

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 grounds .....6

    B. Citation of prior art.....7

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

    A. Overview .....8

    B. Summary of the prosecution history .....10

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

    D. Claim construction .....11

        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 Ahmed .....17

    B. Overview of Kimura.....20

    C. Claim 1 .....24

*[1.P] A monitoring apparatus .....24*

*[1.1] a housing configured to be positioned within an ear of a subject ....25*

*[1.2] a sensor module disposed within the housing .....26*

*[1.2.1] a printed circuit board (PCB) having opposite first and second  
sides .....27*

*[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*

[1.2.3] <i>an optical detector attached to the first side of the PCB adjacent to the optical emitter.....</i>	30
[1.2.4] <i>wherein the optical detector detects an energy response signal from the subject that is associated with a physiological condition of the subject.....</i>	31
[1.2.5] <i>an optical filter overlying at least a portion of the optical detector .....</i>	31
[1.2.6] <i>wherein the optical filter attenuates time-varying environmental light interference at one or more selected wavelengths from the energy response signal .....</i>	33
[1.2.7] <i>wherein the time-varying environmental light interference is caused by sunlight and/or ambient light .....</i>	34
[1.2.8] <i>at least one processor that controls operations of the optical emitter and/or optical detector.....</i>	35
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.