UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC., Petitioner,

v.

MASIMO CORPORATION, Patent Owner

> IPR2022-01465 Patent 10,687,745

PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE

DOCKET A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), Petitioner hereby submits the following

objections to evidence filed with Patent Owner's Response of May 26, 2023.

Evidence	Objections
Exhibit 2070	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2070 under
	FRE 702 and 703, because it contains opinions that are
	conclusory, do not disclose supporting facts or data, are based
	on unreliable facts, data, or methods, and/or include testimony
	outside the scope of Dr. Duckworth's specialized knowledge (to
	the extent he has any such knowledge) that will not assist the
	trier of fact. For example, ¶¶ 29, 34, 39-43, 51-52, 59-65, 68,
	79-87, 98-99, 102, 104, 112-114 of Dr. Duckworth's
	declaration consist of a series of conclusory statements and
	arguments that are presented without citation to evidence. Dr.
	Duckworth's failure to disclose the underlying facts or data
	upon which his opinions are based (to the extent any such facts
	or data exist) renders his opinions unreliable.
	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2070 under
	FRE 702-703 and 802 because it includes statements that
	constitute inadmissible hearsay. For example, ¶¶ 22-28, 30-33,
	53, 73 of Dr. Duckworth's declaration include statements based
	on statements made outside of this proceeding. The statements
	are offered for the truth of the matter asserted, and the
	statements are not the product of reliable principles or methods.

Exhibit 2072	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2072 under
	FRE 402 and 901 because this exhibit is not relevant to any
	issue in this proceeding. Masimo has not shown that the exhibit
	is prior art. This exhibit has not been authenticated.
Exhibit 2073	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2073 under
	FRE 402 and 901 because this exhibit is not relevant to any
	issue in this proceeding. Masimo has not shown that the exhibit
	is prior art. This exhibit has not been authenticated.
Exhibit 2074	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2087 under
	FRE 802 because it constitutes inadmissible hearsay.
Exhibit 2076	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2087 under
	FRE 802 because it constitutes inadmissible hearsay.
Exhibit 2077	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2087 under
	FRE 802 because it constitutes inadmissible hearsay.
Exhibit 2078	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2087 under
	FRE 802 because it constitutes inadmissible hearsay.
Exhibit 2079	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2087 under
	FRE 802 because it constitutes inadmissible hearsay.
Exhibit 2080	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2087 under
	FRE 802 because it constitutes inadmissible hearsay.
Exhibit 2081	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2087 under
	FRE 802 because it constitutes inadmissible hearsay.
Exhibit 2082	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2087 under
	FRE 802 because it constitutes inadmissible hearsay.
Exhibit 2083	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2087 under
	FRE 802 because it constitutes inadmissible hearsay.

Exhibit 2084	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2087 under
	FRE 802 because it constitutes inadmissible hearsay.
Exhibit 2085	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2087 under
	FRE 802 because it constitutes inadmissible hearsay.
Exhibit 2086	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2087 under
	FRE 402 because it is irrelevant. Exhibit 2087 is not cited or
	relied on for any purpose in the Petition or in Dr. Duckworth's
	declaration.
	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2087 under
	FRE 802 because it constitutes inadmissible hearsay.
	•
Exhibit 2087	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2087 under
	FRE 402 and 901 because this exhibit is not relevant to any
	issue in this proceeding. Exhibit 2087 is not cited or relied on
	for any purpose in the Petition or in Dr. Duckworth's
	declaration. Masimo has not shown that the exhibit is prior art.
	This exhibit has not been authenticated.
Exhibit 2088	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2087 under
	FRE 402 and 901 because this exhibit is not relevant to any
	issue in this proceeding. Masimo has not shown that the exhibit
	is prior art. This exhibit has not been authenticated.
Exhibit 2089	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2087 under
	FRE 402 because it is irrelevant. Exhibit 2087 is not cited or
	relied on for any purpose in the Petition or in Dr. Duckworth's
	declaration.

	-
	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2087 under
	FRE 802 because it constitutes inadmissible hearsay.
Exhibit 2090	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2087 under
	FRE 402 because it is irrelevant. Exhibit 2087 is not cited or
	relied on for any purpose in the Petition or in Dr. Duckworth's
	declaration.
	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2087 under
	FRE 802 because it constitutes inadmissible hearsay.
Exhibit 2091	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2091 under
	FRE 402 and 901 because this exhibit is not relevant to any
	issue in this proceeding. Masimo has not shown that the exhibit
	is prior art. This exhibit has not been authenticated.
Exhibit 2092	Petitioner objects to the admissibility of Exhibit 2092 under
	FRE 402 and 901 because this exhibit is not relevant to any
	issue in this proceeding. Masimo has not shown that the exhibit
	is prior art. This exhibit has not been authenticated.

For at least these reasons, Petitioner objects to Exhibits 2070, 2072-2074,

2076-2092 and reserves the right to move to exclude these exhibits as inadmissible.

DOCKET A L A R M



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.