

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

FITBIT, INC.  
Petitioner

v.

VALENCELL, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF  
U.S. PATENT NO. 8,923,941**

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Page No.</u>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Identification of Challenge (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)).....	8
A. Statutory Grounds for the Challenge.....	8
B. Citation of Prior Art.....	9
C. The '941 Patent.....	11
D. Overview .....	11
E. Summary of the Prosecution History .....	11
F. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	13
G. Claim Construction.....	13
1. “physiological information” .....	13
2. [This section intentionally omitted] .....	14
3. [This section intentionally omitted] .....	14
III. Ground 1: Claims 1–2, 9, and 11-13 are unpatentable under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Luo in view of Craw.....	15
A. Overview of Luo.....	15
B. Overview of Craw .....	19
C. Claim 1 .....	22
D. Claim 2 .....	26
E. [This section intentionally omitted] .....	27
F. Claim 9 .....	27
G. Claim 11 .....	27
H. Claim 12 .....	27
I. Claim 13 .....	27
IV. Ground 2: [This section intentionally omitted] .....	28
V. Ground 3: Claims 6 and 8 are unpatentable under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Luo in view of Craw and Fricke.....	28
A. Overview of Fricke.....	29
B. Rationale to Combine the Teachings of Luo, Craw, and Fricke.....	33

*Petition for Inter Partes Review of  
U.S. Patent No. 8,923,941*

VI.	Ground 4: Claim 7 is unpatentable under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Luo in view of Craw, Fricke, and Comtois.....	35
	A. Overview of Comtois .....	36
	B. Rationale to Combine the Teachings of Luo, Craw, Fricke, and Comtois.....	39
VII.	Ground 5: Claim 10 is unpatentable under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Luo in view of Craw and Aceti.....	39
	A. Overview of Aceti .....	40
	B. Rationale to Combine the Teachings of Luo, Craw, and Aceti .....	41
VIII.	Ground 6: Claims 1, 2, 9, and 11–12 are unpatentable under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mault in view of Al-Ali. ....	42
	A. Overview of Mault .....	42
	B. Overview of Al-Ali.....	44
	C. Claim 1 .....	46
	D. Claim 2 .....	51
	E. Claim 9 .....	52
	F. Claim 11 .....	52
	G. Claim 12 .....	53
IX.	Ground 7: [This section intentionally omitted] .....	53
X.	Ground 8: [This section intentionally omitted] .....	53
XI.	Ground 9: Claims 6–8 are unpatentable under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mault in view of Al-Ali, and Han.....	53
	A. Overview of Han .....	53
	B. Rationale to combine the teachings of Mault, Al-Ali, and Han.....	56
XII.	Ground 10: Claim 10 is unpatentable under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mault in view of Al-Ali and Numaga.....	56
	A. Overview of Numaga .....	57
	B. Rationale to Combine the Teachings of Mault, Al-Ali, and Numaga.....	58
XIII.	Ground 11: Claim 13 is unpatentable under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mault in view of Al-Ali and Ali. ....	58
	A. Overview of Ali.....	59

*Petition for Inter Partes Review of  
U.S. Patent No. 8,923,941*

B. Rationale to Combine the Teachings of Mault, Al-Ali, and Ali .....60  
XIV. Conclusion .....60  
XV. Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)).....62  
XVI. Mandatory Notices (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1)).....62

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Agrizap, Inc. v. Woodstream Corp.</i> , 520 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	69
<i>Anderson’s-Black Rock, Inc. v. Pavement Salvage Co.</i> , 396 U.S. 57 (1969).....	30, 47
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , ___ US ___, 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	13
<i>Dann v. Johnston</i> , 425 U.S. 219 (1976).....	54, 56
<i>Great Atl. &amp; P. Tea Co. v. Supermarket Equip. Corp.</i> , 340 U.S. 147 (1950).....	71
<i>In re Am. Acad. Of Sci. Tech Ctr.</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	13
<i>In re Nilssen</i> , 851 F.2d 1401 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....	67
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	passim
<i>Perfect Web Tech., Inc. v. InfoUSA, Inc.</i> , 587 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	54
<i>Sakraida v. AG Pro, Inc.</i> , 425 U.S. 273 (1976).....	30
<b>STATUTES</b>	
35 U.S.C. § 103(a) .....	passim
<b>OTHER AUTHORITIES</b>	
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....	13
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b) .....	8

# 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.