

Filed: November 16, 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, 14th Floor
Irvine, CA 92614
Tel.: (949) 760-0404
Fax: (949) 760-9502
E-mail: AppleIPR2020-1733-195@knobbe.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.

Petitioner,

v.

MASIMO CORPORATION,

Patent Owner.

IPR2020-01733
U.S. Patent 10,702,195

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

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 1057 Refractive Indices of Human Skin Tissues at Eight Wavelengths	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 Analysis of the Dispersion of Optical Plastic Materials	<p>Incomplete, Irrelevant, Misleading (FRE 106, 401, 403):</p> <p>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.</p>
Exhibit 1060 Second Declaration of Dr. Thomas W. Kenny	<p>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>, ¶¶31-59).</p> <p>Incomplete, Irrelevant, Misleading (FRE 106, 401, 403):</p> <p>The testimony is misleading, incomplete, and irrelevant because it lacks support for contentions and mischaracterizes the teachings of Exs. 1001, 1003, 1006, 1008, 1009, 1010, 1012, 1014, 1016, 1017, 1024, 1025, 1053, 1054, 1056, 1057, 1058, 1059, 1061, 1062, 1063, 2004, 2006, 2026, and the Patent Owner Response.</p> <p>Improper Testimony by Expert Witness (FRE 702):</p> <p>The testimony is not based on sufficient facts and data, and does not reliably apply facts and data using scientific principles.</p>
Exhibit 1061 Eugene Hecht Optics 2nd Ed. 1990	<p>Admissibility (FRE 1002, 1003):</p> <p>This exhibit is an inadmissible copy because the exhibit as filed contains illegible and/or inaccurate reproductions of text and/or figures.</p> <p>Incomplete, Irrelevant, Misleading (FRE 106, 401, 403):</p> <p>As used by Petitioner, this document does not stand for the proposition for which it is cited and</p>

	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 1062 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.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: November 16, 2021

By: /Jacob L. Peterson/

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

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e) and with the agreement of counsel for Petitioner, a true and correct copy of **MASIMO OBJECTIONS TO ADMISSIBILITY OF APPLE EVIDENCE SUBMITTED BEFORE TRIAL INSTITUTION** is being served electronically on November 16, 2021, to the e-mail addresses shown below:

W. Karl Renner
Roberto J. Devoto
devoto@fr.com
Hyun Jin In
in@fr.com
Fish & Richardson P.C.
3200 RBC Plaza
60 South Sixth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
IPR50095-0026IP1@fr.com
PTABInbound@fr.com, axf-ptab@fr.com

Dated: November 16, 2021

By: /Jacob L. Peterson/
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

54588964