

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TRW AUTOMOTIVE U.S. LLC

Petitioner

v.

MAGNA ELECTRONICS INC.

Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-00436

Patent 8,599,001

**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 & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction..... 1

II. The '001 patent..... 4

 A. Summary of the '001 patent.....4

 B. TRW errs in reducing the differences between the forward-facing and rear-facing embodiments of the '001 patent purely to the method of operation4

III. TRW’s Petition and Miller’s Declaration contain irreparable factual and legal flaws 8

 A. TRW’s Petition misrepresents that the '001 patent specification admits using Vellacott’s system.9

 B. The Miller Declaration fails to cure the misrepresentations of the Petition11

 C. TRW’s Petition fails to meet the threshold showing for institution and rather improperly incorporates by reference the Declaration.12

 D. Miller makes many fatal mistakes in his Declaration.14

IV. TRW’s Petition failed to meet the minimum threshold showing that TRW is likely to prevail on the asserted Grounds 15

 A. TRW improperly relies on precedent as if they provide *per se* obviousness in asserting a combination of Vellacott and Kenue.....16

 1. TRW’s core asserted references..... 17

 (a) Vellacott..... 17

 (b) Kenue 18

 2. TRW improperly asserts *per se* rules of obviousness without providing any analysis of how they applied to the current facts..... 19

(a)	<i>Gazda</i>	20
(b)	<i>Japikse</i>	22
(c)	Applying a known technique to a known device	23
(d)	Use of a known technique to improve similar devices	26
3.	Miller does not cure the deficiencies regarding lack of motivation to combine since it routinely turns to documents not found in the Grounds to support its allegations.	28
4.	TRW ignores the technical differences between Vellacott’s CMOS and Kenue’s CCD system when alleging the references should be combined.	29
B.	The Petition lacks adequate evidentiary support for the grounds challenging claims 15, 28, 35-38, 46, and 47.....	31
C.	TRW fails to provide a threshold showing that a POSA would have combined Yanagawa’s color system with Vellacott and Kenue’s black and white systems for the Grounds challenging dependent claims 6-10, 32, and 34.	32
D.	TRW failed to fully and properly consider the scope of the claims before applying the asserted references	33
1.	TRW ignores the requirement for the Petition to provide claim construction, and rather improperly relies on Miller’s Declaration	34
2.	TRW’s fails to construe the term “operable at a plurality of exposure periods” of claim 1	35
3.	TRW’s misrepresents that claim terms can be ignored as merely “functional limitations”	37
E.	Even if combinable as alleged, TRW failed to meet the threshold showing how the disparate language of the applied references meets the language of the claims, even in view of the Miller Declaration.	39

1.	The Petition fails to provide sufficient evidence that Vellacott discloses “a module attached at the windshield”	39
2.	TRW failed to explain how Vellacott teaches a “photosensor array [that] is operable at a plurality of exposure periods”	41
3.	TRW failed to show Vellacott teaches a vision system to “detect an object” as recited in claim 1	43
4.	TRW failed to cure the deficiencies of Vellacott with the alleged AAPA.	44
5.	TRW failed to show that Vellacott and Kenue, alone or in combination, teach features in several dependent claims	46
(a)	TRW fails to meet the threshold showing for the configuration of the claimed arrays as recited in claims 43, 46, and 47	46
(b)	TRW fails to meet the threshold showing for “said imager views through the windshield of the equipped vehicle at a windshield area that is swept by a windshield wiper,” as recited in claim 16	48
(c)	Claims 17-21	49
(d)	Claim 22	51
(e)	Claim 23	52
(f)	TRW fails to meet the threshold showing for “said module includes a heat sink” as recited in claim 51	52
(g)	TRW fails to meet the threshold showing for “said module includes a connector for electrically connecting to a power source of the equipped vehicle,” as recited in claim 52	55

V. Conclusion 56

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.