

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SUBARU OF AMERICA, INC., TOYOTA MOTOR NORTH AMERICA, INC.,  
AMERICAN HONDA MOTOR CO., INC., FORD MOTOR COMPANY,  
JAGUAR LAND ROVER NORTH AMERICA, LLC, VOLVO CARS OF  
NORTH AMERICA, LLC, NISSAN NORTH AMERICA, INC., FUJI HEAVY  
INDUSTRIES LTD., and HONDA PATENTS AND TECHNOLOGIES NORTH  
AMERICA, LLC,  
Petitioner

v.

CRUISE CONTROL TECHNOLOGIES LLC,  
Patent Owner

---

CASE IPR: 2014-00279  
Patent 6,324,463

---

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

***Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"***  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. LAW OF ANTICIPATION.....	2
III. THE PETITION DOES NOT SHOW THAT THE CITED REFERENCES ANTICIPATE THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS .....	3
A. Mizuno Does Not Anticipate The Challenged Claims.....	3
Ex. 1004, p. 10.....	5
1. The Petition Does Not Show That Mizuno Discloses “An Enable Switch Associated With Said Controller For Enabling The System” (Claim 1).....	5
2. The Petition Does Not Show That Mizuno Discloses “A Cruise Control Enable Switch Associated With The Controller For Enabling And Disabling The Controller” (Claim 2) .....	8
3. The Petition Does Not Show That Mizuno Discloses “Maintaining The Activated Cruise Control Speed Symbol Upon Temporary Acceleration Or Deceleration Of The Vehicle” (Claim 12) .....	10
4. The Petition Does Not Show That Mizuno Discloses “Upon Braking The Vehicle, Discontinuing Maintaining The Vehicle Speed At Substantially The Preset Speed While Keeping Data Corresponding To The Preset Speed In A Memory Device” (Claim 18).....	12
5. The Petition Does Not Show That Mizuno Discloses “After The Cruise Control System Is Deactivated, Displaying A Symbol Indicative Of An Unset State Of The Preset Speed” (Claim 21).....	14
6. The Petition Does Not Show That Mizuno Discloses “A First Visual Display Apparatus Operable To Display The [Information] Indicative Of The Actual Speed Of The Vehicle” (Claim 34).....	16
B. Miura Does Not Anticipate The Challenged Claims .....	18

1.	The Petition Does Not Show That Mizuno Discloses “An Enable Switch Associated With Said Controller For Enabling The System” (Claim 1).....	19
2.	The Petition Does Not Show That Miura Discloses “A Cruise Control Enable Switch Associated With The Controller For Enabling And Disabling The Controller” (Claim 2) .....	21
3.	The Petition Does Not Show That Miura Discloses “Maintaining The Activated Cruise Control Speed Symbol Upon Temporary Acceleration Or Deceleration Of The Vehicle” (Claim 12) .....	23
4.	The Petition Does Not Show That Miura Discloses “Displaying A Visual Symbol To The Operator” (Claim 16) .....	26
5.	The Petition Does Not Show That Miura Discloses “After The Cruise Control System Is Deactivated, Displaying A Symbol Indicative Of An Unset State Of The Preset Speed” (Claim 21).....	27
6.	The Petition Does Not Show That Miura Discloses “Maintaining The Display Of The Symbol Indicative Of The Preset Speed While The Vehicle Is At The Speed Above The Preset Speed” (Claim 25).....	28
7.	The Petition Does Not Show That Miura Discloses “The Visual Information Displayed By The Second Visual Display Apparatus Includes Information Reflecting Whether The Speed Controller Is Operating To Maintain The Vehicle At The Cruising Speed At The Time The Display Is Made” (Claim 27).....	28
8.	The Petition Does Not Show That Miura Discloses “The Individual Visual Indicators Are Disposed On The Indicator Dial Of The Analog Speedometer” (Claim 31).....	29
IV.	THE PETITION DOES NOT SHOW THAT THE CITED REFERENCES RENDER OBVIOUS THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS .....	31
V.	CONCLUSION.....	31

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

### CASES

<i>Aspex Eyewear, Inc. v. Marchon Eyewear, Inc.</i> , 672 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	9, 21
<i>C.R. Bard v. M3 Sys.</i> , 157 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	2
<i>Comark Commc'ns, Inc. v. Harris Corp.</i> , 156 F.3d 1182 (Fed.Cir.1998).....	9, 22
<i>Finisar Corp. v. DirectTV Group, Inc.</i> , 523 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	2
<i>In re Bond</i> , 910 F.2d 831 (Fed. Cir. 1990) .....	2
<i>In re Rijckaert</i> , 9 F.3d 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993) .....	2
<i>In re Robertson</i> , 169 F.3d 743 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	3
<i>Net MoneyIn, Inc. v. Verisign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	2, 31

## I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.120, Patent Owner Cruise Control Technologies LLC (“Patent Owner”) submits this response to the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (“Petition”) of claims 1-5, 12-16, 18-21, 23, 25-31 and 34-36 of U.S. Patent No. 6,324,463 (the “463 Patent”) filed by Subaru of America, Inc., Toyota Motor North America, Inc., American Honda Motor Co., Inc., Nissan North America Inc., Ford Motor Company, Jaguar Land Rover North America LLC and Volvo Cars of North America LLC (collectively “Petitioner”). Paper 1, p. 1.

On July 2, 2014, the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“Board”) instituted *inter partes* review based on the following grounds of unpatentability alleged in the Petition:

Ground A: JP S58-52708 (“Mizuno”) anticipates claims 1-3, 5, 12-14, 18, 21, 25, 26 and 34-36;

Ground B: JP H8-220118 (“Miura”) anticipates claims 1, 2, 12-16, 21, 25-27 and 29-31; and

Ground C: Mizuno and ordinary skill in the art render obvious claims 4, 19, 20, 23, 27 and 28. Paper 19, p. 34.

All cites to Mizuno and Miura are to the respective English translations (Ex. 1004 for Mizuno and Ex. 1006 for Miura) filed by Petitioner with the Petition.

# 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.