PUBLIC VERSION

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C.

In the Matter of **CERTAIN LIGHT-BASED PHYSIOLOGICAL MEASUREMENT DEVICES AND COMPONENTS THEREOF**	**Inv. No. 337-TA-1276**

FINAL INITIAL DETERMINATION ON VIOLATION OF SECTION 337

Administrative Law Judge Monica Bhattacharyya

(January 10, 2023)

Appearances:

For Complainants Masimo Corporation and Cercacor Laboratories, Inc.:

Stephen C. Jensen, Joseph R. Re, Irfan A. Lateef, Sheila N. Swaroop, Ted M. Cannon, Brian C. Claassen, Alan G. Laquer, Kendall M. Loebbaka, Daniel C. Kiang, and Douglas B. Wentzel of Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear, LLP in Irvine, CA; William R. Zimmerman and Jonathan E. Bachand of Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear, LLP in Washington, DC; Carol Pitzel Cruz of Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear, LLP in Seattle, WA; and Karl W. Kowallis and Matthew S. Friedrichs of Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear in New York, NY.

For Respondent Apple Inc.:

Mark D. Selwyn of Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP in Palo Alto, CA; Joseph J. Mueller, Richard Goldenberg, and Sarah R. Frazier of Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP in Boston, MA; and Michael D. Esch and David Cavanaugh of Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP in Washington, DC.

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

Pursuant to the Notice of Investigation (EDIS Doc. ID 749538), 86 Fed. Reg. 46275-76 (Aug. 18, 2021), and Commission Rule 210.42, this is the administrative law judge's final initial determination on violation in the matter of *Certain Light-Based Physiological Measurement Devices and Components Thereof,* Commission Investigation No. 337-TA-1276. 19 C.F.R. § 210.42(a)(1)(i).

For the reasons discussed herein, it is the undersigned's final initial determination that there has been a violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. § 1337, in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and/or the sale within the United States after importation of certain wearable electronic devices with light-based pulse oximetry functionality and components thereof by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 10,945,648.

It is also the undersigned's final initial determination that there has been no violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. § 1337, in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and/or the sale within the United States after importation of certain wearable electronic devices with light-based pulse oximetry functionality and components thereof with respect to U.S. Patent Nos. 10,912,501, U.S. Patent No. 10,912,502, U.S. Patent No. 10,687,745, and U.S. Patent No. 7,761,127.

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. BACKGROUND 1
A. Procedural History 1
B. The Parties 3
C. Asserted Patents 4
D. Products at Issue 4
E. Witness Testimony 5
II. JURISDICTION AND IMPORTATION 8
A. Personal Jurisdiction 8
B. *In Rem* Jurisdiction and Importation 8
III. LEGAL STANDARDS 8
A. Infringement 8
B. Invalidity 11
C. Inequitable Conduct 16
D. Domestic Industry 17
IV. POEZE PATENTS 19
A. Specification 20
B. Asserted claims 21
C. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art 25
D. Claim Construction 26
E. Infringement 33
F. Domestic Industry—Technical prong 55
G. Invalidity – Anticipation/Obviousness 88
H. Invalidity – Written Description and Enablement 156
I. Prosecution Laches and Unclean Hands 170
V. U.S. PATENT NO. 10,687,745 174
A. Specification 174
B. Claims 176
C. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art 179
D. Claim Construction 179
E. Infringement 180
F. Domestic Industry—Technical Prong 199
G. Invalidity – Obviousness 209
H. Invalidity – Written Description and Enablement 241
I. Prosecution Laches 245
VI. U.S. PATENT NO. 7,761,127 246
A. Specification 247
B. Claims 248
C. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art 249
D. Claim Construction 250
E. Infringement 259
F. Domestic Industry—Technical Prong 273
G. Invalidity 283
VII. DOMESTIC INDUSTRY – ECONOMIC PRONG (MASIMO WATCH) 301
A. The "Masimo Watch" Articles 301

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

B. Disputed Background Issues Regarding Domestic Industry Investments 302
C. Domestic Industry Existing at the Time of the Complaint 305
D. Domestic Industry in the Process of Being Established 319
VIII. DOMESTIC INDUSTRY – ECONOMIC PRONG ('127 PATENT) 324
A. Domestic Industry Existing at the Time of the Complaint 324
B. Domestic Industry in the Process of Being Established 326
C. Asserted Domestic Industry Expenditures 327
IX. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW 335

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

The following abbreviations may be used in this Initial Determination:

Tr.	Hearing Transcript
Dep. Tr.	Deposition Transcript
JX	Joint Exhibit
CX	Complainants' exhibit
CPX	Complainants' physical exhibit
CDX	Complainants' demonstrative exhibit
RX	Respondents' exhibit
RPX	Respondents' physical exhibit
RDX	Respondents' demonstrative exhibit
CPHB	Complainants' pre-hearing brief (EDIS Doc. ID 770786)
CIB	Complainants' corrected initial post-hearing brief (EDIS Doc. ID 775422)
CRB	Complainants' post-hearing reply brief (EDIS Doc. ID 775058)
RPHB	Respondents' corrected pre-hearing brief (EDIS Doc. ID 770874)
RIB	Respondents' second corrected initial post-hearing brief (EDIS Doc. ID 779376)
RRB	Respondents' corrected post-hearing reply brief (EDIS Doc. ID 779379)

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

I. BACKGROUND

A. Procedural History

The Commission instituted this investigation in response to a complaint filed by Complainants Masimo Corporation and Cercacor Laboratories, Inc. on June 30, 2021, with an amended complaint filed on July 12, 2021 (the "Amended Complaint," EDIS Doc. ID 746186), and supplemented on July 19, 2021. Notice of Investigation at 1, EDIS Doc. No. 749538 (Aug. 13, 2021); 86 Fed. Reg. 46275-76 (Aug. 18, 2021). The complaint, as amended, alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 10,912,501 ("the '501 patent"), U.S. Patent No. 10,912,502 ("the '502 patent"), U.S. Patent 10,945,648 ("the '648 patent"), U.S. Patent No. 10,687,745 ("the '745 patent"), and U.S. Patent No. 7,761,127 ("the '127 patent"). *Id.* The Commission ordered institution of this investigation to determine "whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain products . . . by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 1-9 and 11-30 of the '501 patent; claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-12, 14-22, 24-26, and 28-30 of the '502 patent; claims 1-17 and 19-30 of the '648 patent; claims 1-6, 8-9, 11, 14, 20-24, and 26-27 of the '745 patent; and claims 7-9 of the '127 patent; and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337." *Id.* at 2. The investigation was instituted upon publication of the Notice of Investigation in the *Federal Register* on Monday, August 18, 2021. 86 Fed. Reg. 46275-76.

