

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent of: Jeroen Poeze, et al.
U.S. Patent No.: 10,631,765
Issue Date: April 28, 2020
Appl. Serial No.: 16/725,478
Filing Date: December 23, 2019
Title: MULTI-STREAM DATA COLLECTION SYSTEM FOR
NONINVASIVE MEASUREMENT OF BLOOD
CONSTITUENTS

Mail Stop Patent Board

Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**PETITIONER'S NOTICE RANKING AND EXPLAINING MATERIAL
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PETITIONS FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 10,631,765**

Apple is filing two petitions (IPR2020-01714 and IPR2020-01715) challenging U.S. Patent No. 10,631,765 (the “’765 Patent”). Pursuant to the November 2019 Trial Practice Guide Update, this paper provides: “(1) a ranking of the petitions in the order in which [Petitioner] wishes the Board to consider the merits, if the Board uses its discretion to institute any of the petitions, and (2) a succinct explanation of the differences between the petitions, why the issues addressed by the differences are material, and why the Board should exercise its discretion to institute additional petitions.” Trial Practice Guide, 59-61.

I. Ranking of Petitions

Although Apple believes that both petitions are meritorious and justified, Petitioner requests that the Board consider the petitions in the following order:

Rank	Petition	Primary Reference
1	IPR2020-01714	Mendelson-799
2	IPR2020-01715	Aizawa

II. Considerations in Allowing Multiple Petitions Covering Different Grounds Where Patent Owner Has Asserted a Large Number of Claims

Apple is a defendant in a pending infringement suit involving the ’765 Patent, in addition to eleven other patents that are presently asserted. The District Court recently ordered the parties to submit a “Joint Claim Narrowing Proposal” by November 23, 2020, Patent Owner has not yet narrowed the asserted claims.

APPLE-1033, 1; APPLE-1040, 1-3. As such, any of the '765 Patent's 29 claims might potentially be asserted.

Given the uncertainty of which claims will ultimately be asserted, Petitioner is forced to address all claims of the '765 Patent in the present IPRs. If Petitioner were to leave some claims unaddressed, Patent Owner would be free to strategically tailor its final set of asserted claims in the Litigation to include claims left unaddressed in these IPRs. Petitioner attempted to fully address all 29 claims in a single petition, but was forced to split its arguments into two petitions due to word count constraints.

Thus, the need for two Petitions is driven by uncertainty regarding which claims will ultimately be asserted in the Litigation. Patent Owner should not be allowed to hamper Apple's ability to effectively use IPR as a defense by choosing to leave its assertion broad.

III. Material Differences Between the Petitions

Material differences exist. At bottom, the Petitions are non-redundant simply in their reliance on different combinations of references that address the claim elements in materially different ways. Although the combinations of references presented in each Petition render obvious the claims of the '765 Patent, they do so in different ways, using different description.

IPR2020-01714 relies on Mendelson-799 as its primary reference.

Mendelson-799 describes a pulse oximeter featuring a sensor housing 17 that accommodates a “light source 12 composed of three closely spaced light emitting elements (e.g., LEDs or laser sources)” and an array of twelve “discrete detectors (e.g., photodiodes).” APPLE-1012, Title, Abstract, 9:22-40, 10:16-37, FIGS. 7, 8. In contrast, the primary reference in IPR2020-01715 is Aizawa, which describes a pulse wave sensor featuring “four photodetectors” disposed around a central light source and a “holder” that secures the light source and photodetectors. APPLE-1006, ¶[0023]; FIGS. 1(a), 1(b).

These distinct primary references, in combination with various secondary references, apply differently to the claims of the '765 Patent. Additionally, motivation to combine the distinct sets of references presented in the two Petitions materially differs.

In summary, the Petitions are not redundant, duplicative, or substantially similar. Each Petition provides a strong showing of unpatentability and/or obviousness, without repeating the same theory. Accordingly, Petitioner requests that the Board institute trial on both Petitions.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 30, 2020

/W. Karl Renner/

W. Karl Renner, Reg. No. 41,265
Andrew B. Patrick, Reg. No. 63,471
Usman Khan, Reg. No. 70,439
Grace J. Kim, Reg. No. 71,977
Fish & Richardson P.C.
3200 RBC Plaza, 60 South Sixth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
T: 202-783-5070
F: 877-769-7945

Attorneys for Petitioner

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.