

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TOYOTA MOTOR CORPORATION

Petitioner

v.

BLITZSAFE TEXAS, LLC

Patent Owner

Patent No. 8,155,342

Issue Date: April 10, 2012

Title: MULTIMEDIA DEVICE INTEGRATION SYSTEM

**BLITZSAFE TEXAS, LLC'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION
FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,155,342**

Case No. IPR2016-00418

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. THE PETITION SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED BECAUSE
PETITIONER'S CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS ARE INCORRECT IN
LIGHT OF THE SPECIFICATION AND CLAIMS 5

A. The Board Should Deny Institution in the Interest of Justice
Because Petitioner’s Arguments Are an Abuse of Process..... 5

B. Petitioner Has Not Shown that the Term “Integration
Subsystem” Invokes 35 U.S.C. 112 ¶ 6 6

C. Even if the Term “Integration Subsystem” Is Found to Invoke
35 U.S.C. 112 ¶ 6, the ’342 Patent Describes Sufficient
Structure. 10

1. The Alleged Functions of the Integration Subsystem are
not “Computer-Implemented” and Do Not Require an
Algorithm..... 11

2. Even if the Functions Required an Algorithm, Figure 24
is Sufficient 14

3. Petitioner Ignores the Voluminous Algorithms and
Source Code Provided in the ’342 Specification 15

III. PETITIONER HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED A REASONABLE
LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS FOR ANY OF GROUNDS 1-3 AND
THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED. 18

A. Requirements for Showing Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. §
103. 18

B. The Clayton Reference 20

C. Claims 49-55, 57, 62-64, 71, 73-80, 95, 97, 99-103, 109-111,
and 120 Are Not Obvious over Clayton and Berry (Ground 1)..... 21

1. The Clayton Reference Does Not Teach or Disclose the
“Audio Generated by the Portable Device” Limitation..... 22

2.	The Clayton Provisional Application Does Not Support the Teaching or Disclosure of the “Audio Generated by the Portable Device” Limitation	24
3.	The Alleged Combination with Berry is Improper and Does Not Address the Deficiencies of Clayton	28
4.	The Dependent Claims Are Valid over Clayton and Berry.....	31
D.	Claims 49-57, 62-64, 66, 70, 71, 73-80, 94, 95, 97, 99-103, 106, 109-111, 113, and 120 Are Not Obvious Over Clayton in View of Berry and Marlowe (Ground 2)	31
1.	Ground 2 Fails to Specify Any Differences Between the Claims and the Cited References	32
2.	The Petition Does Not Explain Why a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Have Had Reason to Modify Clayton to Render the Claims Obvious	344
3.	Because the Independent Claims are Valid in View of Ground 2, the Dependent Claims Are Also Valid in View of Ground 2.	37
E.	Claims 68 and 115 are Not Obvious over Clayton in View of Berry, Marlowe, and Gioscia (Ground 3)	37
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	38

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00355, Paper 9 (PTAB June 26, 2015)	18
<i>Apple Inc. v. Motorola, Inc.</i> , 757 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	14
<i>Aristocrat Techs., Aus. Pty Ltd. v. Int’l Game Tech.</i> , 521 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	11
<i>C.B. Distributors, Inc. v. Fontem Holdings I B.V.</i> , IPR2013-00387, Paper 43 (PTAB, Dec. 24, 2014)	19
<i>Callaway Golf Co. v. Acushnet Co.</i> , 576 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	31, 37
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc., v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (PTAB. Aug. 29, 2014).....	19
<i>Google Inc. v. EveryMd.com LLC</i> , IPR2014-00347, Paper 9 (PTAB May 22, 2014)	28
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	18
<i>Kinetic Concepts v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	28, 32
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	18, 19, 30, 37
<i>Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.</i> , CBM-2012-00003, Paper 7 (PTAB Oct. 25, 2012).....	29

Plant Science, Inc. v. The Andersons, Inc.,
IPR2014-00939, Paper 8 (PTAB Dec. 17, 2014)19

Space Exploration Techs. Corp. v. Blue Origin LLC,
IPR2014-01378, Paper 6 (PTAB, Mar. 3, 2015)5

Unified Patents Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC,
IPR2015-01045, Paper 15 (PTAB Oct. 7, 2015).....3, 6

Whole Space Indus. Ltd. v. Zipshade Indus.(B.V.I.) Corp.,
IPR2015-00488, Paper 14 (PTAB July 24, 2015)19, 20, 28

Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC,
792 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2015)6, 7, 10

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 311(b)5

35 U.S.C. § 314(a)4

Regulations

37 C.F.R. 1.75(c).....31, 37

37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3).....4, 19, 35, 36

37 C.F.R. § 42.12(a)(7).....3, 6, 10

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)4, 5

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.