

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC. and FITBIT, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

VALENCELL, INC.
Patent Owner.

IPR2017-00318¹
Patent 8,886,269 B2

Before BRIAN J. McNAMARA, JAMES B. ARPIN, and
SHEILA F. McSHANE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

McSHANE, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

FINAL WRITTEN DECISION
35 U.S.C. § 318(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.73

¹ *Fitbit, Inc. v. Valencell, Inc.*, Case IPR2017-01554, has been joined with this proceeding.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

Apple Inc. (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition requesting *inter partes* review of claims 1–10 (“the challenged claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 8,886,269 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’269 patent”) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 311–319. Paper 2 (“Pet.”). *Fitbit, Inc. v. Valencell, Inc.*, Case IPR2017-01554, has been joined with this proceeding. Paper 30, 5–6. Valencell, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) filed a Preliminary Response to the Petition. Paper 6 (“Prelim. Resp.”). Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 314, we instituted an *inter partes* review as to claims 1–10 of the ’269 patent on June 5, 2017 on all of the asserted grounds, which are:

Ground	Claim(s)	Reference(s)
§ 103	1, 2, 6, 7	Asada ²
§ 103	3	Asada and Hicks ³
§ 103	4, 5	Asada and Hannula ⁴
§ 103	8	Asada and Delonzor ⁵
§ 103	9, 10	Asada and Al-Ali ⁶
§ 103	1, 2	Goodman ⁷

² H. Harry Asada, *Mobile Monitoring with Wearable Photoplethysmographic Biosensors*, IEEE ENGINEERING IN MEDICINE AND BIOLOGY MAGAZINE, 22:3, 28–40, May–June 2003 (Ex. 1005).

³ U.S. Patent No. 6,745,061 B1 (issued June 1, 2004) (Ex. 1008).

⁴ U.S. Patent No. 7,190,986 B1 (issued March 13, 2007) (Ex. 1009).

⁵ U.S. Patent No. 5,797,841 (issued August 25, 1998) (Ex. 1010).

⁶ U.S. Publication No. 2007/0123763 A1, published May 31, 2007 (Ex. 1011).

⁷ U.S. Patent No. 4,830,014 (issued May 16, 1989) (Ex. 1007).

Ground	Claim(s)	Reference(s)
§ 103	3	Goodman and Hicks
§ 103	4	Goodman and Hannula
§ 103	5	Goodman, Hannula, and Asada
§ 103	6, 7	Goodman and Asada
§ 103	8	Goodman and Delonzor
§ 103	9, 10	Goodman and Al-Ali

Paper 7 (“Dec.” or “Institution Decision”), 25–26.

During the course of trial, Patent Owner filed a Corrected Patent Owner Response (Paper 22, “PO Resp.”), and Petitioner filed a Reply to the Patent Owner Response (Paper 32, “Pet. Reply”). Petitioner submitted the Declaration of Brian W. Anthony, Ph.D. (Ex. 1003) and the Declaration of Brian W. Anthony, Ph.D. in Support of Petitioner’s Reply (Ex. 1102). Patent Owner submitted the Declaration of Albert H. Titus, Ph.D. (Ex. 2007).

Patent Owner filed a Motion for Observations on the cross-examination of Dr. Anthony (Paper 42), and Petitioner filed a response thereto (Paper 45). Petitioner filed a Motion to Exclude Evidence (Paper 44, “Mot. Ex.”), with Patent Owner filing an Opposition the Motion to Exclude (Paper 47, “Mot. Ex. Opp.”), and Petitioner filing a Reply thereto (Paper 48, “Mot. Ex. Reply”). In support of Patent Owner’s Opposition to the Motion to Exclude, the Declaration of Alex Wong (Ex. 2154) and the Declaration of Nathan L. Levenson (Ex. 2155) were submitted.

In addition, Patent Owner filed a Motion to Amend (Paper 21, “Mot.”), which was opposed by Petitioner (Paper 33, “Opp.”). Patent Owner submitted a Reply in Support of its Motion to Amend (Paper 37, “PO

IPR2017-00318

Patent 8,886,269 B2

Reply”), and Petitioner filed a Sur-Reply supporting its Opposition (Paper 39, “Sur-Reply”). In support of the Motion to Amend, Patent Owner submitted the Declaration of Dr. Titus (Ex. 2110), as well as the Supplemental Declaration of Dr. Titus (Ex. 2151). Petitioner submitted the Declaration of Dr. Anthony in support of the Opposition (Ex. 1103).

We held a consolidated oral hearing on February 27, 2018, in relation to this proceeding and that in Case IPR2017-00317. A transcript (Paper 53, “Tr.”) of the oral hearing has been entered into the record.

We have jurisdiction to hear this *inter partes* review under 35 U.S.C. § 6, and this Final Written Decision is issued pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 318(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.73. For the reasons that follow, we determine that Petitioner has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that claims 1–10 of the ’269 patent are unpatentable. We deny Patent Owner’s Motion to Amend. Additionally, we deny Petitioner’s Motion to Exclude.

B. Related Proceedings

The parties indicate that the ’269 patent is at issue in *Valencell, Inc. v. Apple Inc.*, Case No. 5:16-cv-00001 (E.D.N.C), and *Valencell, Inc. v. Fitbit, Inc.*, Case No. 5:16-cv-00002 (E.D.N.C). Pet. 3; Paper 5, 1. Patent Owner indicates the ’269 patent is also at issue in *Valencell, Inc. v. Bragi Store, LLC*, Case No. 5:16-cv-00895 (E.D.N.C.). Paper 5, 1.

In addition to this Petition, Petitioner indicates that it filed other *inter partes* review petitions challenging claims of U.S. Patent No. 8,989,830 B2 (IPR2017-00316 (institution denied) and IPR2017-00317 (instituted)). Pet. 3. U.S. Patent No. 8,989,830 B2 is a continuation of the ’269 patent. *Id.*

C. The '269 Patent

The '269 patent is entitled “Wearable Light-Guiding Bands For Physiological Monitoring” and issued on November 11, 2014, from an application filed on February 19, 2014. Ex. 1001, [22], [45], [54]. The '269 patent claims priority to the following applications: (1) U.S. Patent Application No. 12/691,388, filed on January 21, 2010 (now U.S. Patent No. 8,700,111); (2) U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 61/208,567, filed on February 25, 2009; (3) U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 61/208,574, filed on February 25, 2009; (4) U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 61/212,444, filed on April 13, 2009; and (5) U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 61/274,191, filed on August 14, 2009. *Id.* at [63], [60].

The '269 patent is directed to monitoring devices capable of encircling a portion of the body of a subject. Ex. 1001, Abstract. The monitoring devices may include physiological sensors to measure, for example, heart rate, pulse rate, breathing rate, and a variety of other physical parameters. *Id.* at 4:31–65. Monitoring devices may be configured to be attached to earlobes, fingers, toes, and other digits. *Id.* at 27:59–61. The '269 patent discloses various embodiments of the monitoring devices, such as that depicted in Figures 22A and 22B, reproduced below.

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.