claims 3-5 recite further

limitations related to the organization and use of the serial data output:

3. The method of claim 1, wherein the serial data output is parsed out such that an application-specific interface (API) can utilize the physiological information and motion-related information for an application.

4. The method of claim [3], wherein the application is configured to generate statistical relationships between subject physiological parameters and subject physical activity parameters in the physiological information and motion-related information.

5. The method of claim 4, wherein the application is configured to generate statistical relationships between subject physiological parameters and subject physical activity parameters via at least one of the following: principal component analysis, multiple linear regression, machine learning, and Bland-Altman plots.

III. Procedural Background

Apple Inc. (“Apple”) challenged claims 1-13 of the ’941 patent in its original IPR petition. Paper 2. The Board instituted this IPR on claims 1-2 and 6-13 after disagreeing with Apple’s proposed construction for “application-specific interface (API)” in claim 3 and its attempt to resolve the dependency of claims 4-5. Paper 10. Fitbit later joined the instituted IPR. IPR2017-01555, Paper 9.

After oral arguments were already held for this IPR, the Supreme Court issued its decision in *SAS Inst., Inc. v. Iancu*, 138 S. Ct. 1348, 1358 (2018). In response, the Board added dependent claims 3-5 to the IPR and authorized additional briefing on this subject. Paper 39. Petitioners explained in this briefing

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.