

Filed August 27, 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)
Jacob L. Peterson (Reg. No. 65,096)
KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP
2040 Main Street, 14th Floor
Irvine, CA 92614
Ph.: (949) 760-0404 Fax: (949) 760-9502
E-mail: AppleIPR2021-0193-708@knobbe.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.

Petitioner,

v.

MASIMO CORPORATION,

Patent Owner.

IPR2021-00193
Patent 10,299,708

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	MASIMO’S PIONEERING TECHNOLOGY	4
A.	The ’708 Patent	4
B.	Introduction To Independent Claims	6
C.	The ’708 Patent Prosecution	7
D.	Petitioner’s Challenge To Priority Date Of Claimed Subject Matter	7
III.	THE PETITION’S PROPOSED COMBINATIONS.....	8
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	9
V.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	9
VI.	LEGAL STANDARD	10
VII.	FOUNDATIONS 1A-1F DO NOT ESTABLISH OBVIOUSNESS	11
A.	Introduction To Ground 1A.....	11
1.	Aizawa Uses Peripheral Detectors Around A Single Centrally Located LED	11
2.	Inokawa Uses Peripheral LEDs Around A Single Centrally Located Detector	12
3.	Petitioner’s Proposed Combination Of Aizawa And Inokawa	13
B.	Ground 1A Does Not Establish Obviousness Because A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated To Combine Inokawa’s Lens With Aizawa’s Sensor As Proposed In Ground 1A	15

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Cont'd)

	Page No.
1. Petitioner Admits Inokawa’s Lens Directs Light To The Center Of The Sensor	15
2. A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated To Direct Light Away From Aizawa’s Detectors And Would Have No Reasonable Expectation Of Success When Doing So.....	19
3. Dr. Kenny’s New Opinions Are Improper, Contradict His Declaration And Undermine Petitioner’s Obviousness Challenge.....	22
4. Petitioner’s Obviousness Challenge Also Improperly Relies On References Not Identified As Part Of Ground 1A Without An Articulated Motivation To Combine Or Expectation Of Success.....	32
C. The Remaining Challenged Dependent Claims Are Nonobvious Over Ground 1A	35
D. Ground 1B Fails For The Same Reason As Ground 1A And For Additional Reasons	35
1. Ohsaki Does Not Fix The Problems With Petitioner’s Proposed Combination.....	36
2. A POSITA Would Have Understood That Ohsaki’s Board Would Not Prevent Slippage With Aizawa’s Sensor.....	37
E. The Challenged Dependent Claims Are Nonobvious Over Ground 1B	39
F. Grounds 1C-1F Fail For The Same Reasons As Ground 1A.....	39

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Cont'd)

	Page No.
VIII. GROUNDS 2A-2C DO NOT ESTABLISH OBVIOUSNESS.....	39
A. Introduction To Ground 2A.....	39
1. Mendelson-1988 Uses Detectors Around Centrally Located LEDs	40
2. Petitioner’s Proposed Combination Of Mendelson- 1988 And Inokawa.....	40
B. Ground 2A Does Not Establish Obviousness	42
1. There Would Have Been No Motivation To Combine And No Reasonable Expectation Of Success	42
2. Petitioner’s Proposed Ground 2A Combination Does Not Include The Claimed Cover.....	45
3. Mendelson-1988 And Inokawa Do Not Have A “Cylindrical Housing” With A “Light Permeable Cover” (Claim 3).....	48
4. The Petition Improperly Relies On References Not Identified As Part Of Ground 2A With No Analysis Of Any Motivation To Combine.....	50
C. The Challenged Dependent Claims Are Nonobvious Over Ground 2A	52
D. Grounds 2B-2C Fail For The Same Reason As Ground 2A	52
IX. CONCLUSION.....	53

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page No(s).

<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	10
<i>CFMT, Inc. v. YieldUp Int'l Corp.</i> , 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	10
<i>In re Fritch</i> , 972 F.2d 1260 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	35, 39, 52
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	10
<i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	33
<i>InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGo Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	49
<i>K/S HIMPP v. Hear-Wear Techs., LLC</i> , 751 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	51
<i>Kennametal, Inc. v. Ingersoll Cutting Tool Co.</i> , 780 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	39
<i>In re Kotzab</i> , 217 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	10
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	11
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.</i> , 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	11
<i>Personal Web Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	27, 28, 29

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.