Respondent Apple Inc. filed a response to the Amended Complaint and Notice of Investigation on September 7, 2021 (the "Response to Complaint"), disputing Complainants'

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

allegations with respect to infringement and domestic industry and asserting affirmative defenses of invalidity and unenforceability. *See* EDIS Doc. ID 752521.[1]

Pursuant to Order No. 3 (Sept. 1, 2021), the target date of this investigation was set to be December 16, 2022. On September 13, 2021, the investigation was assigned by then Chief Administrative Law Judge Bullock to the undersigned. *See* Notice to the Parties, EDIS Doc. ID 751531 (Sept. 13, 2021). Pursuant to Order No. 5 (Sept. 22, 2021), the target date was extended to January 16, 2023. *See* Comm'n Notice (Oct. 12, 2021), EDIS Doc. ID 754020.

A technology tutorial and *Markman* hearing was held on February 17, 2022. *See* *Markman* Tr., EDIS Doc. ID 763489.[2]

Pursuant to Order No. 25 (Mar. 23, 2022), Complainants withdrew their allegations of infringement with respect to claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 11, 16, 19, 20, and 22-30 of the '501 patent, claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-12, 14-18, 20, 25, and 26 of the '502 patent, claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13-17, 19, 22, and 25-28 of the '648, and claims 1, 3-6, 8, 11, 14, 20-24, and 26 of the '745 patent. *See* Comm'n Notice, EDIS Doc. ID 768023 (Apr. 12, 2022). Pursuant to Order No. 33 (May 20, 2022), Complainants withdrew their allegations of infringement with respect to claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 13-15, 17, 18, and 21 of the '501 patent, claims 19, 21, 24, 29, and 30 of the '502 patent, claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 11, 20, 21, 23, and 29 of the '648, and claim 2 of the '745 patent. *See* Comm'n Notice, EDIS Doc. ID 772826 (Jun. 10, 2022).

[1] The affirmative defenses based on inequitable conduct were stricken pursuant to Order No. 9 (Dec. 20, 2021), and Respondent was subsequently granted leave to add certain inequitable conduct defenses pursuant to Order No. 23 (Mar. 23, 2022).

[2] All of the claim construction disputes raised at the *Markman* hearing were subsequently mooted by the withdrawal of asserted claims or by agreement of the parties. *See infra*.

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

An evidentiary hearing was held on June 6-10, 2022. The parties filed initial post-hearing briefs on June 27, 2022, and filed post-hearing reply briefs on July 11, 2022. Additional exhibits were admitted pursuant to Order No. 50 (Jun. 16, 2022) and Order No. 56 (Aug. 31, 2022). The hearing transcript was amended pursuant to Order No. 51 (Jun. 23, 2022) and Order No. 52 (Jun. 27, 2022). The parties' post-hearing briefs were amended pursuant to Order No. 54 (Jul. 14, 2022), Order No. 55 (Jul. 14, 2022), and Order No. 57 (Aug. 31, 2022).

Pursuant to Order No. 58 (Sept. 12, 2022), Order No. 59 (Oct. 24, 2022), and Order No. 61 (Dec. 9, 2022), the target date was extended to May 10, 2023. *See* Comm'n Notice, EDIS Doc. ID 787448 (Jan. 6, 2023).

B. The Parties

1. Complainants

The Complainants are Masimo Corporation ("Masimo") and Cercacor Laboratories, Inc. ("Cercacor") (collectively, "Complainants"). Notice of Investigation at 2. Masimo and Cercacor are both Delaware corporations having their principal places of business in Irvine, California. Complaint ¶ 9. Masimo is the owner of the '501 patent (JX-0001), '502 patent (JX-0002), '648 patent (JX-0003), and '745 patent (JX-0009). *Id.* ¶ 4. Cercacor is the owner of the '127 patent (JX-0007). *Id.* Masimo and Cercacor have rights to each of the asserted patents through a cross-licensing agreement. *Id.* ¶¶ 4, 77; CX-1612C.

2. Respondent

The Respondent is Apple Inc. ("Apple"). Notice of Investigation at 2. Apple is a California corporation having its principal place of business in Cupertino, California. Response to Complaint ¶ 21.

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

C. Asserted Patents

The '501 patent, '502 patent, and '648 patent share a common specification, claiming priority to an application filed on July 3, 2008. JX-0001; JX-0002; JX-0003. These patents are entitled "User-Worn Device for Noninvasively Measuring a Physiological Parameter of a User," naming inventors Jeroen Poeze *et al.*, and are referenced herein as the "Poeze patents." *Id.*

The '745 patent is entitled "Physiological Monitoring Devices, Systems, and Methods," and claims priority to an application filed on June 28, 2016, naming inventor Ammar Al-Ali. JX-0009.

The '127 patent is entitled "Multiple Wavelength Sensor Substrate" and issued from an application filed on March 1, 2006, naming inventors Ammar Al-Ali *et al.* JX-0007.

D. Products at Issue

The products at issue are "wearable electronic devices with light-based pulse oximetry functionality and components thereof." Notice of Investigation at 2.

1. Accused Products

Complainants accuse Apple Watch products of infringing the asserted patents, including the Apple Watch Series 6, the Apple Watch Series 7, and certain prototype Apple Watch products [redacted] ("Next Generation Apple Watches"). CIB at 37-39. Apple has stipulated to the importation of the Apple Watch Series 6, Apple Watch Series 7, and Next Generation Apple Watches (collectively, the "Accused Products"). *See* CX-0128C (Stipulation Regarding Importation and Inventory) at ¶¶ 2-4; CX-1259C (Stipulation Relating to Next-Generation Watches) at ¶¶ 5-6. The parties have stipulated that the Accused Products are materially identical for the purposes of infringement in this investigation. *See* Joint Stipulation of Facts at ¶¶ 11-13, EDIS Doc. ID 770692 (May 13, 2022); CX-1259C at ¶¶ 7-8.

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

2. Domestic Industry Products

With respect to the '501, '502, '648, and '745 patents, Complainants rely on certain "Masimo Watch" products. CIB at 26-35. These Masimo Watch products include certain prototypes identified as the "Circle Sensor" (CPX-0021C), the "Wings Sensor" (CPX-0029C), the "RevA sensor" (CPX-0052C), the "RevD sensor" (CPX-0058C), the "RevE sensors" (CPX-0019C, CPX-0020C, CPX-0065C), and a product identified as the Masimo W1 Watch (CPX-0146C). CIB at 30-35. With respect to the '127 patent, Complainants rely on certain of Masimo's rainbow® sensors. *Id.* at 36.

E. Witness Testimony

The undersigned received testimonial evidence in this investigation in the form of live testimony and deposition designations.

