

Filed: November 4, 2022

Filed on behalf of:

Patent Owner Masimo Corporation
By: Brian C. Claassen (Reg. No. 63,051)
Carol Pitzel Cruz (Reg. No. 61,224)
Jarom D. Kesler (Reg. No. 57,046)
Jacob L. Peterson (Reg. No. 65,096)
Daniel Kiang (Reg. No. 79,631)

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP
2040 Main Street, Fourteenth Floor
Irvine, CA 92614
Tel.: (949) 760-0404
Fax: (949) 760-9502
E-mail: AppleIPR745-1@knobbe.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

MASIMO CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2022-01291
U.S. Patent 10,687,745

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	4
A. Overview of the Technology	4
B. The '745 Patent	5
C. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	10
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	10
A. The Petition Violates 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3)	10
B. The Specification and Prosecution History Drive the Proper Construction of “Second Shape”	12
C. Apple Agreed That “a mere difference in size, without any other difference, is not a shape different from the first shape”	15
D. Apple Improperly Limits “material configured to change the first shape into a second shape” to a Diffuser	16
E. Apple Ignores the Claim Construction Dispute Regarding “plurality of photodiodes are arranged in an array having a spatial configuration corresponding to a shape of the portion of the tissue measurement site encircled by the light block”	17
IV. NO GROUND WOULD ESTABLISH OBVIOUSNESS	20
A. Apple Failed to Address Known Objective Indicia of Nonobviousness	22

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

	Page No.
1. Apple’s Skepticism and Copying of Masimo’s Technology Demonstrates the Nonobviousness of Oxygen Saturation Measurements at the Wrist (Claims 9 and 18).....	24
2. Apple’s Failures Demonstrate The Nonobviousness of Claimed Material that Changes a First Shape to a Second Shape	27
3. Commercial Success	30
4. Nexus.....	32
B. Grounds 1A and 1B Based on Iwamiya Fail to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood of Success	33
1. The Examiner Considered a Prior Publication of Iwamiya	34
2. Apple Fails to Demonstrate that Claims 9 and 18, which Require Measuring Oxygen Saturation at the Wrist Would Have Been Obvious	34
a) Iwamiya Does Not Disclose Oxygen Saturation.....	35
b) Apple Fails to Explain Why a POSITA Would Have Combined Iwamiya with Sarantos.....	37
c) A POSITA Would Not Have Expected Success in the Combination.....	39

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

	Page No.
3. Iwamiya Would Not Be Combined with Sarantos to Add a “second wavelength” (Claim 27)	42
4. Apple Fails to Demonstrate that a POSITA Would Add a “surface comprising a dark-colored coating” to Iwamiya (Claims 1, 9, 20, 27)	43
5. Apple Fails to Demonstrate a Plurality of Photodiodes “arranged in an array having a spatial configuration corresponding to a shape of the portion of the tissue measurement site encircled by the light block” (Claims 15, 18).....	47
C. Grounds 2A and 2B Based on Sarantos Fail to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood of Success	48
1. Apple Fails to Show a “First Shape” and “Second Shape” (Claims 1, 9, 20, 27)	49
2. Apple Fails to Demonstrate a Motivation to Combine Sarantos with Shie with a Reasonable Expectation of Success (Claims 1, 9, 15, 18, 20, 27)	51
3. Apple Fails to Show that Measuring Oxygen Saturation at the Wrist Would Have Been Obvious (Claims 9, 18).....	56
4. Apple Fails to Identify a “light block having a circular shape” in the Proposed Combinations (Claims 15, 18).....	56

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

	Page No.
5. Apple Does Not Address “wherein the plurality of photodiodes are arranged in an array having a spatial configuration ...” (Claims 15, 18).....	58
V. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS.....	59
VI. CONCLUSION.....	59

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.