

Filed on behalf of Apple Inc.

By: Michelle K. Holoubek
Mark J. Consilvio
Michael D. Specht
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC
1100 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C.
Tel: (202) 371-2600
Fax: (202) 371-2540

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.
Petitioner

v.

VALENCELL, INC.
Patent Owner

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,888,701**

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

I. Introduction..... 1

II. Identification of challenge (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)).....6

 A. Statutory grounds6

 B. Citation of prior art.....7

III. The '701 Patent.....8

 A. Overview8

 B. Summary of the prosecution history10

 C. Level of ordinary skill in the art.....11

 D. Claim construction11

 1. “monitoring”13

 2. “housing”13

 3. “within an ear”14

 4. “physiological”15

 5. “optical filter”15

 6. “modulated”16

IV. Ground 1: Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 14 are unpatentable under pre-AIA 35
U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ahmed in view of Kimura.17

 A. Overview of Ahmed17

 B. Overview of Kimura.....20

 C. Claim 124

[1.P] A monitoring apparatus24

[1.1] a housing configured to be positioned within an ear of a subject25

[1.2] a sensor module disposed within the housing26

*[1.2.1] a printed circuit board (PCB) having opposite first and second
sides27*

*[1.2.2] an optical emitter attached to the first side of the PCB, wherein the
optical emitter directs modulated electromagnetic radiation at a
target region of the ear.....28*

*Petition for Inter Partes Review of
U.S. Patent No. 8,888,701*

<i>[1.2.3] an optical detector attached to the first side of the PCB adjacent to the optical emitter.....</i>	<i>30</i>
<i>[1.2.4] wherein the optical detector detects an energy response signal from the subject that is associated with a physiological condition of the subject.....</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>[1.2.5] an optical filter overlying at least a portion of the optical detector</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>[1.2.6] wherein the optical filter attenuates time-varying environmental light interference at one or more selected wavelengths from the energy response signal</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>[1.2.7] wherein the time-varying environmental light interference is caused by sunlight and/or ambient light</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>[1.2.8] at least one processor that controls operations of the optical emitter and/or optical detector.....</i>	<i>35</i>
Rationale to Combine the Teachings of Ahmed and Kimura.....	36
D. Claim 2	37
E. Claim 5	40
F. Claim 6	42
G. Claim 14	44
V. Ground 2: Claim 3 is unpatentable under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ahmed in view of Kimura and in further view of LeBoeuf.....	45
A. Overview of LeBoeuf.....	45
B. Claim 3	46
VI. Ground 3: Claims 4, 8, and 13 are unpatentable under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ahmed in view of Kimura and in further view of O’Neil.	47
A. Overview of O’Neil.....	47
B. Claim 4	49
C. Claim 8	50
D. Claim 13	53
VII. Ground 4: Claim 7 is unpatentable under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ahmed in view of Kimura and in further view of Uenishi.	54

*Petition for Inter Partes Review of
U.S. Patent No. 8,888,701*

A.	Overview of Uenishi	54
B.	Claim 7	56
VIII.	Ground 5: Claims 9-12 are unpatentable under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ahmed in view of Kimura and in further view of Klinghult.	59
A.	Overview of Klinghult	59
B.	Claim 9	60
C.	Claim 10	62
D.	Claim 11	62
E.	Claim 12	66
IX.	Ground 6: Claim 15 is unpatentable under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ahmed in view of Kimura and in further view of Woehrle.	67
A.	Overview of Woehrle	67
B.	Claim 15	69
X.	Conclusion	71
XI.	Grounds for standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a))	71
XII.	Mandatory notices (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1))	71

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Federal Cases

Agrizap, Inc. v. Woodstream Corp.
520 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 47

Anderson’s-Black Rock, Inc. v. Pavement Salvage Co.
396 U.S. 57 (1969)..... passim

Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee
579 U.S. ___, 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016)..... 11

Gardner v. TEC Syst., Inc.
725 F.2d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 1984), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 830 (1984)..... 39

Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc.
909 F.2d 1464 (Fed. Cir. 1990)..... 34

In re Am. Acad. Of Sci. Tech Ctr.
367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004)..... 12

In re ICON Health & Fitness, Inc.
496 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2007)..... 47

In re Nilssen
851 F.2d 1401 (Fed. Cir. 1988)..... passim

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.
550 U.S. 398 (2007)..... passim

Paragon Sols., LLC v. Timex Corp.
566 F.3d 1075 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... 34

Rexnord Indus., LLC v. Kappos
705 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... 39

Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.
357 F.3d 1270 (Fed. Cir. 2004)..... 47

Sakraida v. AG Pro, Inc.
425 U.S. 273 (1976)..... passim

Federal Statutes

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.