

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIALS AND APPEAL BOARD

SL CORPORATION
Petitioner,

v.

ADAPTIVE HEADLAMP TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Patent Owner

INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,241,034
Case IPR No.: Unassigned

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 7,241,034 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND
37 C.F.R. §§ 42.1-80, 42.100 *et seq.***

DECLARATION OF HARVEY WEINBERG

Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS	1
III.	MATERIALS CONSIDERED	2
IV.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	3
V.	BACKGROUND OF TECHNOLOGY	4
VI.	SUMMARY OF THE '034 PATENT	5
VII.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	5
VIII.	LEGAL STANDARD	6
	A. Anticipation	6
	B. Obviousness.....	7
IX.	ANALYSIS OF THE '034 PATENT CLAIMS.....	8
	A. Claims 7-9, 13-18, 21-24, and 28-33 are anticipated by Kato.....	8
	B. Claims 3-6, and 10-12 would have been obvious over Kato in view of Izawa and in view of the Patent Owner's admission in the specification that condition sensors of the invention are "conventional."	23
	C. To the extent the "predetermined minimum threshold" limitation of Claims 3 and 7 is not inherently present in Kato, it would have been obvious over Kato in view of Takahashi.....	30
	D. Claims 19 and 20 would have been obvious over Kato and the Patent Owner's admission in the specification that the actuators of the invention are "conventional."	32
	E. Claims 25-27 would have been obvious over Kato in view of the patent owner's admission that feedback sensors are "conventional."	34
	F. Claims 33-35 would have been obvious over Kato in view of Takahashi.....	36

G.	Claims 36-39 would have been obvious over Kato in view of Hayami.	39
H.	Claims 7-9, 13-17, 21-24, and 28-33 are anticipated by Fukuwa.....	45
I.	Claims 3-6, and 10-12 would have been obvious over Fukuwa in view of Izawa and in view of the Patent Owner’s admission in the specification that condition sensors of the invention are “conventional.”.....	60
J.	To the extent the “predetermined minimum threshold” limitation of Claims 3 and 7 is not inherently present in Fukuwa, it would have been obvious over Fukuwa in view of Takahashi.....	67
K.	Claims 18-20 would have been obvious over Fukuwa and the Patent Owner’s admission in the specification that the actuators of the invention are “conventional.”	69
L.	Claims 25-27 would have been obvious over Fukuwa in view of the patent owner’s admission that feedback sensors are “conventional.”.....	71
M.	Claims 33-35 would have been obvious over Fukuwa in view of Takahashi.....	74
N.	Claims 36-39 would have been obvious over Fukuwa in view of Hayami.....	76
X.	SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS	82

I, Harvey Weinberg, being of legal age, hereby declare, affirm, and state the following:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I have been retained on behalf of Petitioner, SL Corporation (“SL”), to offer statements and opinions generally regarding the validity, novelty, prior art, obviousness considerations, and understanding of a person of ordinary skill in the art (“POSITA”) in the industry as it relates to U.S. Patent No. 7,241,034 (“’034 patent”). Attached hereto as Appendix A is a true and correct copy of my Curriculum Vitae describing my background and experience. I have personal knowledge of the facts and opinions set forth in this declaration, and, if called upon to do so, I would testify competently thereto. All of the opinions and conclusions found in this declaration are my own.

2. I am being compensated at a rate of \$200 per hour for my services. This compensation is in no way based on the content of my opinions or the outcome of this matter.

II. BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS

3. Please refer to my resume attached as Appendix A.

4. To summarize with respect to the technology of the ‘034 patent, I have over 18 years of experience in the automotive industry in various areas supporting automotive OEMs directly and through Tier-One manufacturers in the following

applications: MEMS inertial sensors used for crash detection (sensors used in center crash modules as well as those used as “satellite” sensors at doors, near front bumpers, etc.); MEMS inertial sensors (gyroscopes and low-g accelerometers) used in electronic stability control; MEMS inertial sensors (gyroscopes and accelerometers) used in roll over detection; MEMS inertial sensors (gyroscopes and accelerometers) used in body/chassis management electronics including theft alarms, sliding door protection, noise cancellation, suspension control, etc.; current sensing for transmission control; Li-Ion and Lead-Acid battery management for conventional internal combustion engines as well as hybrid electric vehicles; and LIDAR (optical RADAR) systems for short and mid-range presence detection.

III. MATERIALS CONSIDERED

5. In developing my opinions below relating to the ‘034 patent, I have considered the materials cited herein, as well as the following materials:
6. US Patent 7,241,034 (“the ‘034 Patent”) (Petition Ex. 1001);
7. Japanese Patent Application No. 09-151649 (“Kato”) (Petition Ex. 1023);
8. Japanese Patent Application No. 10-364667 (“Fukuwa”) (Petition Ex. 1024);
9. UK Patent Application GB2,309,774 (“Takahashi”) (Petition Ex. 1018);
10. US Patent 6,293,686 (“Hayami”) (Petition Ex. 1025);
11. ROBERT BOSCH GMBH, AUTOMOTIVE HANDBOOK (Horst Bauer *et al.* eds., 5th ed. 2000) (Appendix B);

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.