UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC., Petitioner,

v.

MASIMO CORPORATION, Patent Owner.

Case IPR2020-01722 Patent 10,470,695

PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE



Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), Petitioner hereby submits the following objections to evidence filed with Patent Owner's Response of August 9, 2021.

Evidence	Objections
Exhibit 2001	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2001 under
	FRE 702 and 703, because it contains opinions that are
	conclusory, do not disclose supporting facts or data, are
	based on unreliable facts, data, or methods, and/or include
	testimony outside the scope of Dr. Madisetti's specialized
	knowledge (to the extent he has any such knowledge) that
	will not assist the trier of fact. Petitioner also objects to
	Exhibit 2001 as containing opinions that are irrelevant,
	confusing, and presenting the danger of unfair prejudice
	under FRE 401, 402, and 403.
Exhibit 2003	Petitioner incorporates the real-time objections made by
	Petitioner's counsel reflected in Exhibit 2003, to the extent
	that such objections relate to portions of Exhibit 2003 that
	are cited in Patent Owner's Response.
Exhibit 2006	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2006 under
	FRE 401, 402, and 403 at least insofar as the Patent Owner
	Response does not establish the relevance of the statements
	cited to the issues in the present proceeding, and at least
	insofar as the cited statements are potentially misleading
	when taken out of context.
	Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2006 under FRE 901, as Patent
	Owner has not submitted evidence that the document is



Evidence	<u>Objections</u>
	authentic, nor that the document is self-authenticating.
	Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2006 under FRE 801
	and 802 as inadmissible hearsay, to the extent Patent
	Owner relies on statements from Exhibit 2006 for their
	truth. See, e.g., POR, 1.
Exhibit 2007	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2007 under
	FRE 401, 402, and 403 at least insofar as the Patent Owner
	Response does not establish the relevance of the statements
	cited to the issues in the present proceeding, and at least
	insofar as the cited statements are potentially misleading
	when taken out of context.
	Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2007 under FRE 901, as Patent
	Owner has not submitted evidence that the document is
	authentic, nor that the document is self-authenticating.
	Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2007 under FRE 801
	and 802 as inadmissible hearsay, to the extent Patent
	Owner relies on statements from Exhibit 2007 for their
	truth. See, e.g., POR, 1.
Exhibit 2008	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2008 under
	FRE 401, 402, and 403 at least insofar as the Patent Owner
	Response does not establish the relevance of the statements
	cited to the issues in the present proceeding, and at least
	insofar as the cited statements are potentially misleading
	when taken out of context.
	Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2008 under FRE 901, as Patent



Evidence	Objections
	Owner has not submitted evidence that the document is
	authentic, nor that the document is self-authenticating.
	Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2008 under FRE 801
	and 802 as inadmissible hearsay, to the extent Patent
	Owner relies on statements from Exhibit 2008 for their
	truth. See, e.g., Ex. 2001, [70].
Exhibit 2009	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2009 under
	FRE 401, 402, and 403 at least insofar as the Patent Owner
	Response does not establish the relevance of the statements
	cited to the issues in the present proceeding, and at least
	insofar as the cited statements are potentially misleading
	when taken out of context.
	Petitioner objects to Exhibit 2009 under FRE 901, as Patent
	Owner has not submitted evidence that the document is
	authentic, nor that the document is self-authenticating.
	Petitioner further objects to Exhibit 2009 under FRE 801
	and 802 as inadmissible hearsay, to the extent Patent
	Owner relies on statements from Exhibit 2009 for their
	truth. See, e.g., Ex. 2001, [83].

For at least these reasons, Petitioner objects to Exhibits 2001, 2003, 2006-2009. Petitioner reserves the right to move to exclude Exhibits 2001, 2003, 2006-2009.



Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 16, 2021 /Dan Smith/

Dan Smith, Reg. No. 71,278
Fish & Richardson P.C.
3200 RBC Plaza, 60 South Sixth Street

Minneapolis, MN 55402

T: 202-783-5553



DOCKET

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.

