

Filed: May 26, 2023

Filed on behalf of:

Patent Owner Masimo Corporation  
By: Brian C. Claassen (Reg. No. 63,051)  
Carol Pitzel Cruz (Reg. No. 61,224)  
Daniel Kiang (Reg. No. 79,631)  
Jeremiah S. Helm, Ph.D. (admitted *pro hac vice*)

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP  
2040 Main Street, Fourteenth Floor  
Irvine, CA 92614  
Tel.: (949) 760-0404  
Fax: (949) 760-9502  
E-mail: AppleIPR745-3@knobbe.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

MASIMO CORPORATION,  
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2022-01465  
U.S. Patent 10,687,745

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## Page No.

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	BACKGROUND .....	4
A.	Overview of the Technology.....	4
B.	The Industry Recognized Masimo’s Excellence in Physiological Monitoring.....	5
C.	The ’745 Patent .....	6
D.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	9
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	9
IV.	FOUNDATIONS 1A AND 1B FAIL TO ESTABLISH OBVIOUSNESS.....	15
A.	Apple Does Not Establish a Motivation for Adding a “surface comprising a dark-colored coating” to Iwamiya (Claims 2-6, 8, 10-12, 14, 21-26).....	16
B.	The Combination Does Not Disclose 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 6, 17, 19, 26).....	23
C.	Apple Fails to Demonstrate that Claim 2 Would Have Been Obvious.....	28
1.	Iwamiya Teaches Away from Sarantos and the Combination Would Be Inoperable .....	29

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

	<b>Page No.</b>
2. Sarantos Does Not Explain How to Successfully Use Red and Infrared Lights in Its Sensor .....	35
3. A POSITA Would Not Have Reasonably Expected Success in Combining Iwamiya with Sarantos to Add Oxygen Saturation Measurements .....	36
D. Apple Fails to Demonstrate “the second shape comprises a width and a length, and wherein the width is different from the length” (Claim 25).....	40
V. GROUND 2A-2C FAIL TO DEMONSTRATE OBVIOUSNESS .....	42
A. Apple Fails to Show a “First Shape” and a Different “Second Shape” (Claims 2-6, 8, 10-14, 19, 21-26).....	43
B. Apple Fails to Demonstrate a Motivation to Combine Sarantos with Shie with a Reasonable Expectation of Success (All Challenged Claims).....	45
C. Apple Fails to Identify a “light block having a circular shape” in the Proposed Combinations (All Claims that Depend from 15) .....	54
D. Apple Failed to Show that Claims 12 and 25 Would Have Been Obvious .....	56
1. Apple Did Not Demonstrate that a Cylindrical Lens Would Result in a Second Shape with a Length and a Different Width (Claim 25) .....	56
2. Apple Failed to Explain Why a POSITA Would Have Used a Cylindrical Lens (Claim 25) .....	58

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

	<b>Page No.</b>
3. Apple Fails to Demonstrate a “Second Shape” Different than the “First Shape” for Claim 12.....	60
4. Apple Failed to Explain a Motivation to Combine Sarantos, Shie, and Savant (Claim 12) .....	61
E. Apple Failed to Demonstrate that the Plurality of Photodiodes Are in the Claimed Array (Claims 6, 17, 19, 26).....	62
VI. CONCLUSION.....	64

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page No(s).

<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	25
<i>Bicon, Inc. v. Straumann Co.</i> , 441 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	11
<i>Chemours Co. FC, LLC v. Daikin Indus.</i> , 4 F.4th 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2021) .....	34
<i>In re Gurley</i> , 27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994) .....	34
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	22
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	17, 54
<i>Mallinckrodt, Inc. v. Masimo Corp.</i> , No. 2:00-cv-06506, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 28518 (C.D. Cal. 2004), <i>aff’d in part and rev’d in part, reh’g en banc denied</i> , 147 F. App’x 158 (Fed. Circ. 2005), <i>cert. dismissed</i> , 546 U.S. 1162 (2006).....	6
<i>Masimo Corp v. Philips Elec. N. Am. Corp.</i> , No. 1:09-cv-00080, 2015 WL 2379485 (D. Del. May 18, 2015).....	6, 7, 8
<i>New Hampshire v. Maine</i> , 532 U.S. 742 (2001).....	45
<i>O2 Micro Int’l v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co. Ltd.</i> , 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	13
<i>Personal Web Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	46, 57

# 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.