1. Fact Witnesses

The first witness at the hearing was Joe Kiani, the chairman and chief executive officer of Masimo and Cercacor. Tr. at 79-189. Complainants also presented testimony from Mohamed Diab, an engineer at Masimo, *id.* at 190-246; Ammar Al-Ali, who oversees technology development at Masimo, *id.* at 247-340; and Bilal Muhsin, who is the chief operating officer of Masimo. *Id.* at 341-89. Complainants further presented testimony from Stephen Scruggs, the director of sensor design at Masimo, *id.* at 390-479; Micah Young, who is Masimo's chief financial officer and executive vice president, *id.* at 481-520; and Jeroen Hammarth, the chief financial officer of Cercacor. *Id.* at 521-33.

Apple presented testimony from several of its employees, including Vivek Venugopal, an optical engineer, *id.* at 816-49; Saahil Mehra, who manages product design for the Apple Watch health sensors, *id.* at 850-94; Ueyn Block, who worked on the optical architecture for the Apple

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

Watch health sensors, *id.* at 895-917; Stephen Waydo, who is the director of a human interface device (HID) health group at Apple, *id.* at 918-51; Brian Land, who leads a health sensing hardware group at Apple, *id.* at 952-92; and Paul Mannheimer, a sensor architect and scientist at Apple, *id.* at 993-1025. Apple's counsel also examined Scott Cromar, the prosecuting attorney for the '501 patent, '502 patent, and '648 patent. *Id.* at 1026-41. Apple further presented testimony from Robert Rowe, who was the named inventor of certain asserted prior art. *Id.* at 1141-53; *see id.* at 1174:3-1175:7 (no cross-examination for Mr. Rowe).

2. Expert Witnesses

Complainants rely on the testimony of Daniel McGavock, who was admitted as an expert in financial matters, offering testimony regarding economic domestic industry, bond, and commercial success. Tr. at 533-76 (expert qualification at 534:25-535:6), 1416-42. With respect to the '127 patent, Complainants rely on the testimony of Jack Goldberg, who was admitted as an expert in the field of physiological monitoring technologies. *Id.* at 612-63 (expert qualification at 614:3-11), 1391-1408. With respect to the '501 patent, '502 patent, '648 patent, and '745 patent, Complainants rely on the testimony of Vijay Madisetti, who was admitted as an expert in the field of physiological monitoring technologies. *Id.* at 664-813 (*voir dire* and expert qualification at 666:10-674:12). Complainants also rely on the testimony of Robert Stoll, who was admitted as an expert on Patent Office practice and procedure. *Id.* at 1409-15 (expert qualification at 1409:23-1410:4).

Apple relies on the testimony of Majid Sarrafzadeh, who was admitted as an expert in physiological monitoring technologies including the design of pulse oximetry sensors, with respect to the '745 patent and '127 patent. *Id.* at 1042-1138 (expert qualification at 1046:5-12). With respect to the '501 patent, '502 patent, and '648 patent, Apple relies on the testimony of

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

Steven Warren, who was admitted as an expert in biomedical engineering, medical monitoring systems, biomedical instrumentation, biomedical optics, light issue interaction, diagnostic systems, wearable sensors, and biomedical signal processing. *Id.* at 1181-1282 (expert qualification at 1187:20-1188:11). Apple also relies on the testimony of Vincent Thomas, who was admitted as an expert in the field of economics and financial analysis, with respect to the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement. *Id.* at 1282-1389 (expert qualification at 1283:11-17).

3. Deposition Designations

Complainants submitted several designated deposition transcripts that were received into evidence without a sponsoring witness: CX-0273C (Amor Dep. Tr.); CX-0281C (Block Dep. Tr.); CX-0275C (Caldbeck Dep. Tr.); CX-0283C (Charbonneau-Lefort Dep. Tr.); CX-0285C (Dua Dep. Tr.); CX-0287C (Land Dep. Tr.); CX-0289C (Mannheimer Dep. Tr.); CX-0291C (Mehra Dep. Tr.); CX-0293C (Rollins Dep. Tr.); CX-0279C (Rowe Dep. Tr.); CX-0295C (Shui Dep. Tr.); CX-0297C (Venugopal Dep. Tr.); CX-0299C (Waydo Dep. Tr.). *See* Tr. at 291:22-299:5. Apple also submitted several designated deposition transcripts that were received into evidence without a sponsoring witness: RX-1195C (Abdul-Hafiz Dep. Tr.); RX-1296C (Al-Ali Dep. Tr.); RX-1200C (Diab Dep. Tr.); RX-1201C (Hammarth Dep. Tr.); RX-1202C (Kaufman Dep. Tr.); RX-1204C (Kiani Dep. Tr.); RX-1206C (Muhsin Dep. Tr.); RX-1209C (Scruggs Dep. Tr.); RX-1210C (Scruggs 2nd Dep. Tr.); RX-1211C (Young Dep. Tr.). *See* Tr. at 1323:24-1324:20.

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

II. JURISDICTION AND IMPORTATION

A. Personal Jurisdiction

Apple has submitted to the personal jurisdiction of the Commission by answering the Complaint and Notice of Investigation, participating in discovery, appearing at hearings, and filing motions and briefs. *See Certain Miniature Hacksaws*, Inv. No. 337-TA-237, USITC Pub. No. 1948, Initial Determination at 4, 1986 WL 379287, *1 (Oct. 15, 1986), *not reviewed in relevant part by* Comm'n Action and Order, 1987 WL 450871 (Jan. 15, 1987). Apple does not dispute the Commission's jurisdiction in this investigation. *See* RIB at 18.

B. *In Rem* Jurisdiction and Importation

The Commission has *in rem* jurisdiction over the accused products by virtue of their importation into the United States. *See Sealed Air Corp. v. U.S. Int'l Trade Comm'n*, 645 F.2d 976, 985-86 (C.C.P.A. 1981) (holding that the ITC's jurisdiction over imported articles is sufficient to exclude such articles). Apple has stipulated to the importation of the Accused Products. CX-0128C at 1-2; CX-1259C ¶¶ 5-6. Apple does not dispute the Commission's jurisdiction in this investigation. *See* RIB at 18.

III. LEGAL STANDARDS

A. Infringement

Section 337(a)(1)(B)(i) prohibits "the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation by the owner, importer, or consignee, of articles that – (i) infringe a valid and enforceable United States patent or a valid and enforceable United States copyright registered under title 17." 19 U.S.C. §1337(a)(1)(B)(i). The Commission has held that the word "infringe" in Section 337(a)(1)(B)(i) "derives its legal meaning from 35 U.S.C. § 271, the section of the Patent Act that defines patent infringement."

