

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: AppleIPR127-2@knobbe.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

MASIMO CORPORATION,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2022-01300  
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 .....	20
	1. “thermal mass” (claims 1, 7, 13, 20, 26).....	20
	1. “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.....	26
	b) The temperature sensor measures the temperature of the thermal mass in every claim.....	28
IV.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	31
V.	THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE PATENTABLE OVER APPLE’S PROPOSED COMBINATIONS .....	32
	A. Claims 7-12 would not have been obvious over Dietiker and Oldham. ....	36
	1. Dietiker and Oldham do not disclose a “thermal mass.” .....	36

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
*(cont'd)*

	<b>Page No.</b>
2. Dietiker and Oldham do not disclose a temperature sensor “capable of determining a bulk temperature for the thermal mass, the operating wavelengths dependent on the bulk temperature.” .....	40
3. A POSITA would not have been motivated to combine Oldham and Dietiker in a way that would yield the claimed invention.....	45
a) The proposed combination does not yield the claimed invention.....	45
b) Oldham’s <i>temperature regulation</i> technique and Dietiker’s <i>self-calibration with wavelength sensor</i> technique would not be used together.....	46
c) None of Apple’s alleged motivations would have motivated a POSITA to modify or combine Oldham and Dietiker in a way that would yield the claimed invention. ....	47
(1) Alleged motivations to implement Oldham’s temperature-regulation system with Dietiker.....	47
(2) Alleged motivations to use Oldham’s metal plate in the combination’s substrate.....	52
d) A POSITA would not have reasonably expected success. ....	55
B. Claims 1-3, 6, 13-17, and 20-23 would not have been obvious over Dietiker, Oldham, and Noguchi. ....	56

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
*(cont'd)*

	<b>Page No.</b>
1. Dietiker, Oldham, and Noguchi do not disclose a “thermal mass.” .....	56
2. Dietiker, Oldham, and Noguchi do not disclose LED wavelengths “determinable as a function of” or “dependent on the bulk temperature.” .....	56
3. Apple fails to show a motivation to combine or reasonable expectation of success.....	59
C. Claims 26, 27, and 30 would not have been obvious over Dietiker, Oldham, Noguchi, and Yamada.....	62
VI. APPLE IGNORES PRIOR ART THAT TEACHES AWAY FROM THE CLAIMED INVENTION.....	62
VII. APPLE IGNORES KNOWN SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS.....	65
A. Failure to address known secondary considerations of non-obviousness warrants denial of institution .....	65
B. Masimo’s rainbow® sensors embody the claimed invention. ....	66
C. The rainbow® sensors are commercially successful. ....	74
D. The rainbow® sensors have received significant industry praise.....	74
E. There is a nexus between the commercial success and industry praise and the claimed invention.....	76
VIII. CONCLUSION.....	77

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page No(s).

<i>ActiveVideo Networks v. Verizon Comms.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	52, 54
<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. Med-El Elektromedizinische Gerate GMBH</i> , IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 (PTAB Feb. 13, 2020).....	31
<i>Apple Inc. v. Masimo Corp.</i> , No. IPR2020-01524, 2022 WL 1177317 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 19, 2022) .....	50
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	65
<i>Ex parte Burns</i> , No. Appeal 2016-000351, 2017 WL 2132361 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 28, 2017) .....	50
<i>ClassCo, Inc. v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 838 F.3d 1214 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	65
<i>Edwards Lifesciences LLC v. Cook Inc.</i> , 582 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	28
<i>Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. United States</i> , IPR2019-01456, Paper 17 (PTAB Feb. 5, 2020).....	66
<i>Leo Pharm. Prod., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	65
<i>Mallinckrodt, Inc. v. Masimo Corp.</i> , 147 Fed. Appx. 158, 2005 WL 2139867 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 7, 2005).....	1
<i>Masimo Corp. v. Philips Electronic N. Amer. Corp.</i> , 2015 WL 2379485 (D. Del. May 18, 2015) .....	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.