

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TOYOTA MOTOR CORPORATION

Petitioner

v.

AMERICAN VEHICULAR SCIENCES

Patent Owner

Patent No. 5,845,000

Issue Date: December 1, 1998

Title: OPTICAL IDENTIFICATION AND MONITORING SYSTEM USING
PATTERN RECOGNITION FOR USE WITH VEHICLES

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

Case No. IPR2013-00424

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. SUMMARY OF THE '000 PATENT, SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART, AND LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL.....5

III. GROUNDS FOR WHICH REVIEW HAS BEEN INSTITUTED9

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION9

V. THE BOARD SHOULD CONFIRM VALIDITY OF CLAIMS 10, 11, 16, 17, 19, 20 AND 23 OVER THE GROUNDS ASSERTED IN THE PETITION.....12

 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 Electromagnetic Illumination From the Possible Exterior Objects*” (Claims 10, 11, 19, and 23) or a “*Pattern Recognition Algorithm Generated From Data of Possible Sources of Radiation Including Lights of Vehicles and Patterns of Received Radiation From the Possible Sources*” (Claims 16, 17, and 20).....12

 (1) Lemelson.....13

 a. Lemelson does not expressly disclose the claim limitation.....14

 b. The Board’s decision to grant review based on Lemelson relied on the doctrine of inherency14

 c. Lemelson does not inherently disclose the claim limitation—it could have involved generating the algorithm with simulated data16

 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	20
e. Toyota's expert's belated attempt at his deposition to read extra disclosure into Lemelson is unavailing	21
(2) Asayama.....	25
(3) Yanagawa.....	25
(4) Other References Cited In the Petition But For Which Review Was Not Granted	26
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 Electromagnetic Illumination From the Possible Exterior Objects</i> " (Claims 10, 11, 19, and 23) or a " <i>Pattern Recognition Algorithm Generated From Data of Possible Sources of Radiation Including Lights of Vehicles and Patterns of Received Radiation From the Possible Sources</i> " (Claims 16, 17, and 20)	28
(1) Lemelson and Asayama	28
(2) Lemelson and Yanagawa	29
VI. CONCLUSION.....	34

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.,
Case IPR2012-00026 (PTAB, Feb. 19, 2014) 15, 28

Scaltech, Inc. v. Retec/Tetra, LLC.,
178 F.3d 1378 (Fed. Cir. 1999) 15

Transclean Corp. v. Bridgewood Servs., Inc.,
290 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2002) 15

Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California,
814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987) 13

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102 9

35 U.S.C. § 103 9

35 U.S.C. § 314 26

Rules

37 CFR §42.120..... 1, 9, 27, 36

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. 5,845,000 (“the ‘000 patent”). This filing is timely pursuant to the Board’s Scheduling Order and the parties’ stipulation extending the deadline to March 24, 2014. (See Paper 17, Scheduling Order at 2 (“The parties may stipulate to different dates for DUE DATES 1 through 3 (earlier or later, but no later than DUE DATE 4).”); Paper 26, 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 10, 11, 16, 17, 19, 20, and 23 of the ‘000 patent are not anticipated or obvious in view of the grounds for review.

Specifically, none of the prior art raised in the grounds for review discloses or teaches at least one key requirement in claims 10, 11, 16, 17, 19, 20, and 23 of the ‘000 patent: a “trained pattern recognition means” that is “structured and arranged to apply a pattern recognition algorithm generated from data of possible exterior objects and patterns of received electromagnetic illumination from the possible exterior objects” (claims 10, 11, and 19); “trained pattern recognition means” that is “structured and arranged to apply a pattern recognition algorithm

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.