

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 IPR2015-00436¹
Patent 8,599,001 B2

DECLARATION OF DR. RALPH ETIENNE-CUMMINGS

¹ Cases IPR2015-00437, IPR2015-00438, and IPR2015-00439 have been consolidated with this proceeding.

Magna 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Qualifications.....	1
III.	Materials Considered.....	3
IV.	Overview Of The Law Used In This Declaration	9
	A. Level of Skill in the Art.....	10
	B. Obviousness.....	11
	C. Obviousness to Combine.....	12
	D. Claim Construction	13
V.	Instituted Grounds	14
VI.	Technology	15
	A. Vision Systems.....	15
	B. Vehicular Vision Systems	19
	C. Image Sensors.....	21
	1. Charge-Coupled Devices (“CCD’s”).....	22
	2. CMOS	23
	D. Attributes Characterizing Image Sensors.....	28
	1. Responsivity.....	28
	2. Dynamic Range.....	29
	3. Uniformity.....	33
	4. Shuttering.....	34
	5. Speed.....	36
	6. Processing	37
	7. Windowing.....	37
	8. Anti-blooming.....	38
	9. Resolution	39
	E. Image Intensifiers.....	40
VII.	Summary of the Asserted References.....	44
	A. Vellacott (Passive-Pixel CMOS Vision Systems)	44

B.	The Kenue Reference (CCD Vision System for Lane Markers)	52
C.	Venturello (Intensified Camera and Display)	57
D.	Schofield (Rearview Mirror).....	61
E.	Comparison of Alleged Prior Art Vision Systems.....	63
VIII.	Analysis	63
A.	A POSA not would have found it obvious to combine Vellacott with Kenue.....	64
B.	Modifying Vellacott with Kenue would have rendered Vellacott’s systems inoperable for its intended purpose – to reduce glare in the rearview mirror.....	68
C.	There is no reason to believe that Donnelly’s EC mirror dimming system could detect headlights in a forward field of view and no reason to do it.	75
D.	Donnelley’s rearview mirror system and Kenue’s lane detection systems operate in different ways for disparate purposes.....	81
E.	There is not a reasonable expectation of success in modifying Vellacott with Kenue’s teachings.....	84
F.	Even if Vellacott was properly combinable with the various secondary references, the combinations lack a suggestion of critical claim features.	88
1.	Vellacott fails to teach a module attached to a windshield (claims 1-14, 24, 28, 32, 34-40, 42-50, 53-55).....	88
2.	Vellacott fails to teach an array with more columns than rows (claims 3, 4, 96-100, 102-109).....	93
3.	Vellacott fails to teach an array comprising at least 40 rows (claims 4, 59, 81, 96 -100, 102-109).....	101
4.	Vellacott fails to teach that image data processing by said image processor comprises pattern recognition (claim 28).....	102
5.	Vellacott and Kenue fail to teach a control that determines a peak light level of at least on sub-array (claims 35, 36).....	105
6.	Vellacott fails to teach a connector for electrically connecting to a power source of the equipped vehicle (52, 56-66, 69, 71, 73-78).	109

7.	Vellacott fails to teach an image processor that compares captured image data with stored data and outputs a vehicle control signal based on the comparison (claims 15, 66, 85, 100).	112
8.	The combination including Schofield does not teach or suggest a module that releasably mounts (claims 56-66, 69, 71, 73-79, 81-85, 87-100, 102-108).	114
9.	The combination including Kenue fails to teach or suggest an image sensor array with more columns than rows (claims 3, 4, 96-100, 102-109).....	115
10.	The combination including Venturello does not teach or suggest a vehicular vision system that “determines a presence of fog” or “recognize veiling glare” (claims 11-14, 64, 65, 79, 80-85, 87-95, 98, 99).	118
11.	The combination including Venturello does not teach or suggest “determin[ing] a presence of at least one of fog, snow and rain” (Claims 79 and 84).....	129
IX.	Conclusion	132

I. Introduction

I, Dr. Ralph Etienne-Cummings, hereby declare as follows:

1. I understand that in response to a Petition submitted by TRW Automotive U.S. LLC (“TRW”), the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“Board”) instituted an *inter partes* review as to claims 1–15, 24, 28, 32, 34-40, 42-50, 53-66, 69, 71, 73-79, 81-85, 87-100, and 102–08 of U.S. Patent No. 8,599,001 (“the ’001 Patent”). I understand that the ’001 Patent is titled “Vehicular Vision System” by Kenneth Schofield *et al.* and that the ’001 Patent is currently assigned to Magna Electronics Inc. (“Magna”).

2. I have been retained on behalf of Magna to provide expert opinions in connection with this *inter partes* review proceeding. Specifically, I have been asked to provide my expert opinion relating to the patentability of claims 1-15, 24, 28, 32, 34-40, 42–50, 53-66, 69, 71, 73-79, 81–85, 87-100, and 102-08 of the ’001 Patent relative to the instituted grounds based on the Vellacott, Kenue, Yanagawa, Denyer, Schofield, and Venturello references.

II. Qualifications

3. I am expert in the field of computer vision, having designed and implemented image sensors and vision algorithms hardware and software.

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.