

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TOYOTA MOTOR CORP.,

Petitioner,

v.

SIGNAL IP, INC.,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00292

Patent 6,012,007

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Overview of the ‘007 Patent.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. Argument.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>A. Claim Construction.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>B. The Challenged Claims Are Not Anticipated by Schousek.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<i>i. Overview of Schousek.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>ii. The Minimum Weight of an Occupied Infant Seat Taught by Schousek is Not Equivalent to the First Threshold of a Relative Weight Parameter Recited in the Challenged Claims.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>iii. The Maximum Weight of an Occupied Infant Seat Taught by Schousek is Not Equivalent to the First Threshold of a Relative Weight Parameter Recited in the Challenged Claims.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>iv. Schousek Does Not Teach Setting a Lock Flag When a Relative Weight Parameter is Above a Lock Threshold and Air Bag Deployment has Been Allowed for a Given Time, as Recited in the Challenged Claims.....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>v. Schousek Does Not Teach Clearing a Lock Flag When a Relative Weight Parameter is Below an Unlock Threshold for a Time, as Recited in the Challenged Claims.....</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>vi. Schousek Does Not Allow Deployment of an Airbag When the Relative Weight Parameter is Above the First Threshold, as Recited in the Challenged Claims.....</i>	<i>23</i>
<b>4. Conclusion.....</b>	<b>24</b>

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### CASES

<i>CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.</i> , 288 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	10
<i>In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	9
<i>In re Cortright</i> , 165 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	10
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	9
<i>In re Suitco Surface, Inc.</i> , 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	9
<i>Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. Am. Hoist &amp; Derrick Co.</i> , 730 F.2d 1452 (Fed. Cir. 1984) .....	18
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	18
<i>Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.</i> , 868 F.2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1989) .....	15
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Va. Innov. Scis., Inc.</i> , Case IPR2013-00569 (PTAB Oct. 30, 2013) .....	8
<i>Schering Corp. v. Geneva Pharm.</i> , 339 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	15, 21, 23, 24
<i>VirnetX, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 767 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	16

### STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 112(d) .....	passim
--------------------------	--------

## EXHIBIT LIST

<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>Description</b>
2001	Transcript of deposition of Mr. Andrews

## 1. Introduction.

The Board should confirm the patentability of claims 17 and 21 of U.S. Patent 6,012,007 (the “’007 Patent”) because *Schousek* fails to teach or suggest allowing deployment of air bags when a relative weight parameter used by a vehicle restraint system is above a first threshold, establishing a lock threshold above the first threshold, and setting a lock flag when the relative weight parameter is above the lock threshold and deployment has been allowed for a given time. As explained below, and contrary to Petitioner’s contentions, the minimum weight of an occupied infant seat as used by *Schousek* is not equivalent to the first threshold of the relative weight parameter recited in the challenged claims. This is because in *Schousek*, air bag deployment is not *allowed* when seat sensors detect a weight above that minimum weight of an occupied infant seat. Instead, air bag deployment is inhibited in such circumstances unless other conditions are met.

Further, even if one were to equate the minimum weight of an occupied infant seat as used by *Schousek* with the first threshold of the relative weight parameter recited in the challenged claims, it would still be the case that *Schousek* fails to teach or suggest establishing a lock threshold above the first threshold, and setting a lock flag when the relative weight

# 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.