Filed November 5, 2021

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) KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP 2040 Main Street, Fourteenth Floor Irvine, CA 92614 Tel.: (949) 760-0404 Fax: (949) 760-9502 E-mail: AppleIPR2020-1714-765@knobbe.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.

Petitioner,

v.

MASIMO CORPORATION,

Patent Owner.

IPR2020-01714 Patent 10,631,765

MASIMO OBJECTIONS TO ADMISSIBILITY OF APPLE EVIDENCE SERVED WITH APPLE'S REPLY

IPR2020-01714 – Patent 10,631,765 Apple v. Masimo

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b), Patent Owner Masimo Corporation objects as follows to the admissibility of evidence served with Petitioner's reply. Patent Owner reserves the right to: (1) timely file a motion to exclude these objectionable exhibits or portions thereof; (2) challenge the credibility and/or weight that should be afforded to these exhibits, whether or not Patent Owner files a motion to exclude the exhibits; (3) challenge the sufficiency of the evidence to meet Petitioner's burden of proof on any issue, including, without limitation, whether Petitioner met its burden to prove the prior art status of the alleged prior art on which it relies, whether or not Patent Owner has objected to, or files a motion to exclude, the evidence; and (4) cross examine any Petitioner declarant within the scope of his or her direct testimony that relates to these exhibits, without regard to whether Patent Owner has objected to the testimony or related exhibits or whether the testimony or related exhibits are ultimately found to be inadmissible.

Exhibit Number and Description	Objections
Exhibit 1047 Second Declaration of Dr. Thomas W. Kenny	Masimo objects because declarant's testimony improperly relies on new evidence and arguments not presented in connection with Petitioner's petition and does not respond to arguments raised in Patent Owner's responsive papers (37 C.F.R. § 42.23) (<i>see e.g.</i> , ¶[29-44).
	Incomplete, Irrelevant, Misleading (FRE 106, 401, 403): The testimony is misleading, incomplete, and irrelevant because it lacks support for contentions and mischaracterizes the teachings

	of Exs. 1001, 1003, 1006, 1007, 1008, 1009, 1010, 1012, 1013, 1017, 1018, 1019, 1026, 1046, 1051, 1052, 1053, 1055, 1056, 1057, 1058, 1060, 2003, 2004, 2006, 2007, 2008, and the Patent Owner Response. Improper Testimony by Expert Witness (FRE 702): The testimony is not based on sufficient facts and data, and does not reliably apply facts and data using scientific principles.
Exhibit 1049 Eugene Hecht Optics 4th Ed. 2002	Admissibility (FRE 1002, 1003): This exhibit is an inadmissible copy because the exhibit as filed contains illegible and/or inaccurate reproductions of text and/or figures.
	Incomplete, Irrelevant, Misleading (FRE 106, 401, 403):
	As used by Petitioner, this document does not stand for the proposition for which it is cited and the portion of this document cited by Petitioner provides an incomplete characterization that, when taken in isolation, is misleading in the manner in which it is used, and confuses issues in the case.
Exhibit 1050 Excerpts of	Admissibility (FRE 1002, 1003):
Eugene Hecht Optics 2nd Ed. 1990	This exhibit is an inadmissible copy because the exhibit as filed contains illegible and/or inaccurate reproductions of text and/or figures.
	Incomplete, Irrelevant, Misleading (FRE 106, 401, 403):
	This exhibit is a selected subsection of a larger document and is thus incomplete. Moreover, as used by Petitioner, this document does not stand for the proposition for which it is cited and the portion of this document cited by Petitioner provides an incomplete characterization that, when taken in isolation, is misleading in the manner in which it is used, and confuses issues in the case. In addition, this exhibit is not cited

	in or part of Petitioner's remarks.
Exhibit 1051 Eugene Hecht	Admissibility (FRE 1002, 1003):
Optics 2nd Ed. 1990	This exhibit is an inadmissible copy because the exhibit as filed contains illegible and/or inaccurate reproductions of text and/or figures.
	Incomplete, Irrelevant, Misleading (FRE 106, 401, 403):
	As used by Petitioner, this document does not stand for the proposition for which it is cited and the portion of this document cited by Petitioner provides an incomplete characterization that, when taken in isolation, is misleading in the manner in which it is used, and confuses issues in the case.
Exhibit 1055 Refractive Indices	Incomplete, Irrelevant, Misleading (FRE 106,
of Human Skin Tissues at Eight Wavelengths	401, 403) : As used by Petitioner, this document does not stand for the proposition for which it is cited and the portion of this document cited by Petitioner
	provides an incomplete characterization that, when taken in isolation, is misleading in the manner in which it is used, and confuses issues in the case.
Exhibit 1056 Analysis of the Dispersion of Optical Plastic	Incomplete, Irrelevant, Misleading (FRE 106, 401, 403):
Materials	As used by Petitioner, this document does not stand for the proposition for which it is cited and the portion of this document cited by Petitioner provides an incomplete characterization that, when taken in isolation, is misleading in the manner in which it is used, and confuses issues in the case.

DOCKET

Exhibit 1057 Noninvasive Pulse Oximetry Utilizing Skin Reflectance	Incomplete, Irrelevant, Misleading (FRE 106, 401, 403): As used by Petitioner, this document does not stand for the proposition for which it is cited and the portion of this document cited by Petitioner provides an incomplete characterization that, when taken in isolation, is misleading in the manner in which it is used, and confuses issues in the case.
Exhibit 1058 U.S. Patent No. 6,198,951	Incomplete, Irrelevant, Misleading (FRE 106, 401, 403): As used by Petitioner, this document does not stand for the proposition for which it is cited and the portion of this document cited by Petitioner provides an incomplete characterization that, when taken in isolation, is misleading in the manner in which it is used, and confuses issues in the case.
Dated: November 5, 2021	Respectfully submitted, KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP By: <u>/Jacob L. Peterson/</u> 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)

Attorneys for Patent Owner Masimo Corporation

DOCKET A L A R M



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.