

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

MASIMO CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

IPR2022-01291
Patent 10,687,745 B1

Before JOSIAH C. COCKS, GEORGE R. HOSKINS, and
ROBERT A. POLLOCK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

HOSKINS, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

JUDGMENT
Final Written Decision
Determining All Challenged Claims Unpatentable
35 U.S.C. § 318(a)

ORDER
Denying Petitioner's Motion to Exclude and
Denying Patent Owner's Motion to Exclude
37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND 2

 A. Real Parties-in-Interest and Related Proceedings..... 2

 B. The '745 Patent Specification..... 4

 C. The Challenged Claims of the '745 Patent 8

 D. Asserted Prior Art..... 9

 E. Asserted Grounds 10

 F. Testimonial Evidence..... 10

III. ANALYSIS OF PETITIONER’S GROUNDS 11

 A. Statement of Law..... 11

 B. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art 12

 C. Claim Construction..... 13

 D. Ground 1A — Obviousness over Iwamiya and Sarantos 15

 1. Iwamiya..... 15

 2. Sarantos..... 18

 3. Claim 1..... 20

 a) Iwamiya vs. Claim 1 21

 b) Sarantos vs. Claim 1 29

 c) Motivation for Combining Iwamiya and Sarantos with a Reasonable Expectation of Success..... 30

 (i) Petitioner’s Contentions (in the Petition)..... 30

 (ii) Patent Owner’s Opposition 31

 (iii) Petitioner’s Reply 33

 (iv) Patent Owner’s Sur-reply..... 36

 (v) Analysis and Determination as to Motivation to Combine with a Reasonable Expectation of Success..... 37

 d) Conclusion as to Claim 1 43

- 4. Claim 9..... 44
 - a) Scope of Claim 9..... 45
 - b) Iwamiya and Sarantos vs. Claim 9 47
 - (i) Iwamiya vs. Claim 9 47
 - (ii) Sarantos vs. Claim 9..... 48
 - (1) Summary of Sarantos Disclosure..... 48
 - (2) Petitioner’s Contentions (in the Petition) 49
 - (3) Patent Owner’s Opposition..... 49
 - (4) Petitioner’s Reply..... 50
 - (5) Patent Owner’s Sur-reply 51
 - (6) Analysis and Findings as to Sarantos’s Disclosure of Determining Oxygen Saturation at the Wrist 51
 - c) Motivation for Combining Iwamiya and Sarantos to Determine Oxygen Saturation at the Wrist..... 55
 - (i) Petitioner’s Contentions (in the Petition)..... 55
 - (ii) Patent Owner’s Opposition 56
 - (iii) Petitioner’s Reply 59
 - (iv) Patent Owner’s Sur-reply..... 61
 - (v) Analysis and Determination as to Motivation for Combining Iwamiya and Sarantos to Determine Oxygen Saturation at the Wrist 62
 - d) Reasonable Expectation of Success in Combining Iwamiya and Sarantos to Determine Oxygen Saturation at the Wrist..... 70
 - (i) Petitioner’s Contentions (in the Petition)..... 70
 - (ii) Patent Owner’s Opposition 70
 - (1) The ITC Investigation 70
 - (2) Patent Owner’s Argument 79
 - (iii) Petitioner’s Reply 82
 - (iv) Patent Owner’s Sur-reply..... 84

- (v) Analysis and Determination as to Reasonable Expectation of Success in Combining Iwamiya and Sarantos to Determine Oxygen Saturation at the Wrist 89
 - (1) Scope of, and Incorporation by Reference in, the Petitioner Reply..... 89
 - (2) Analysis and Determination..... 91
- e) Objective Indicia of Nonobviousness103
 - (i) Patent Owner’s Argument.....103
 - (ii) Petitioner’s Reply104
 - (iii) Patent Owner’s Sur-reply.....104
 - (iv) Analysis and Determination as to Objective Indicia of Nonobviousness.....105
- f) Weighing of Evidence and Conclusion as to Obviousness....107
- E. Ground 1B— Obviousness over Iwamiya, Sarantos, and Venkatraman.....108
 - 1. Venkatraman.....108
 - 2. Claim 15.....108
 - a) Scope of Claim 15109
 - b) Petitioner’s Contentions (in the Petition).....112
 - c) Patent Owner’s Opposition115
 - d) Petitioner’s Reply.....117
 - e) Patent Owner’s Sur-reply.....120
 - f) Analysis and Determination as to Claim 15.....122
 - 3. Claim 18.....127
 - 4. Claim 20.....127
 - a) Petitioner’s Contentions (in the Petition).....128
 - b) Patent Owner’s Opposition129
 - c) Petitioner’s Reply.....129
 - d) Patent Owner’s Sur-Reply130
 - e) Analysis and Determination as to Claim 20.....130

IPR2022-01291
Patent 10,687,745 B1

5. Claim 27.....131
F. Grounds 2A and 2B — Obviousness over Sarantos, Shie, and Venkatraman.....132
IV. PATENT OWNER’S MOTION TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE.....133
V. PETITIONER’S MOTION TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE136
VI. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS.....138
VII. ORDER.....139

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.