

Filed: May 28, 2021

Filed on behalf of:

Patent Owner Masimo Corporation  
By: Joseph R. Re (Reg. No. 31,291)  
Stephen W. Larson (Reg. No. 69,133)  
Jarom D. Kesler (Reg. No. 57,046)  
Jacob L. Peterson (Reg. No. 65,096)  
William R. Zimmerman (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Jeremiah S. Helm, Ph.D. (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP  
2040 Main Street, Fourteenth Floor  
Irvine, CA 92614  
Tel.: (949) 760-0404  
Fax: (949) 760-9502  
E-mail: AppleIPR2020-1520-265@knobbe.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE INC.

Petitioner,

v.

MASIMO CORPORATION,

Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2020-01520  
U.S. Patent 10,258,265

---

**PATENT OWNER RESPONSE**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   | Page No. |
|---|----------|
| I. INTRODUCTION .....   | 1        |
| II. MASIMO'S PIONEERING TECHNOLOGY .....  | 4        |
| A. The '265 Patent .....  | 4        |
| B. Introduction To Independent Claims .....   | 6        |
| C. The '265 Patent Prosecution .....  | 8        |
| III. THE PETITION'S PROPOSED COMBINATIONS.....  | 8        |
| IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....  | 9        |
| V. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....   | 9        |
| VI. LEGAL STANDARD .....  | 10       |
| VII. GROUNDS 1A-1E DO NOT ESTABLISH OBVIOUSNESS.....  | 11       |
| A. Introduction To Ground 1A.....   | 11       |
| 1. Aizawa Uses Peripheral Detectors Around A Single<br>Centrally Located LED .....                | 11       |
| 2. Inokawa Uses Peripheral LEDs Around A Single<br>Centrally Located Detector .....               | 13       |
| 3. Petitioner's Proposed Combination Of Aizawa And<br>Inokawa.....                                | 13       |
| B. Ground 1A Does Not Establish Obviousness .....   | 15       |
| 1. A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated To<br>Combine Inokawa's Lens With Aizawa's Sensor ..... | 15       |
| a) Petitioner Admits Inokawa's Lens Directs<br>Light To The Center Of The Sensor.....             | 15       |

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
**(Cont'd)**

|   | <b>Page No.</b> |
|---|-----------------|
| b) A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated To Direct Light Away From Aizawa's Detectors And Would Have No Reasonable Expectation Of Success When Doing So .....                              | 18              |
| c) Dr. Kenny's New Opinions Are Improper, Contradict His Declaration And Undermine Petitioner's Obviousness Challenge .....   | 22              |
| d) Petitioner's Obviousness Challenge Also Improperly Relies On References Not Identified As Part Of Ground 1A Without An Articulated Motivation To Combine Or Expectation Of Success ..... | 31              |
| 2. Petitioner Identifies No Credible Basis To Add A Second LED To Aizawa .....  | 34              |
| C. The Remaining Challenged Dependent Claims Are Nonobvious Over Ground 1A .....  | 40              |
| D. Ground 1B Fails For The Same Reason As Ground 1A And For Additional Reasons .....  | 40              |
| 1. Ohsaki Does Not Fix The Problems With Petitioner's Proposed Combination .....  | 41              |
| 2. A POSITA Would Have Understood That Ohsaki Would Not Prevent Slippage With Aizawa's Device .....   | 42              |
| E. The Challenged Dependent Claims Are Nonobvious Over Ground 1B .....  | 44              |
| F. Grounds 1C-1E Fail For The Same Reasons As Ground 1A .....   | 44              |
| VIII. GROUNDS 2A-2C DO NOT ESTABLISH OBVIOUSNESS .....  | 44              |

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
**(Cont'd)**

|   | <b>Page No.</b> |
|---|-----------------|
| A. Introduction To Ground 2A.....   | 44              |
| 1. Mendelson-1988 Uses Detectors Around Centrally<br>Located LEDs .....   | 45              |
| 2. Petitioner’s Proposed Combination Of Mendelson-<br>1988 And Inokawa.....   | 46              |
| B. Ground 2A Does Not Establish Obviousness .....   | 47              |
| 1. There Would Have Been No Motivation To Combine<br>And No Reasonable Expectation Of Success .....   | 47              |
| 2. Petitioner’s Proposed Ground 2A Combination Does<br>Not Include The Claimed Cover.....   | 50              |
| 3. The Combination Of Mendelson-1988 And Inokawa<br>Does Not Have The Claimed “Circular Wall” That<br>“Creates A Gap Between The Surface And The Light<br>Permeable Cover” (Claim 3)..... | 53              |
| 4. Mendelson-1999 And Inokawa Do Not Have A<br>“Circular” Wall (Claim 3) Or “Circular Housing<br>With A Raised Edge” (Claim 26) .....   | 56              |
| 5. The Petition Improperly Relies On References Not<br>Identified As Part Of Ground 2A With No Analysis<br>Of Any Motivation To Combine.....  | 58              |
| C. The Challenged Dependent Claims Are Nonobvious Over<br>Ground 2A .....   | 60              |
| D. Grounds 2B-2C Fail For The Same Reason As Ground 2A .....  | 60              |
| IX. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS.....  | 61              |
| X. CONCLUSION.....  | 61              |

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Page No(s).

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns</i><br>694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....             | 10         |
| <i>CFMT, Inc. v. YieldUp Int'l Corp.</i> ,<br>349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....                        | 10         |
| <i>In re Fritch</i> ,<br>972 F.2d 1260 (Fed. Cir. 1992) .....   | 40, 44, 60 |
| <i>In re Gordon</i> ,<br>733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984) .....  | 11         |
| <i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> ,<br>821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016) ..... | 32         |
| <i>InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGo Commc'ns, Inc.</i> ,<br>751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....               | 57         |
| <i>K/S HIMPP v. Hear-Wear Technologies, LLC</i> ,<br>751 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....                 | 59         |
| <i>Kennametal, Inc. v. Ingersoll Cutting Tool Co.</i> ,<br>780 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....           | 44         |
| <i>In re Kotzab</i> ,<br>217 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....   | 10         |
| <i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> ,<br>654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....  | 11         |
| <i>Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.</i> ,<br>520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....           | 11         |
| <i>Personal Web Technologies, LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> ,<br>848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....             | 26, 27, 28 |
| <i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> ,<br>415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) ( <i>en banc</i> ) .....                 | 9          |

# 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.