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

Certain Elec. Devices with Image Processing Sys., Components Thereof, and Associated Software, Inv. No. 337-TA-724, Comm'n Op. at 13-14, EDIS Doc. ID 467105 (Dec. 21, 2011).

Infringement must be proven by a preponderance of the evidence. *SmithKline Diagnostics, Inc. v. Helena Labs. Corp.*, 859 F.2d 878, 889 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The preponderance of the evidence standard "requires proving that infringement was more likely than not to have occurred." *Warner-Lambert Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.*, 418 F.3d 1326, 1341 n.15 (Fed. Cir. 2005).

1. Claim Construction

"An infringement analysis entails two steps. The first step is determining the meaning and scope of the patent claims asserted to be infringed. The second step is comparing the properly construed claims to the device accused of infringing." *Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*, 52 F.3d 967, 976 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (en banc), *aff'd*, 517 U.S. 370 (1996) (citation omitted). "[T]he construction of claims is simply a way of elaborating the normally terse claim language[] in order to understand and explain, but not to change, the scope of the claims." *Embrex, Inc. v. Serv. Eng'g Corp.*, 216 F.3d 1343, 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (alterations in original) (quoting *Scripps Clinic v. Genentech, Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1565, 1580 (Fed. Cir. 1991)). "[O]nly those [claim] terms need be construed that are in controversy, and only to the extent necessary to resolve the controversy." *Vivid Techs., Inc. v. Am. Sci. & Eng'g, Inc.*, 200 F.3d 795, 803 (Fed. Cir. 1999). The words of a claim "'are generally given their ordinary and customary meaning,'" which is "the meaning that the term would have to a person of ordinary skill in art" as of the date that the patent application was filed. *Phillips v. AWH Corp.,* 415 F.3d 1303, 1312-13 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (*en banc*) (quoting *Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.*, 90 F.3d 1576, 1582 (Fed. Cir. 1996)).

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

2. Direct and Indirect Infringement

A patent claim is directly infringed when a respondent "makes, uses, offers to sell, or sells any patented invention, within the United States, or imports into the United States any patented invention" without consent of the patent owner. 35 U.S.C. § 271(a)

In addition to direct infringement, a respondent may be liable for indirect infringement, including induced infringement, which is defined in section 271(b) of the Patent Act: "Whoever actively induces infringement of a patent shall be liable as an infringer." 35 U.S.C. § 271(b). *See DSU Med. Corp. v. JMS Co., Ltd.*, 471 F.3d 1293, 1305 (Fed. Cir. 2006) (en banc) ("To establish liability under section 271(b), a patent holder must prove that once the defendants knew of the patent, they actively and knowingly aided and abetted another's direct infringement.") (citations omitted). "The mere knowledge of possible infringement by others does not amount to inducement; specific intent and action to induce infringement must be proven." *Id.* (citations omitted). The Supreme Court has held that induced infringement "requires knowledge that the induced acts constitute patent infringement." *Global-Tech Appliances, Inc. v. SEB S.A.*, 563 U.S. 754, 766 (2011). In *Suprema, Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n*, the Federal Circuit upheld the Commission's interpretation of the section 337 language "articles that infringe" in the context of induced infringement, holding that the statute "covers goods that were used by an importer to directly infringe post-importation as a result of the seller's inducement." 796 F.3d 1338, 1352-53 (Fed. Cir. 2015).

Another form of indirect infringement is contributory infringement, defined in section 271(c) of the Patent Act: "Whoever offers to sell . . . or imports into the United States a component of a patented machine, . . . or a material or apparatus for use in practicing a patented process, constituting a material part of the invention, knowing the same to be especially made or

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

especially adapted for use in an infringement of such patent, and not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing use, shall be liable as a contributory infringer." 35 U.S.C. § 271(c). The intent requirement for contributory infringement requires that respondent knows "that the combination for which [the] component was especially designed was both patented and infringing." *Global-Tech*, 563 U.S. at 763. A violation of section 337 based on contributory infringement requires that "the accused infringer imported, sold for importation, or sold after importation within the United States, the accused components that contributed to another's direct infringement." *Spansion, Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n*, 629 F.3d 1331, 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2010).

3. Literal Infringement and the Doctrine of Equivalents

A complainant must prove either literal infringement or infringement under the doctrine of equivalents. Literal infringement requires the patentee to prove that the accused device meets each and every limitation of the asserted claim(s). *Frank's Casing Crew & Rental Tools, Inc. v. Weatherford Int'l, Inc.*, 389 F.3d 1370, 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2004). "If even one limitation is missing or not met as claimed, there is no literal infringement." *Elkay Mfg. Co. v. EBCO Mfg. Co.*, 192 F.3d 973, 980 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Literal infringement is a question of fact. *Finisar Corp. v. DirecTV Grp., Inc.*, 523 F.3d 1323, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2008). Under the doctrine of equivalents, "a product or process that does not literally infringe upon the express terms of a patent claim may nonetheless be found to infringe if there is 'equivalence' between the elements of the accused product or process and the claimed elements of the patented invention." *Warner-Jenkinson Co. v. Hilton Davis Chem. Co.*, 520 U.S. 17, 21 (1997).

B. Invalidity

It is the respondents' burden to prove invalidity, and the burden of proof never shifts to

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

the patentee to prove validity. *Scanner Techs. Corp. v. ICOS Vision Sys. Corp. N.V.*, 528 F.3d 1365, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2008). "Under the patent statutes, a patent enjoys a presumption of validity, *see* 35 U.S.C. § 282, which can be overcome only through facts supported by clear and convincing evidence . . . ." *SRAM Corp. v. AD-II Eng'g, Inc.*, 465 F.3d 1351, 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2006); *see also Microsoft Corp. v. i4i Ltd. P'ship*, 564 U.S. 91, 100-114 (2011) (upholding the "clear and convincing" standard for invalidity).

The clear and convincing evidence standard placed on the party asserting an invalidity defense requires a level of proof beyond the preponderance of the evidence. Although not susceptible to precise definition, "clear and convincing" evidence has been described as evidence that produces in the mind of the trier of fact "an abiding conviction that the truth of a factual contention is 'highly probable.'" *Price v. Symsek*, 988 F.2d 1187, 1191 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (quoting *Buildex, Inc. v. Kason Indus., Inc.,* 849 F.2d 1461, 1463 (Fed. Cir. 1988)).

1. Anticipation

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102, a patent claim is invalid as anticipated if:

> (1) the claimed invention was patented, described in a printed publication, or in public use, on sale, or otherwise available to the public before the effective filing date of the claimed invention; or
>
> (2) the claimed invention was described in a patent issued under section 151, or in an application for patent published or deemed published under section 122(b), in which the patent or application, as the case may be, names another inventor and was effectively filed before the effective filing date of the claimed invention.

