

Filed January 17, 2022

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
Tel.: (949) 760-0404
Email: AppleIPR2021-0208-266@knobbe.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.

Petitioner,

v.

MASIMO CORPORATION,

Patent Owner.

IPR2021-00208
Patent 10,258,266

PATENT OWNER MASIMO SUR-REPLY TO REPLY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. ARGUMENT.....	2
A. Grounds 1A-1B	2
1. Petitioner’s New Evidence And Arguments Address An Argument Masimo Never Made	2
a) The Principle Of Reversibility Is Irrelevant To Petitioner’s Proposed Combination.....	6
b) Petitioner’s Other New Theories Are Similarly Misplaced.....	10
2. Petitioner Does Not Establish A Motivation To Modify Aizawa’s Sensor To Include Both Multiple Detectors And Multiple LEDs	13
3. Ohsaki Would Not Have Motivated A POSITA To Add A Convex Protrusion To Aizawa’s Sensor	15
B. Ground 2.....	20
1. A POSITA Would Not Have Added A Convex Surface To Mendelson-1988’s Sensor	20
2. Petitioner’s Proposed Combination Does Not Include A “Cover”	20
3. Petitioner’s Proposed Combination Does Not Include The Claimed “Circular Housing”.....	23
4. Petitioner Uses Nishikawa As Far More Than A “Supporting Reference”	23
III. CONCLUSION.....	24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page No(s).

<i>DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	19
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (<i>en banc</i>)	21

I. INTRODUCTION

Rather than substantively rebut Masimo’s arguments, Petitioner concocts arguments Masimo never made and then spends many pages of briefing attempting to disprove those arguments. Petitioner asserts numerous new optics theories in an attempt to show a convex surface does not direct “*all*” light to “a single point at the center.” Reply 3.¹ Masimo never made such an argument.

Rather, Masimo argued that a convex surface condenses relatively more light towards a more central location as compared to a flat surface. There should be no dispute on this issue. Petitioner and its declarant repeatedly admitted that a convex surface would direct light away from the periphery and towards a more central position. Yet, Petitioner proposed adding a convex surface above *peripherally located detectors*, arguing a POSITA would make the addition to *improve* optical signal strength. Masimo explained that, consistent with Petitioner’s admissions, a POSITA would *not* have been motivated to direct light *away* from peripherally located detectors. None of Petitioner’s new arguments persuasively rebut this. The Board should affirm the patentability of all challenged claims.

¹ All emphasis is added unless otherwise noted

II. ARGUMENT

A. Grounds 1A-1B

1. Petitioner’s New Evidence And Arguments Address An Argument Masimo Never Made

Petitioner mischaracterizes Masimo’s position as contending Inokawa’s lens would direct “*all*” light “only at a *single point* at the center...” Reply 3. However, Petitioner never quotes any such Masimo argument because *none* exists. Masimo clearly and repeatedly argued “that a POSITA would have understood that Inokawa’s protruding surface would direct incoming light *towards the center* of the sensor.” Patent Owner Response (“POR”) 19; *see also id.* 2, 15-16, 24-27, 28. Masimo’s declarant, Dr. Madisetti, likewise repeatedly testified that Inokawa’s lens directs light “to a *more central location* as a result of passing through the protruding surface.” Ex. 2004 ¶¶54; *see also id.*, e.g. ¶¶34, 43, 49, 51, 52, 55.² Masimo and Dr. Madisetti explained that a convex surface condenses relatively more light *towards* a more central location as compared to a flat surface. *See, e.g.*, Ex. 2004 ¶67 (“Taken as a whole, a POSITA would have understood that a protruding surface results in an overall redirection of incoming light towards the

² Indeed, when asked, Dr. Kenny could identify no testimony from Dr. Madisetti stating that *all* light was directed to center. *See, e.g.*, Ex. 2027 63:7-64:6, 94:20-96:1, 96:18-97:7.

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.