

Filed August 9, 2021

On behalf of:

Patent Owner Masimo Corporation
By: Joseph R. Re (Reg. No. 31,291)
Jarom D. Kesler (Reg. No. 57,046)
Stephen W. Larson (Reg. No. 69,133)
Shannon H. Lam (Reg. No. 65,614)
KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP
2040 Main Street, 14th Floor
Irvine, CA 92614
Tel.: (949) 760-0404 Fax: (949) 760-9502
E-mail: AppleIPR2020-1722-695@knobbe.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE, INC.

Petitioner,

v.

MASIMO CORPORATION,

Patent Owner.

IPR2020-01722
Patent 10,470,695

MASIMO RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	3
A. The Importance of Pulse Oximeters.....	3
B. How Oximetry Works	4
C. The '695 Patent	4
III. OVERVIEW OF ALLEGED PRIOR ART	7
A. Sarantos (EX1014)	7
B. Mendelson (EX1015)	10
C. Ackermans (EX1016).....	11
D. Chin (EX1006)	12
IV. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	13
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	14
VI. PETITIONER FAILS TO SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF UNPATENTABILITY OF ANY CLAIM.....	14
A. Legal Background	14
B. Grounds	15
C. Apple's Grounds Ignore Differences Between Thick Tissue and Thin Tissue.....	16

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

	Page No.
1. Chin’s alterations are not necessary for thick tissue.....	16
2. Diffusers can make sensors worse by reducing the light reaching the detector.....	20
D. Ground 1D (Sarantos, Mendelson, Chin): Apple has not demonstrated the obviousness of claims 6, 14, or 21	21
1. Apple misplaces its reliance on light passing through more tissue.....	21
2. Apple fails to support its similar device, similar way assertion.....	23
3. Apples’ naked allegation of a reasonable expectation of success is conclusory	24
4. Apple ignores the differences between Sarantos’ wrist-worn sensor and Chin’s nostril-based sensor	25
5. Apple’s proposed modification would make Sarantos-Mendelson perform worse	29
6. Sarantos-Mendelson already spreads light	31
7. Apple has not met its burden to provide a <i>prima facie</i> case of obviousness against claims 6, 14, or 21	32
E. Ground 2C (Ackermans and Chin): Apple has not demonstrated the obviousness of claims 6, 14, or 21.....	33

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

	Page No.
1. Apple misplaces its reliance on light passing through more tissue.....	34
2. Apple fails to support its similar device, similar way	35
3. Apples' naked allegation of a reasonable expectation of success is conclusory	36
4. Apple ignores the differences between Ackermans' wrist-worn sensor and Chin's nostril-based sensor.....	38
5. Apple's proposed modification would make Ackermans perform worse.....	40
6. Ackermans already spreads light	41
7. Apple has not met its burden to provide a <i>prima facie</i> case of obviousness against claims 6, 14, or 21	42
VII. CONCLUSION.....	43

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page No(s).

<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	14
<i>CFMT, Inc. v. YieldUp Int'l Corp.</i> , 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	14
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	15
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	23, 35
<i>In re Kotzab</i> , 217 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	15
<i>Masimo Corp. v. Philips Elec. N. Am. Corp.</i> , C.A. No. 09-80-LPS, 2015 WL 2379485 (D. Del. May 18, 2015).....	3
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	15
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.</i> , 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	15
<i>PersonalWeb Technologies, LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	23, 35
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (<i>en banc</i>)	14
<i>In re Royka</i> , 490 F.2d 981 (C.C.P.A. 1974)	14
<i>Star Sci., Inc. v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.</i> , 655 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	15

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.