35 U.S.C. § 102 (2012). "A patent is invalid for anticipation if a single prior art reference discloses each and every limitation of the claimed invention. Moreover, a prior art reference may anticipate without disclosing a feature of the claimed invention if that missing characteristic is necessarily

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

present, or inherent, in the single anticipating reference." *Schering Corp. v. Geneva Pharm., Inc.*, 339 F.3d 1373, 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (citations omitted).

2. Obviousness

Section 103 of the Patent Act states:

> A patent for a claimed invention may not be obtained, notwithstanding that the claimed invention is not identically disclosed as set forth in section 102, if the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are such that the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious before the effective filing date of the claimed invention to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the claimed invention pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (2012).

"Obviousness is a question of law based on underlying questions of fact." *Scanner Techs.*, 528 F.3d at 1379. The underlying factual determinations include: "(1) the scope and content of the prior art, (2) the level of ordinary skill in the art, (3) the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art, and (4) objective indicia of non-obviousness." *Id.* at 1380 (citing *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966)). These factual determinations are often referred to as the "*Graham* factors."

A critical inquiry in determining the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art is whether there is a reason to combine the prior art references. *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 418-21 (2007). In *KSR*, the Supreme Court rejected the Federal Circuit's rigid application of a "teaching-suggestion-motivation" test—while the Court stated that "it can be important to identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the elements in the way the claimed new invention does," it described a more flexible analysis:

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

> Often, it will be necessary for a court to look to interrelated teachings of multiple patents; the effects of demands known to the design community or present in the marketplace; and the background knowledge possessed by a person having ordinary skill in the art, all in order to determine whether there was an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed by the patent at issue . . . . As our precedents make clear, however, the analysis need not seek out precise teachings directed to the specific subject matter of the challenged claim, for a court can take account of the inferences and creative steps that a person of ordinary skill in the art would employ.

Id. at 418. Applying *KSR*, the Federal Circuit has held that, where a patent challenger contends that a patent is invalid for obviousness based on a combination of prior art references, "the burden falls on the patent challenger to show by clear and convincing evidence that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have had reason to attempt to make the composition or device . . . and would have had a reasonable expectation of success in doing so." *PharmaStem Therapeutics, Inc. v. ViaCell, Inc.*, 491 F.3d 1342, 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2007).

In addition to demonstrating that a reason exists to combine prior art references, the challenger must demonstrate that the combination of prior art references discloses all of the limitations of the claims. *Hearing Components, Inc. v. Shure Inc.*, 600 F.3d 1357, 1373-1374 (Fed. Cir. 2010), *abrogated on other grounds by Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.*, 572 U.S. 898 (2014) (upholding finding of non-obviousness based on substantial evidence that the asserted combination of references failed to disclose a claim limitation); *Velander v. Garner*, 348 F.3d 1359, 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (explaining that a requirement for a finding of obviousness is that "all the elements of an invention are found in a combination of prior art references").

3. Indefiniteness

"The Patent Act requires that a patent specification 'conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as [the] invention.'" *Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.,* 572 U.S. 898 (2014)

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

(quoting 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2). "[T]he second paragraph of § 112 contains two requirements: first, [the claim] must set forth what the applicant regards as his invention, and second, it must do so with sufficient particularity and distinctness, *i.e.*, the claim must be sufficiently definite." *Allen Eng'g Corp. v. Bartell Indus., Inc,.* 299 F.3d 1336, 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted) (alteration in original). A claim does not satisfy the second requirement and is thereby indefinite "if read in light of the specification delineating the patent, and the prosecution history, [the claim] fail[s] to inform, with reasonable certainty, those skilled in the art about the scope of the invention." *Nautilus*, 534 U.S. at 901. Indefiniteness is a question of law, subject to a determination of underlying facts. *Akzo Nobel Coatings, Inc. v. Dow Chem. Co.,* 811 F.3d 1334, 1343-44 (Fed. Cir. 2016). The party challenging the validity of a claim bears the burden of establishing indefiniteness. *Id.*

4. Written Description

Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1, the specification must provide a written description of the claimed invention that "reasonably conveys to those skilled in the art that the inventor had possession of the claimed subject matter as of the filing date." *Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lilly and Co.*, 598 F.3d 1336, 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (*en banc*). Determining whether the written description requirement has been satisfied "requires an objective inquiry into the four corners of the specification from the perspective of a person of ordinary skill in the art" to determine whether the specification "show[s] that the inventor actually invented the invention claimed." *Id.*

5. Enablement

The enablement requirement is set forth in 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 and provides in pertinent part that the specification shall describe "the manner and process of making and using [the

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

invention], in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the [invention]." The "enablement requirement is satisfied when one skilled in the art, after reading the specification, could practice the claimed invention without undue experimentation." *AK Steel Corp. v. Sollac & Ugine*, 344 F.3d 1234, 1244 (Fed. Cir. 2003). Whether undue experimentation is needed is not a single, simple factual determination, but rather is a conclusion reached by weighing many factual considerations. *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 737 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

C. Inequitable Conduct

A patent containing a claim obtained through inequitable conduct is unenforceable. *Therasense, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson & Co.,* 649 F.3d 1276, 1288-89 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (en banc). "Moreover, the taint of a finding of inequitable conduct can spread from a single patent to render unenforceable other related patents and applications in the same technology family." *Id.* (*citing Consol. Aluminum Corp. v. Foseco Int'l Ltd.,* 910 F.2d 804, 808-12 (Fed. Cir. 1990)).

"To prevail on the defense of inequitable conduct, the accused infringer must prove that the applicant misrepresented or omitted material information with the specific intent to deceive the PTO." *Id.* at 1287. The failure to disclose a reference to the PTO constitutes inequitable conduct only if "the applicant *made a deliberate decision* to withhold a known material reference." *Id.* at 1290 (quoting *Molins PLC v. Textron, Inc.,* 48 F.3d 1172, 1182 (Fed. Cir. 1995)) (internal quotation marks omitted; emphasis in original). "In other words, the accused infringer must prove by clear and convincing evidence that the applicant knew of the reference, knew that it was material, and made a deliberate decision to withhold it." *Id.* Inequitable conduct based on the failure to disclose a reference requires a showing of "but for" materiality for the reference. *Id.* at 1291. The "but for" materiality requirement is satisfied "if the PTO

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

would not have allowed a claim had it been aware of the undisclosed prior art." *Id.* In determining whether "but for" materiality requirement is satisfied, the "the court should apply the preponderance of the evidence standard and give claims their broadest reasonable construction." *Id.* at 1291-92.

While deceptive intent may be inferred solely from circumstantial evidence, "[t]o meet the clear and convincing evidence standard, the specific intent to deceive must be 'the single most reasonable inference able to be drawn from the evidence.'" *Id.* (quoting *Star Scientific Inc. v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.*, 537 F.3d 1357, 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2008)).

