UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

VALEO NORTH AMERICA, INC., VALEO S.A., VALEO GMBH,
VALEO SCHALTER UND SENSOREN GMBH,
AND CONNAUGHT ELECTRONICS LTD.
Petitioners

v.

MAGNA ELECTRONICS, INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-00253
Patent 8,643,724

PATENT OWNER MAGNA ELECTRONICS, INC.'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107

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

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. The Board should not institute *inter partes* review of the '724 patent. 1

II. Valeo's obviousness analysis is deficient because Valeo fails to resolve the level of ordinary skill in the art. 4

A. The Petition does not resolve the level of ordinary skill in the art. 4

B. Dr. Wolberg and Dr. Wilhelm confuse, rather than resolve, the level of ordinary skill in the art. 5

III. Valeo's obviousness analysis is deficient because Valeo fails to show that a POSA would have combined the references. 7

A. Dr. Wolberg's and Dr. Wilhelm's reliance on each other invalidates Valeo's assertion that a POSA would have been motivated to combine the references. 9

1. Dr. Wolberg merely assumes that a POSA would have combined Lemelson with Nissan, Hino, Wang, and Aishin. 10

2. Dr. Wilhelm merely assumes that a POSA would have combined Nissan, Hino, Wang, and Aishin. 11

3. The declarants' piecemeal approach to the references, with differing definitions of a POSA, evidences that a POSA would not have combined the references. 13

B. Dr. Wolberg and Dr. Wilhelm fail to consider the claims as a whole.14

C. Valeo fails to adequately show how a POSA would have combined Nissan and Hino. 16

IV. Valeo's obviousness analysis is deficient because the Petition fails to identify how the construed claim is unpatentable. 19

A. The Petition does not adequately discuss the asserted references. 22

B. Valeo's reasons for combining the references are conclusory. 23

C. Valeo fails to adequately explain the significance of the evidence cited in the claim charts. 23

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

1. Claim 49 24

2. Claims 54 and 69 25

V. Nissan and Hino are insufficient to disclose "wherein said synthesized image approximates a view as would be seen by a virtual camera at a single location exterior of the equipped vehicle." 27

VI. Conclusion 32

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Beckman Instruments v. LKB Produkter AB,
892 F.2d 1547 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....27

Cisco Systems, Inc. v. C-Cation Technologies, LLC,
IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 29, 2014).....20

Google Inc. v. Visual Real Estate, Inc.,
IPR2014-01338, Paper 3 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 2, 2014).....20

Graham v. John Deere Co.,
383 U.S. 1 (1966).....4

In re Aslanian,
590 F.2d 911 (C.C.P.A. 1979).....27

In re Kahn,
441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 15, 23

Int'l Business Machines Corp. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC,
IPR2014-00673, Paper 18 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 23, 2014).....20

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007)..... 4, 15, 16, 23

Marvell Semiconductor, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC,
IPR2014-00547, Paper 3 (P.T.A.B. April 10, 2014).....20

Ryko Mfg. Co. v. Nu-Star, Inc.,
950 F.2d 714 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....5

Symbol Techs. Inc. v. Opticon Inc.,
935 F.2d 1569 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....27

ZTE Corp. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.,
IPR2013-00136, Paper 31 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 5, 2013)..... 20, 23

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103.....4

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) 4, 15

35 U.S.C. § 314(a) 1, 4

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4) 5, 19

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(5) 19, 24

37 C.F.R. § 42.107(b). 1

37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)(2) 19

37 C.F.R. § 42.24(a)(1)(i) 19

37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3) 20

Other Authorities

M.P.E.P. § 2121.01 27

M.P.E.P. § 2125 27

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.