

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TOYOTA MOTOR CORPORATION

Petitioner

v.

AMERICAN VEHICULAR SCIENCES LLC

Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2013-00424

U.S. Patent No. 5,845,000

PRELIMINARY RESPONSE BY PATENT OWNER

PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107

Before: Administrative Patent Judge Jameson Lee

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	SUMMARY OF THE '000 PATENT	2
III.	OVERVIEW OF THE PETITION	3
A.	The Prior Art	3
B.	Toyota Statements Regarding Mandatory Notices	4
C.	Toyota Statements Regarding Standing	4
D.	Toyota Asserted Challenges And Requested Relief	5
E.	Toyota's Statement Regarding The '000 patent.....	7
1.	Effective Filing Date of The '000 patent	7
2.	Claim Construction	7
IV.	REASONS WHY <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED	27
A.	Ground 1: Lemelson Does Not Anticipate Claims 10, 11, 16, 17, 19, 20 And 23	29
1.	Lemelson Does Not Disclose The Claimed Transmitter Means	29
2.	Lemelson Does Not Disclose Reception Means.....	32
3.	Lemelson Does Not Disclose A Pattern Recognition Algorithm Generated From Patterns of Received Electromagnetic Illumination From Possible Exterior Objects	33

B.	Ground 2: The Combination Of Lemelson And Asayama Does Not Render Claims 10, 11, 19, And 23 Obvious	34
C.	Ground 3: Pomerleau Does Not Anticipate Claims 10, 11, 19, And 23	35
D.	Ground 4: Mizukoshi Does Not Anticipate Claims 16, 17 and 20	37
E.	Ground 5: The Combination Of Mizukoshi And Alleged Knowledge Of One Of Ordinary Skill Does Not Render Claims 16, 17, And 20 Obvious	41
F.	Ground 6: Yanagawa Does Not Anticipate Claims 16 And 17	44
G.	Ground 7: The Combination Of Yanagawa And Alleged Knowledge Of One Of Ordinary Skill Does Not Render Claims 16 And 17 Obvious.....	45
H.	Ground 8: The Combination Of Yanagawa And Lemelson Does Not Render Claims 16, 17, And 20 Obvious	47
I.	Ground 9: The Combination Of Yanagawa And Mizukoshi Does Not Render Claim 20 Obvious.....	48
V.	CONCLUSION.....	49

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Chef Am., Inc. v. Lamb-Weston, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	24
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	28
<i>IMS Tech., Inc. v. Haas Automation, Inc.</i> , 206 F.3d 1422 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	26
<i>In re Bond</i> , 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....	27
<i>In re Grasselli</i> , 713 F.2d. 731, 218 USPQ 769 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....	35
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	28
<i>In re Wilson</i> , 424 F.2d 1382 (CCPA 1970).....	27, 28
<i>In re Wilson</i> , 424 F.2d 1382, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970)	27
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	28
<i>KSR</i> , 550 U.S. 398 at 418	28
<i>O.I. Corp. v. Tekmar Co.</i> , 115 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	26
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303, 75 USPQ2d 1321, 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	27

Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.,
868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....27

Sanofi-Synthelabo v. Apotex, Inc.,
550 F.3d 1075, (Fed. Cir. 2008)28

Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California,
814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987).....27

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 102(a) 5, 6, 37, 41

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) 5, 35

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) passim

35 U.S.C. § 112(f) passim

35 U.S.C. § 313 1

35 U.S.C. § 314(a) 1

35 U.S.C. §112(f) passim

OTHER AUTHORITIES

MPEP § 2111 8, 28

MPEP § 2111.018

MPEP § 2121.0111

MPEP § 213128

MPEP § 2143.03 28, 29

MPEP § 2145(X)(D)(2)36

MPEP 2111.0124

REGULATIONS

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a).....4

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.