D. Domestic Industry

In patent-based proceedings under section 337, a complainant must establish that an industry "relating to the articles protected by the patent . . . exists or is in the process of being established" in the United States. 19 U.S.C. § 1337(a)(2). Under Commission precedent, the domestic industry requirement of section 337 consists of a "technical prong" and an "economic prong." *See, e.g., Alloc, Inc. v. Intl Trade Comm'n,* 342 F.3d 1361, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2003).

To meet the technical prong, the complainant must establish that it practices at least one claim of the asserted patent. *Certain Point of Sale Terminals and Components Thereof*, Inv. No. 337-TA-524, Order No. 40 at 17-18, EDIS Doc. ID 230409 (Apr. 11, 2005). "The test for satisfying the 'technical prong' of the industry requirement is essentially [the] same as that for infringement, *i.e.*, a comparison of domestic products to the asserted claims." *Alloc*, 342 F.3d at 1375.

With respect to the "economic prong," subsection (3) of Section 337(a) provides:

> For purposes of paragraph (2), an industry in the United States shall be considered to exist if there is in the United States, with respect to the articles protected by the patent, copyright, trademark, mask work, or design concerned –

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

> (A) significant investment in plant and equipment;
>
> (B) significant employment of labor or capital; or
>
> (C) substantial investment in its exploitation, including engineering, research and development, or licensing.

19 U.S.C. § 1337(a)(3).

Expenditures may be counted toward satisfaction of the domestic industry requirement "as long as those investments pertain to the complainant's industry with respect to the articles protected by the asserted IP rights." *Certain Television Sets, Television Receivers, Television Tuners, and Components Thereof*, Inv. No. 337-TA-910, Comm'n Op. at 68, 2015 WL 6755093, at *36 (Oct. 30, 2015); *accord, e.g., Certain Marine Sonar Imaging Devices, Including Downscan and Sidescan Devices, Prods. Containing the Same, and Components Thereof*, Inv. No. 337-TA-921, Comm'n Op., 2016 WL 10987364, at *40 (Jan. 6, 2016) ("Navico's allocation methodology reasonably approximates the warranty and technical customer support expenditures relating to the LSS-1 product.") (*citing Certain Ground Fault Circuit Interrupters and Prods. Containing Same,* Inv. No. 337-TA-739, Comm'n Op. at 74-75, 79-81 (June 8, 2012)). Subsections (A), (B), and (C) are listed in the disjunctive, and accordingly, the domestic industry investments in plant and equipment or labor and capital can include expenditures that relate to engineering or research and development. *Certain Solid State Storage Drives, Stacked Electronics Components, and Products Containing Same*, Inv. No. 337-TA-1097, Comm'n Op. at 14, EDIS Doc. ID 649139 (June 29, 2018) ("[T]he text of the statute, the legislative history, and Commission precedent do not support narrowing subsections (A) and (B) to exclude non-manufacturing activities, such as investments in engineering and research and development.").

Whether a complainant satisfies the economic prong is not analyzed according to a rigid mathematical formula. *Certain Male Prophylactic Devices*, Inv. No. 337-TA-546, Comm'n Op.

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

at 39, EDIS Doc. ID 279161 (Aug. 1, 2007). The decision is made on a case-by-case basis and requires "an examination of the facts in each investigation, the article of commerce, and the realities of the marketplace." *Id.* Although Section 337(a)(3) describes the economic activities as "significant" and "substantial," a complainant does not need to show any "minimum monetary expenditure," and a complainant does not "need to define or quantify the industry itself in absolute mathematical terms." *Stringed Musical Instruments & Components Thereof* ("*Stringed Musical Instruments*"), Inv. No. 337-TA-586, Comm'n Op. at 26, EDIS Doc. ID 300615 (May 16, 2008). "A precise accounting [of the complainant's domestic investments] is not necessary, as most people do not document their daily affairs in contemplation of possible litigation." *Id.* at 17.

The Commission has held that "[o]rdinarily, the relevant date at which to determine if the domestic industry requirement of section 337 is satisfied is the filing date of the complaint." *Certain Thermoplastic-Encapsulated Electric Motors, Components Thereof, and Products and Vehicles Containing the Same*, Inv. No. 337-TA-1073, Comm'n Op. at 6-7, EDIS Doc. ID 684974 (Aug. 12, 2019). In *Stringed Musical Instruments*, the Commission held that a domestic industry is in the process of being established when (1) a complainant takes "the necessary tangible steps to establish such an industry in the United States," and (2) there is a "significant likelihood that the industry requirement will be satisfied in the future." Inv. No. 337-TA-586, Comm'n Op. at 14-17, EDIS Doc. ID 300615 (May 16, 2008).

IV. POEZE PATENTS

The '501 patent, '502 patent, and '648 patent are entitled "User-Worn Device for Noninvasively Measuring a Physiological Parameter of a User," sharing a common specification and naming inventors Jeroen Poeze *et al.* JX-0001; JX-0002; JX-0003. These patents are

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

collectively referred to herein as the "Poeze patents." The Poeze patents issued from applications filed on September 24, 2020, claiming priority to earlier patent applications, with the earliest provisional application filed on July 3, 2008. *See Id.*

A. Specification

The Poeze patents' specification describes non-invasive physiological sensors for measuring blood constituents or analytes using multi-stream spectroscopy. JX-0001 at 7:18-26. These sensors use an emitter that can uses optical radiation at different wavelengths to measure blood analytes like glucose, hemoglobin, or oxygen saturation. *Id.* at 12:13-13:58. The sensors are connected to handheld or portable monitoring devices that can be attached to a patient's body. *Id.* at 16:31-17:19. In one embodiment, the housing is designed to receive a patient's finger, which can be placed on a protrusion (305) that includes openings or windows (320, 321, 322, and 323) that allow light from the emitter to reach photodetectors. *Id.* at 19:13-20:15.




FIG. 3C

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

Id. at Fig. 3C. One portion of the housing may include LEDs that emit optical radiation passing through a finger before being received by the photodetectors on the other portion of the housing. *Id.* at 26:30-27:41.




FIG. 7A

Id. at Fig. 7A.

B. Asserted claims

Masimo asserts claim 12 of the '501 patent, which depends from claim 1. *See* CIB at 53-66. Claims 1 and 12 of the '501 patent are recited below:

> 1. A user-worn device configured to non-invasively measure a physiological parameter of a user, the user-worn device comprising:
>
> at least three light emitting diodes (LEDs);
>
> at least three photodiodes arranged on an interior surface of the user-worn device and configured to receive light attenuated by tissue of the user;

a protrusion arranged over the interior surface, the protrusion comprising a convex surface and a plurality of openings extending through the protrusion and positioned over the three photodiodes, the openings each comprising an opaque lateral surface, the plurality of openings configured to allow light to reach the photodiodes, the opaque lateral surface configured to avoid light piping through the protrusion; and

one or more processors configured to receive one or more signals from the photodiodes and calculate a measurement of the physiological parameter of the user.

