

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 IPR2015-00438

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..... 3

 A. Summary of the '001 patent.....3

 B. TRW errs in reducing the differences between the forward-facing and rear-facing embodiments of the '001 patent purely to the methods of operation.....4

III. TRW’s Petition and Miller’s Declaration contain irreparable factual and legal flaws 7

 A. TRW’s Petition misrepresents the '001 patent specification as admitting use of Vellacott’s imputer.....8

 B. The Miller Declaration fails to cure the misrepresentations of the Petition10

 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.13

IV. TRW’s Petition failed to meet the minimum threshold showing that TRW is likely to prevail on the asserted Grounds 14

 A. TRW improperly relies on precedent for *per se* obviousness in proposing a combination of Vellacott and Kenue.....15

 1. TRW’s core asserted references..... 16

 (a) Vellacott..... 16

 (b) Kenue 18

 2. TRW improperly asserts *per se* rules of obviousness without providing requisite analysis as to the combination of Vellacott and Kenue. 18

 (a) *Gazda* 20

- (b) *Japikse* 21
 - (c) Applying a known technique to a known device 22
 - (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. The Declaration fails to support the proposed combination of Vellacott and Kenue. 29
- B. TRW failed to show that a POSA would have combined Vellacott with Venturello30
 - 1. Venturello does not suggest detection of the presence of fog as alleged 31
 - 2. The Petition fails to articulate an appropriate explanation as to how and why a POSA would combine Venturello’s system with that of Vellacott, Kenue, and Schofield as proposed..... 34
 - (a) The Petition lacks a credible way of combining Venturello’s teachings such that the results would have been predictable 34
 - (b) The proposed combination with Venturello lacks a rational underpinning..... 36
- C. The Petition lacks adequate explanation and evidentiary support for the Grounds challenging claims 83-85, 88, 89, 92, 93, and 9537
- D. TRW failed to fully and properly consider the scope of the claims before applying the asserted references38
 - 1. TRW ignores the requirement for the Petition to provide claim construction and improperly relies on Miller’s Declaration 39

2.	TRW’s fails to construe the term “operable at a first exposure period and a second exposure period” of claim 90	39
3.	TRW’s misrepresents that claim terms can be ignored as merely “functional limitations”	42
E.	TRW failed to provide proper evidentiary support for its Grounds.	43
1.	The Petition fails to provide sufficient evidence that Vellacott discloses an “imager [that] is disposed at an interior portion of a vehicle”	44
2.	TRW failed to show Vellacott teaches a vision system to “detect an object” as recited in claim 79	44
3.	TRW failed to cure the deficiencies of Vellacott with the alleged AAPA.	45
F.	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.	47
1.	TRW failed to show that Venturello teaches “determin[ing] a presence of at least one of fog, snow and rain” as recited in claims 79 and 84	47
2.	The Petition fails to provide sufficient evidence that Vellacott and Kenue disclose that the imager has a field of view “wherein said horizontal span is greater than said vertical span” of claim 88	51
3.	TRW failed to explain how Vellacott teaches a “photosensor array [that] is operable at a first exposure period and a second exposure period” of claim 90	53
4.	TRW failed to explain how the applied art teaches any of the limitations of claim 86	56
V.	Conclusion	58

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Cases**

<i>Application of Gazda</i> , 219 F.2d 449 (C.C.P.A. 1955).....	20, 21
<i>Application of Japikse</i> , 181 F.2d 1019 (C.C.P.A. 1950).....	21, 22
<i>Application of Ruff</i> , 256 F.2d 590 (C.C.P.A. 1958).....	46, 47
<i>Boston Scientific v. Cordis</i> , 554 F.3d 982 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	9
<i>Cisco Systems, Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454.....	3, 12
<i>DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	23
<i>DeSilva v. DiLeonardi</i> , 181 F.3d 865 (7th Cir. 1999)	3
<i>Ex parte Papst-Motoren</i> , 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1655 (B.P.A.I. 1986)	40
<i>Fidelity Nat'l Info. Services, Inc. v. DataTreasury Corp.</i> , IPR2014-00489 (Paper 9, Aug. 13, 2014).....	12
<i>Geo. M. Martin Co. v. Alliance Mach. Sys. Int'l LLC</i> , 618 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	16
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	14
<i>Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb, Inc.</i> , 909 F.2d 1464 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	42
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	16, 23

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.