

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

TOYOTA MOTOR CORPORATION

Petitioner

v.

Patent of AMERICAN VEHICULAR SCIENCES

Patent Owner

Patent No. 6,772,057

Issue Date: August 3, 2004

Title: VEHICLE MONITORING SYSTEMS USING IMAGE PROCESSING

---

**REVISED PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE  
PURSUANT TO 37 CFR § 42.120**

Case No. IPR2013-00419

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. SUMMARY OF THE ’057 PATENT, SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART, AND LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL..... 4

III. GROUNDS FOR WHICH REVIEW HAS BEEN INSTITUTED ..... 8

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ..... 9

V. THE BOARD SHOULD CONFIRM VALIDITY OF CLAIM 1-4, 7-10, 31, 41, 56, 59-62, AND 64 OVER THE GROUNDS ASSERTED IN THE PETITION ..... 10

    A. None of the References Raised In The Review Disclose a “*Pattern Recognition Algorithm Generated From Data of Possible Exterior Objects and Patterns of Received Waves from the Possible Exterior Objects*” (claims 1-4, 7-10, 31, 41, 56, 59-61, 62, 64)..... 10

        (1) Lemelson..... 11

            a. Lemelson does not expressly disclose the claim limitation..... 12

            b. The Board’s decision to grant review based on Lemelson relied on the doctrine of inherency ..... 12

            c. Lemelson does not inherently disclose the claim limitation—it could have involved generating the algorithm with simulated data ..... 14

            d. Lemelson does not inherently disclose the claim limitation—it also could have involved generating an algorithm with data and waves not representing exterior objects to be detected ..... 19

e.	Toyota’s expert’s belated attempt at his deposition to read extra disclosure into Lemelson is unavailing .....	22
(2)	Borcherts .....	25
(3)	Asayama.....	26
(4)	Yamamura.....	26
(5)	Other References Cited In the Petition But For Which Review Was Not Granted .....	27
B.	None of the Obviousness Grounds Raised In The Review Fix The Failure To Disclose a “ <i>Pattern Recognition Algorithm Generated From Data of Possible Exterior Objects and Patterns of Received Waves from the Possible Exterior Objects</i> ” (claims 4, 31, 59).....	27
VI.	THE BOARD SHOULD CONFIRM VALIDITY OF CLAIM 30, 32-34, 37-39, AND 62 OVER THE GROUNDS ASSERTED IN THE PETITION .....	29
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	32

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases**

*Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.*,  
Case IPR2012-00026 (PTAB, Feb. 19, 2014)..... 13, 28, 29, 32

*Scaltech, Inc. v. Retec/Tetra, LLC.*,  
178 F.3d 1378 (Fed. Cir. 1999) ..... 13

*Transclean Corp. v. Bridgewood Servs., Inc.*,  
290 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2002) ..... 13

Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California,  
814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987) ..... 11

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. §314..... 27

**Rules**

37 CFR §42.120..... 1, 9, 27

## I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner American Vehicular Sciences (“AVS”) submits the following response under 37 CFR §42.120 to the Petition filed by Toyota Motor Corporation (“Toyota”) requesting *inter partes* review of certain claims of U.S. Pat. No. 6,772,057 (“the ‘057 patent”). This filing is timely pursuant to the Board’s Scheduling Order and the parties’ stipulation extending the deadline to March 20, 2014. (*See* Paper 20, Scheduling Order (“The parties may stipulate to different dates for DUE DATES 1 through 3 (earlier or later, but no later than DUE DATE 4).”); Paper 30, Notice of Stipulation).)

AVS respectfully submits that the arguments presented and the additional evidence submitted, such as testimony from AVS expert Professor Cris Koutsougeras, PhD, show that at least claims 1-4, 7-10, 31, 41, 56, 59-62, and 64 of the ‘057 patent are not anticipated or obvious in view of the grounds for review. AVS also reiterates the arguments with respect to claims 30, 32-34 and 37-39.

Specifically, none of the prior art raised in the grounds for review discloses a key requirement in claims 1-4, 7-10, 31, 41, 56, 59-62, and 64 of the ‘057 patent—a “pattern recognition algorithm generated from data of possible exterior objects and patterns of received waves from the possible exterior objects.” (*See* Exhibit 1001, ‘057 patent at independent claims 1 and 56 and dependent claims 31 and 41 (emphasis added).) In other words, these claims require a pattern recognition

# 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.