JX-0001 at 45:2-19.

12. The user-worn device of claim 1, wherein the convex surface of the protrusion is an outermost surface configured to contact the tissue of the user and conform the tissue into a concave shape.

Id. at 46:4-8.

Masimo also asserts claim 22 of the '502 patent, which depends from claims 19, 20, and 21, and claim 28, a separate independent claim. *See* CIB at 66-77. These claims of the '502 patent are recited below:

19. A user-worn device configured to non-invasively measure an oxygen saturation of a user, the user-worn device comprising:

a plurality of emitters configured to emit light, each of the emitters comprising at least two light emitting diodes (LEDs);

four photodiodes arranged within the user-worn device and configured to receive light after at least a portion of the light has been attenuated by tissue of the user;

a protrusion comprising a convex surface including separate openings extending through the protrusion and lined with opaque material, each opening positioned over a different one associated with each of the four photodiodes, the opaque material configured to reduce an amount of light reaching the photodiodes without being attenuated by the tissue;

optically transparent material within each of the openings; and

one or more processors configured to receive one or more signals from at least one of the four photodiodes and output measurements responsive to the one or more signals, the measurements indicative of the oxygen saturation of the user.

20. The user-worn device of claim 19 further comprising a thermistor.

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

21. The user-worn device of claim 20, wherein the one or more processors are further configured to receive a temperature signal from the thermistor and adjust operation of the user-worn device responsive to the temperature signal.

22. The user-worn device of claim 21, wherein the plurality of emitters comprise at least four emitters, and wherein each of the plurality of emitters comprises a respective set of at least three LEDs.

JX-0002 at 46:22-54.

28. A user-worn device configured to non-invasively measure an oxygen saturation of a user, the user-worn device comprising:

a first set of light emitting diodes (LEDs), the first set of LEDs comprising at least an LED configured to emit light at a first wavelength and an LED configured to emit light at a second wavelength;

a second set of LEDs spaced apart from the first set of LEDs, the second set of LEDs comprising at least an LED configured to emit light at the first wavelength and an LED configured to emit light at the second wavelength;

four photodiodes arranged in a quadrant configuration on an interior surface of the user-worn device and configured to receive light after at least a portion of the light has been attenuated by tissue of the user;

a thermistor configured to provide a temperature signal;

a protrusion arranged above the interior surface, the protrusion comprising:

a convex surface;

a plurality of openings in the convex surface, extending through the protrusion, and aligned with the four photodiodes, each opening defined by an opaque surface configured to reduce light piping; and

a plurality of transmissive windows, each of the transmissive windows extending across a different one of the openings;

at least one opaque wall extending between the interior surface and the protrusion, wherein at least the interior surface, the opaque wall and the protrusion form cavities, wherein the photodiodes are arranged on the interior surface within the cavities;

one or more processors configured to receive one or more signals from at least one of the photodiodes and calculate an oxygen saturation measurement of the user, the one or more processors further configured to receive the temperature signal;

a network interface configured to wirelessly communicate the oxygen saturation measurement to at least one of a mobile phone or an electronic network;

a user interface comprising a touch-screen display, wherein the user interface is configured to display indicia responsive to the oxygen saturation measurement of the user;

a storage device configured to at least temporarily store at least the measurement; and

a strap configured to position the user-worn device on the user.

Id. at 47:13-23.

Masimo further asserts claim 12 of the '648 patent, which depends from claim 8, and claims 24 and 30, which depend from claim 20. *See* CIB at 77-83. These claims of the '648 patent are recited below:

8. A user-worn device configured to non-invasively determine measurements of a physiological parameter of a user, the user-worn device comprising:

a first set of light emitting diodes (LEDs), the first set comprising at least an LED configured to emit light at a first wavelength and at least an LED configured to emit light at a second wavelength;

a second set of LEDs spaced apart from the first set of LEDs, the second set of LEDs comprising an LED configured to emit light at the first wavelength and an LED configured to emit light at the second wavelength;

four photodiodes;

a protrusion comprising a convex surface, at least a portion of the protrusion comprising an opaque material;

a plurality of openings provided through the protrusion and the convex surface, the openings aligned with the photodiodes;

a separate optically transparent window extending across each of the openings;

one or more processors configured to receive one or more signals from at least one of the photodiodes and output measurements of a physiological parameter of a user;

a housing; and

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

a strap configured to position the housing proximate tissue of the user when the device is worn.

JX-0003 at 45:45-46:3.

12. The user-worn device of claim 8, wherein the physiological parameter comprises oxygen or oxygen saturation.

Id. at 46:15-16.

20. A user-worn device configured to non-invasively determine measurements of a user's tissue, the user-worn device comprising:

a plurality of light emitting diodes (LEDs);

at least four photodiodes configured to receive light emitted by the LEDs, the four photodiodes being arranged to capture light at different quadrants of tissue of a user;

a protrusion comprising a convex surface and a plurality of through holes, each through hole including a window and arranged over a different one of the at least four photodiodes; and

one or more processors configured to receive one or more signals from at least one of the photodiodes and determine measurements of oxygen saturation of the user.

Id. at 46:34-49.

24. The user-worn device of claim 20, wherein the protrusion comprises opaque material configured to substantially prevent light piping.

Id. at 46:59-61.

30. The user-worn device of claim 20, wherein the protrusion further comprises one or more chamfered edges.

Id. at 47:6-7.

C. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art

The parties have stipulated to a level of ordinary skill in the art for the Poeze patents:

> [A] person with a working knowledge of physiological monitoring technologies. The person would have had a Bachelor of Science degree in an academic discipline emphasizing the design of electrical, computer, or software technologies, in combination with training or at least one to two

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

> years of related work experience with capture and processing of data or information, including but not limited to physiological monitoring technologies. Alternatively, the person could have also had a Master of Science degree in a relevant academic discipline with less than a year of related work experience in the same discipline.

Joint Stipulation of Facts ¶ 12, EDIS Doc. ID 770692 (May 13, 2022).

