

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

MASIMO CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

IPR2020-01521 (Patent 10,292,628 B1)
IPR2020-01714 and IPR2020-01715 (Patent 10,631,765 B1)

Record of Oral Hearing
Held Virtually: January 19, 2022

Before JOSIAH C. COCKS, ROBERT L. KINDER, and
AMANDA F. WIEKER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

IPR2020-01521 (Patent 10,292,628 B1)
IPR2020-01714 and IPR2020-01715 (Patent 10,631,765 B1)

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

WALTER KARL RENNER, ESQUIRE
ANDREW PATRICK, ESQUIRE
HYUN JIN IN, ESQUIRE
Fish & Richardson
1000 Maine Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20024

ON BEHALF OF PATENT OWNER:

STEPHEN JENSEN, ESQUIRE
Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear, LLP
2040 Main Street
Irvine, CA 92614

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Wednesday, January 19, 2022, commencing at 10:00 a.m., EDT, at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, by video/by telephone, before Chris Hofer, Notary Public.

P R O C E E D I N G S

1 - - - - -

2 JUDGE COCKS: Good morning. I am Judge Cocks. I am joined by
3 Judges Wieker and Kinder and we have something of a busy schedule today.
4 We have scheduled oral argument in connection with six related *inter*
5 *partes* review proceedings involving five separate patents. As we set
6 forth in our order setting oral arguments, we have divided the hearings into
7 four sessions. The first session beginning now involves IPR2020-01521,
8 01714 and 01715 concerning patents 10,292,628 and 10,631,765. Let's
9 begin with introduction of counsel who is arguing this first session. Let's
10 begin with Petitioner. Would you please state your appearance today.

11 MR. RENNER: Good morning, Judge. This is Karl Renner from
12 Fish & Richardson and I am joined by Andrew Patrick, Hyun Jin In who'll
13 be presenting in the first stanza today. Grace Kim and Usman Khan are also
14 with us.

15 JUDGE COCKS: All right. Thank you, Mr. Renner. And for Patent
16 Owner, would you please state your appearance today.

17 MR. JENSEN: Yes. I'm Stephen Jensen on behalf of Patent Owner.
18 I'll be arguing the first set that you mentioned. With me is Jeremiah Helm
19 and Josh Stowell who will be handling later proceedings.

20 JUDGE COCKS: All right. Thank you, Mr. Jensen. All right. So,
21 for this first session we have allotted 60 minutes of time per side. Petitioner
22 bears the burden of showing unpatentability and will argue their case first
23 and may reserve rebuttal time. Patent Owner will then argue their
24 opposition to Petitioner's case and may reserve surrebuttal time. Petitioner

1 will then argue their rebuttal and Patent Owner will argue their surrebuttal.

2 A couple of logistics points is that there will be four separate
3 transcripts for the four sessions. So, this first session involving the three
4 cases will have a single transcript. As we have noted to the parties in our
5 Order setting oral arguments, any argument the parties wish to appear in a
6 given transcript per case must be stated in connection with that session or
7 case. Also, we have electronic copies of the parties' demonstratives but if
8 they would please try and identify the slide and slide deck as they go for
9 both our benefit and the benefit of the transcript, we would appreciate it and
10 that being said given that we have a full day, Mr. Renner, you may begin
11 whenever you are ready.

12 MR. RENNER: Certainly. Thank you, Your Honor, and we'll reserve
13 20 minutes in this first argument and I'll welcome Andrew Patrick to join
14 me.

15 MR. PATRICK: Thank you. Thank you, Your Honors. May it
16 please the Board. My name is Andrew Patrick and I represent Petitioner
17 Apple. I am joined today by my colleagues Karl Renner and Hyun Jin In
18 and we plan to divide our presentation on the '628 and '765 patents between
19 us. I'd like to ask Your Honors if I could to turn to slide 2 of our
20 presentation which provides an overview. From the record briefing it's no
21 secret that the dispute between the parties in this proceeding (audio
22 interference). Indeed, similar to the issues addressed last month during our
23 hearing on related matters and as shown in the table of contents provided on
24 this slide we've organized our presentation today to address the record
25 evidence supporting the integration of features for which Masimo has

1 questioned combinability.

2 In that regard I will begin with issue 1A which addresses separate and
3 distinct bases found within Ohsaki for integrating a cover with a protruding
4 convex surface into each base reference. I will then turn to issue 1C which
5 addresses an additional basis corroborated by Inokawa. My colleague today
6 will speak today to issues 1B and 2 with issue 1B offering yet another
7 separate and distinct basis found within Inokawa for integrating a cover with
8 a protruding convex surface and with issue 2 addressing the multiple bases
9 rooted within Inokawa for adding a second emitter to Aizawa. Finally, I will
10 round out our direct by addressing issue 3 regarding the basis for integrating
11 wireless communications with handheld computing devices into the primary
12 references.

13 Before digging in I would like to call your attention to a rather
14 unusual fact pattern presented by this case. In it the prior art not only
15 teaches each of the features central to the dispute before us, it sets forth
16 explicit motivations for integrating these specific features and it does so in a
17 striking way, by acknowledging structures that exist in the base references
18 and by describing how those structures would be improved by inclusion of
19 the features for which combinability has been questioned. This happens
20 over and over again. We see it with regard to issue 1 where the Ohsaki
21 reference tells us that several benefits flow from changing the flat surface
22 found in conventional covers like Aizawa's to a cover featuring a convex
23 protruding portion.

24 Likewise, regarding issue 2, we see Inokawa acknowledge
25 transmitters like those arguably described in the base reference Aizawa and

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.