

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.
Petitioner

v.

VALENCELL, INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2017-00321
U.S. Patent No. 8,923,941

**PETITIONER APPLE INC.'S OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE SUBMITTED
WITH PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Petitioner Apple Inc. (“Apple”) hereby objects under the Federal Rules of Evidence (“FRE”) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.62 to Exhibits 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008 (the “Challenged Exhibits”) cited in Valencell, Inc.’s Patent Owner Preliminary Response (Paper 6). Petitioner timely objects within the allowed ten business days of the June 6, 2017 Institution of the Trial in this matter under 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1). Apple files and serves Valencell with these objections to provide notice that Apple may move to exclude the Challenged Exhibits under 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c).

I. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGED EXHIBITS AND GROUNDS FOR OBJECTIONS

1. Valencell Exhibit 2001: Skip West, Valencell and RapidSOS Honored with CTA’s 2016 Innovation Entrepreneur Awards

Apple objects to this document as irrelevant under FRE 401 and thus inadmissible under FRE 402 because it does not relate to a fact that is of consequence in determining the action, and also is dated too far past the relevant date as to be probative. Apple also objects to this document as prejudicial, confusing, and potentially misleading under FRE 403 because this document is not relevant to any issue in this proceeding, such as patentability of the subject matter, broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims, or obviousness of the claims in view of the prior art, and also appears to be incomplete.

To the extent Valencell relies on the contents of this document for the truth of the matter asserted, Apple objects to such contents as inadmissible hearsay under FRE 801 and 802 that does not fall under any exception.

Apple objects to this document as not properly authenticated under FRE 901 because Valencell has not presented any evidence that the document is authentic or that the document is self-authenticating under FRE 902.

2. **Valencell Exhibit 2002: Biometrics Lab: Performance of Leading Optical Heart Rate Monitors During Interval Exercise Conditions**

Apple objects to this document as irrelevant under FRE 401 and thus inadmissible under FRE 402 because it does not relate to a fact that is of consequence in determining the action, and also is dated too far past the relevant date as to be probative. Apple also objects to this document as prejudicial, confusing, and potentially misleading under FRE 403 because this document is not relevant to any issue in this proceeding, such as patentability of the subject matter, broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims, or obviousness of the claims in view of the prior art, and because the document was created by a biased party.

To the extent Valencell relies on the contents of this document for the truth of the matter asserted, Apple objects to such contents as inadmissible hearsay under FRE 801 and 802 that does not fall under any exception.

Apple objects to this document as not properly authenticated under FRE 901 because Valencell has not presented any evidence that the document is authentic or that the document is self-authenticating under FRE 902.

**3. Valencell Exhibit 2003: Valencell Website
(<http://valencell.com/customers/>)**

Apple objects to this document as irrelevant under FRE 401 and thus inadmissible under FRE 402 because it does not relate to a fact that is of consequence in determining the action, and also is dated too far past the relevant date as to be probative. Apple also objects to this document as prejudicial, confusing, and potentially misleading under FRE 403 because this document is not relevant to any issue in this proceeding, such as patentability of the subject matter, broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims, or obviousness of the claims in view of the prior art, and because the document was created by a biased party.

To the extent Valencell relies on the contents of this document for the truth of the matter asserted, Apple objects to such contents as inadmissible hearsay under FRE 801 and 802 that does not fall under any exception.

Apple objects to this document as not properly authenticated under FRE 901 because Valencell has not presented any evidence that the document is authentic or that the document is self-authenticating under FRE 902.

4. **Valencell Exhibit 2004: Electrical (ECG) vs. Optical-based (PPG) Biosensors in Wearable Devices**

Apple objects to this document as irrelevant under FRE 401 and thus inadmissible under FRE 402 because it does not relate to a fact that is of consequence in determining the action, and also is dated too far past the relevant date as to be probative. Apple also objects to this document as prejudicial, confusing, and potentially misleading under FRE 403 because this document is not relevant to any issue in this proceeding, such as patentability of the subject matter, broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims, or obviousness of the claims in view of the prior art.

To the extent Valencell relies on the contents of this document for the truth of the matter asserted, Apple objects to such contents as inadmissible hearsay under FRE 801 and 802 that does not fall under any exception.

Apple objects to this document as not properly authenticated under FRE 901 because Valencell has not presented any evidence that the document is authentic or that the document is self-authenticating under FRE 902.

5. **Valencell Exhibit 2005: Estimating Respiratory and Heart Rates from the Correntropy Spectral Density of the Photoplethysmogram**

Apple objects to this document as irrelevant under FRE 401 and thus inadmissible under FRE 402 because it is dated too far past the relevant date as to be probative.

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.