D. Claim Construction

The parties dispute the construction of the terms "over"/"above" and the terms "openings"/"through holes" in the claims of the Poeze patents. *See* CIB at 42-53; RIB at 26-39; CRB at 13-19; RRB at 23-34.[3]

1. "over"/"above"

Several of the asserted claims of the Poeze patents contain limitations describing a protrusion that is "arranged over" or "arranged above" an interior surface. *See* '501 patent claim 1 ("a protrusion arranged over the interior surface"); '502 patent claim 28 ("a protrusion arranged above the interior surface"). Other limitations describe openings that are "positioned over" or "arranged over" photodiodes. *See* '501 patent claim 1 ("a plurality of openings extending through the protrusion and positioned over the three photodiodes"); '502 patent claim 19 ("each opening positioned over a different one associated with each of the four photodiodes"); '648 claim 20 ("each through hole including a window and arranged over a different one of the at least four photodiodes").

[3] The parties both argue that certain claim construction arguments were waived because they were not previously raised, *see* RIB at 37-38, CRB at 19 n.4, RRB at 31 n.17, 33 n.22, but these claim construction disputes were clearly addressed in the parties' pre-hearing briefs and pertain to the plain and ordinary meaning of the terms at issue. *See* CPBH at 39-43; RPHB at 8-15. Ground Rule 9.2 does not preclude parties from citing additional evidence that was admitted at the hearing to support arguments that are consistent with their pre-hearing briefs.

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

Apple interprets the "over" and "above" limitations to require that the claimed features be arranged vertically when the claimed device is in use. RIB at 26-34. Complainants argue that these terms refer to "the configuration of features of the device relative to each other, not to the position of the device relative to the Earth." CIB at 43. Both parties purport to rely on the ordinary meaning of these terms, without proposing any explicit construction. CIB at 42-49; RRB at 21.

Apple relies on the preambles of the asserted claims describing "a user-worn device configured to non-invasively measure a physiological parameter" to argue that the orientation of the claimed features must be considered when a device is in use. RIB at 27-28. Complainants dispute this interpretation, arguing that "configured to" refers to the design of the product, not the orientation of components. CIB at 45. Complainants argue that the devices described in the specification do not have a fixed orientation and that the embodiments of the invention show "that the protrusion is arranged over the photodiodes and their interior surface by extending across that surface." *Id.* at 43. Complainants note that the patent specification describes a variety of measurement sites without reference to any specific orientation. CRB at 14 (citing JX-0001 at 8:21-23, 10:15-27, 10:62-11:3, 11:45-55). Complainants cite an example in one embodiment of a material described as "over" the glass layer when it is depicted as below the layer in Figure 7A. *Id.* at 45-46 (citing JX-0001 at 27:59-62, Fig. 7A). Dr. Madisetti testified that Complainants' interpretation is consistent with the ordinary meaning of "over," citing the example of a bandage over a wound, explaining that "the Band-Aid is always over the scratch [ir]respective of the orientation of my hand." Tr. at 701:22-18.

Complainants also cite extrinsic evidence in Apple patents and prior art using the terms "over" and "above" to describe the arrangement of features similar to those claimed in the Poeze

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

patents. CIB at 46-49. *See, e.g.,* U.S. Patent No. 10,687,718 (CX-0118) at 32:17-23 ("For example, a back surface may comprise a first semi-circular protrusion that extends over the portions of the back surface."), 35:38-55 (FIG. 222A depicts . . . a protrusion 2202 disposed over an optical opening 2204."); U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2021/0093237 (CX-0103) at ¶ 0065 ("In some embodiments, windows 1220 over the emitters may be integral with the back cover 107 and windows 120 over the detectors may be inset within the back cover 107."); U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2017/03255744 (CX-1806) at ¶ 0044 ("For example, the back surface can include one or more cavities having a corresponding opening and a protrusion located over each of the openings."); U.S. Patent No. 4,224,948 (RX-0670) at 9:51-56 ("wherein said first and second light obstructing means comprise a pair of annular rings extending above the surface of the lower face of said case whereby said rings are in contact with the skin of the wearer").

Apple argues that Complainants' interpretation of the "over" and "above" limitations would render these terms meaningless. RRB at 23-24. Apple cites figures in the specification that consistently describe the claimed protrusion and openings located on top of the photodiodes. *Id.* at 24-26 (citing JX-0001 at 24:28-33, Figures 3C, 4C, 7B). Apple argues that the specification's use of the term "over" within the phrase "spread over" is irrelevant to the meaning of the claim phrases "positioned over" and "arranged over." RIB at 25-26. Apple further argues that in the Apple patents and patent applications using the term "over," the descriptions refer to devices that are depicted in a face-down position, not when they are configured to measure blood oxygen. *Id.* at 26-28. Apple argues that the "configured to" language in the claims requires that that the features have a specific orientation when the device is in use. *Id.* at 28-29.

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244

In consideration of the parties' arguments and the evidence of record, the undersigned agrees with Complainants that the claim limitations using the terms "over" and "above" do not require a vertical arrangement of features in the context of the Poeze patents. The terms "over" and "above" are commonly understood words with ordinary meanings that can be understood by a lay judge. *See Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1314. The undersigned agrees with Apple that the word "over" may be used to describe a vertical arrangement, but "over" can also be used to describe an arrangement where one feature covers another, as recognized by Dr. Madisetti's example of a bandage over a wound. Tr. (Madisetti) at 701:22-18. This is a common usage of the term "over" in the field of wearable medical equipment, *e.g.*, a mask over one's mouth, or in the field of optical sensors, *e.g.*, a filter over a lens. This is consistent with how the term "over" is used in the asserted claims of the Poeze patents, describing "a protrusion arranged over the interior surface" and openings "positioned over" or "arranged over" photodiodes. In the context of this claim language, the term "over" refers to an arrangement where one feature covers another—not the relative arrangement of these features in a vertical direction.[4] The ordinary meaning of the claim language does not restrict the orientation of these features, and whether the claimed photodiodes

[4] The term "above" is only used in asserted claim 28 of the '502 patent to refer to "a protrusion arranged above the interior surface." The undersigned agrees with Complainants that the patent specification does not require any specific orientation of the device and that the term "above" thus refers to a position relative to the device's features and not to its orientation relative to the Earth. *See* CIB at 43-49; CRB at 15-16. This is also consistent with the usage of the term in a prior art reference relied upon for invalidity purposes by Apple where the term "above" is used to refer to rings that extend beyond a surface, regardless of vertical orientation. *See* RX-0670 (Cramer) at claim 5 ("a pair of annular rings extending above the surface of the lower face of said case"). It is also consistent with the testimony of Apple's expert, Dr. Warren, that "[a] detector can't detect light without some sort of opening above it." Tr. (Warren) at 1193:5-6; *see also* RIB at 61 (same). Apple argues that "Cramer does not disclose restrictions on orientation" (RRB at 29) but this fact weighs against Apple's proposed construction: if the Cramer device can be in any orientation, the term "above" should have a meaning independent from orientation.

MASIMO 2043
Apple v. Masimo
IPR2024-00244