

Filed: November 4, 2022

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 PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. TECHNOLOGICAL BACKGROUND	3
A. Pulse Oximetry	3
B. The Claimed Invention.....	6
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	16
A. The Petition violates 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3).....	16
B. Proper constructions	19
1. “thermal mass” (claims 1, 7, 13, 20, 26).....	19
2. “bulk temperature” (claims 1, 7, 13, 21, and 26).....	25
a) The “bulk temperature” is used to estimate wavelengths for multiple LEDs in every claim.....	25
b) The temperature sensor measures the temperature of the thermal mass in every claim.....	27
IV. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	30
V. THE CLAIMS ARE PATENTABLE OVER THE CITED ART	33
A. Claims 7-12 would not have been obvious over Yamada and Chadwick.	35
1. Yamada and Chadwick do not disclose or make obvious a “thermal mass.”	35

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

	Page No.
2. Yamada and Chadwick do not disclose or make obvious a “temperature sensor ... capable of determining a bulk temperature for the thermal mass, the operating wavelengths dependent on the bulk temperature.”	38
3. Apple fails to show a motivation to combine or reasonable expectation of success.....	41
B. Claims 13-25 would not have been obvious over Yamada, Chadwick, and Cheung.	47
1. Yamada, Chadwick, and Cheung do not disclose or make obvious a “thermal mass” as claimed.....	47
2. Yamada, Chadwick, and Cheung do not disclose or make obvious LED operating wavelengths “dependent on a bulk temperature of the light emitting sources.”	48
3. Apple fails to show a motivation to combine or reasonable expectation of success.....	51
C. Claims 1-12 and 26-30 would not have been obvious over Yamada, Chadwick, and Noguchi.....	51
1. Yamada, Chadwick, and Noguchi do not disclose or make obvious a “thermal mass” as claimed.....	51
2. Yamada, Chadwick, and Noguchi do not disclose or make obvious LED wavelengths “determinable as a function of” or “dependent on the bulk temperature.”	52
3. Apple fails to show a motivation to combine or reasonable expectation of success.....	56

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

	Page No.
D. The challenged claims would not have been obvious over Apple's Grounds 2A-2F.....	56
VI. APPLE IGNORES PRIOR ART THAT TEACHES AWAY FROM THE CLAIMED INVENTION.....	57
VII. APPLE IGNORES KNOWN SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS.....	61
A. Failure to address known secondary considerations of non-obviousness warrants denial of institution.	61
B. Masimo's rainbow® sensors embody the claimed invention.	62
C. The rainbow® sensors are commercially successful.	70
D. The rainbow® sensors have received significant industry praise.....	70
E. There is a nexus between the commercial success and industry praise and the claimed invention.....	72
VIII. CONCLUSION.....	73

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page No(s).

<i>ActiveVideo Networks v. Verizon Comms.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	45
<i>Adidas AG v. Nike, Inc.</i> , 963 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2020), <i>cert denied</i> , 141 S. Ct. 1376 (2021)	46
<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. Med-El Elektromedizinische Gerate GMBH</i> , IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 (PTAB Feb. 13, 2020).....	30, 31, 32
<i>Apple Inc. v. Masimo Corp.</i> , No. IPR2020-01524, 2022 WL 1177317 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 19, 2022)	42
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	61
<i>Ex parte Burns</i> , No. Appeal 2016-000351, 2017 WL 2132361 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 28, 2017)	41, 42
<i>ClassCo, Inc. v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 838 F.3d 1214 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	61
<i>Edwards Lifesciences LLC v. Cook Inc.</i> , 582 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	27
<i>Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. United States</i> , IPR2019-01456, Paper 17 (PTAB Feb. 5, 2020).....	62
<i>Leo Pharm. Prod., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	61
<i>Mallinckrodt, Inc. v. Masimo Corp.</i> , 147 Fed. Appx. 158, 2005 WL 2139867 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 7, 2005).....	1

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.