

Filed: December 13, 2022

Filed on behalf of:

Patent Owner Masimo Corporation
By: Brian C. Claassen (Reg. No. 63,051)
Carol Pitzel Cruz (Reg. No. 61,224)
Jarom D. Kesler (Reg. No. 57,046)
Jacob L. Peterson (Reg. No. 65,096)
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 PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	4
A. Overview of the Technology	4
B. The '745 Patent	7
C. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	11
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	12
A. The Petition Violates 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3)	12
B. The Specification and Prosecution History Drive the Proper Construction of “Second Shape”	13
C. Apple Agreed That “a mere difference in size, without any other difference, is not a shape different from the first shape”	16
D. The Recited “material configured to change the first shape into a second shape” Does Not Refer to a Mere Diffuser	17
E. Apple Ignores the Dispute Regarding “an array having a spatial configuration corresponding to a shape of the portion of the tissue measurement site encircled by the light block”	18
IV. NO GROUND WOULD ESTABLISH OBVIOUSNESS	20
A. Apple Failed to Address Known Objective Indicia of Nonobviousness	23

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

	Page No.
1. Apple’s Skepticism and Copying of Masimo’s Technology Demonstrates the Nonobviousness of the Claims	24
2. Apple’s Failures Demonstrate The Nonobviousness of the Claimed Material that Changes a First Shape to a Second Shape	29
3. Commercial Success	31
4. Nexus.....	33
B. Grounds 1A and 1B Based on Iwamiya Fail to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood of Success	34
1. The Examiner Considered a Prior Publication of Iwamiya.....	35
2. Apple Fails to Demonstrate that a POSITA Would Add a “surface comprising a dark-colored coating” to Iwamiya (Independent Claims 1 and 20, Dependent Claim 14)	35
3. Apple Fails to Demonstrate 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” (Independent Claim 15, Dependent Claims 6, 26).....	40
4. Iwamiya Would Not Be Combined with Sarantos to Add a “second wavelength” (Claim 2)	43
5. Apple Fails to Demonstrate “the second shape comprises a width and a length, and wherein the width is different from the length” (Claim 25).....	46

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

	Page No.
C. Grounds 2A-2C Based on Sarantos Fail to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood of Success.....	47
1. Apple Fails to Show a “First Shape” and “Second Shape” (Independent Claims 1, 20)	47
2. Apple Fails to Demonstrate a Motivation to Combine Sarantos with Shie with a Reasonable Expectation of Success (Independent Claims 1, 15, and 20).....	49
3. Apple Relies on Hindsight to Reconstruct Claims 12 and 25	55
a) Apple Fails to Explain Why a POSITA Would Have Used a Cylindrical Lens (Claim 25).....	55
b) Apple Fails to Demonstrate a “Second Shape” for Claim 12	58
4. Apple Fails to Identify a “light block having a circular shape” in the Proposed Combinations (Independent Claim 15)	60
5. Apple Fails to Demonstrate “wherein the plurality of photodiodes are arranged in an array having a spatial configuration ...” (Independent Claim 15, Dependent Claims 6, 26).....	62
V. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS.....	63
VI. CONCLUSION.....	64

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page No(s).

<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.</i> , 839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	32
<i>Apple Inc. v. Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson</i> , IPR2022-00850, Paper 7 (PTAB Nov. 1, 2022).....	36
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	41
<i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs V LLC v. Hoffman-LaRoche, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01792, Paper 14 (PTAB Mar. 11, 2016).....	23
<i>Fox Factory, Inc. v. SRAM, LLC</i> , 944 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	34
<i>Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. United States</i> , IPR2019-01456, Paper 17 (PTAB Feb. 5, 2020).....	23
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	36, 37
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	61
<i>Mallinckrodt, Inc. v. Masimo Corp.</i> , 147 F. App’x 158, 2005 WL 2139867 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 7, 2005).....	1
<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 Electronic N. Am. Corp.</i> , 2015 WL 2379485 (D. Del. May 18, 2015)	<i>passim</i>

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.