

Filed: May 19, 2023

Filed on behalf of:

Patent Owner Masimo Corporation
By: Irfan A. Lateef (Reg. No. 51,922)
Ted M. Cannon (Reg. No. 55,036)
Jarom D. Kesler (Reg. No. 57,046)
Jacob L. Peterson (Reg. No. 65,096)

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP
2040 Main Street, Fourteenth Floor
Irvine, CA 92614
Tel.: (949) 760-0404
Fax: (949) 760-9502
E-mail: AppleIPR127-1@knobbe.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

MASIMO CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2022-01299
U.S. Patent 7,761,127

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

I.	INTRODUCTION AND TECHNOLOGICAL BACKGROUND	1
A.	Pulse Oximetry	1
B.	Temperature-Induced Wavelength Shift	3
C.	The Claimed Invention	7
II.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	17
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	17
A.	“thermal mass” (claims 1, 7, 13, 20, 26)	17
B.	“bulk temperature for the emitters” (claims 1 and 26) “bulk temperature for the thermal mass” (claim 7) “bulk temperature of the light emitting sources” (claim 13) “bulk temperature for the light emitting sources” (claim 21)	22
C.	Claim 7 interrelates the measured bulk temperature, LED operating wavelengths, and physiological parameters	26
D.	Claim 21 interrelates the measured bulk temperature and LED operating wavelengths	30
IV.	ALL CLAIMS ARE PATENTABLE BECAUSE THE PRIOR ART DOES NOT DISCLOSE OR MAKE OBVIOUS A “THERMAL MASS”	30
A.	Yamada’s substrate lacks a “thermal mass.”	31
B.	Chadwick’s metal core is not a “thermal mass.”	33
1.	Chadwick’s cooling function is different from resisting temperature change on a scale relevant to estimating LED wavelengths.	35

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

	Page No.
2. Apple’s “bulk temperature” argument fails to show Chadwick has a “thermal mass.”	37
3. Apple conducted no structural analysis showing Chadwick discloses the required temperature-change resistance.	38
4. Apple conducted no testing, simulations, or assessment showing Chadwick discloses the required temperature-change resistance.	41
C. Apple does not propose any modification to Yamada’s substrate or Chadwick’s metal core that would make either a “thermal mass.”	42
V. CLAIMS 1-19, 21, 22, AND 25-30 ARE PATENTABLE BECAUSE THE PRIOR ART DOES NOT DISCLOSE OR MAKE OBVIOUS A “TEMPERATURE SENSOR” THAT MEASURES A “BULK TEMPERATURE” TO DETERMINE LED WAVELENGTHS	44
A. Yamada and Chadwick do not disclose or suggest the “bulk temperature” limitations of claims 7-12.....	45
B. Yamada, Chadwick, and Cheung do not disclose or suggest the “bulk temperature” limitations of claims 13-19, 21, 22, and 25.	47
C. Yamada, Chadwick, and Noguchi do not disclose or suggest the “bulk temperature” limitations of claims 1-12 and 26-30.	49
VI. ALL CLAIMS ARE PATENTABLE BECAUSE APPLE DID NOT PROVE A MOTIVATION TO COMBINE	50

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

	Page No.
A. The prior art teaches away from the invention.....	51
B. A POSITA would not have been motivated to combine Yamada and Chadwick in a manner that yields the claimed invention.	57
1. Adding Chadwick’s core to Yamada as a heat sink would not have motivated any combination yielding the invention.....	57
2. Adding Chadwick’s core to Yamada to reduce wavelength shift would have discouraged a POSITA from using the core’s temperature to estimate LED wavelengths.....	58
3. Adding Chadwick’s core to Yamada would not have allowed measurement of an average LED temperature nor motivated any combination yielding the invention.....	59
4. Adding Chadwick’s core to Yamada to draw heat away from the LEDs would not have motivated any combination yielding the invention.	62
5. Apple’s generic known-techniques argument is inadequate to show a motivation to combine.	62
6. A POSITA would not have reasonably expected success.....	63
C. A POSITA would not have been motivated to combine Yamada, Chadwick, and Cheung in a manner that yields claims 13-25.	63

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

	Page No.
D. A POSITA would not have been motivated to combine Yamada, Chadwick, and Noguchi in a manner that yields claims 1-12 or 26-30.....	64
1. A desire to compensate for wavelength shift would not have motivated any combination yielding the invention.....	64
2. A desire to improve accuracy would not have motivated any combination yielding the invention.	66
3. A POSITA would not reasonably have expected success.....	66
VII. CLAIMS 4-5, 11-12, 18-19, 24-25, AND 28-29 WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER APPLE’S GROUNDS 1B, 1D, AND 1F ADDING LEIBOWITZ’S MULTI-LAYER CIRCUIT BOARD	67
VIII. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER APPLE’S GROUNDS 2A-2F.....	69
IX. OBJECTIVE EVIDENCE SUPPORTS NON-OBVIOUSNESS	70
A. Masimo’s rainbow® sensors embody the invention.....	70
B. The rainbow® sensors are commercially successful.	77
C. The rainbow® sensors have received significant industry praise.....	78
D. There is a nexus between the commercial success and industry praise and the invention.	79
X. CONCLUSION.....	79

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.