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. IPR2016-00419

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

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 REASONBLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS FOR ANY OF GROUNDS 1-7 AND THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED. 18

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

B. Claims 49-52, 55-57, 62, 63, and 71 are not Obvious Over Ohmura in View of Berry (Ground 1) 21

1. The Ohmura Reference Does Not Teach or Disclose the "Audio Generated by the Portable Device" Limitation 22

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

2. Neither Ohmura nor Berry Teach or Disclose the "Device Presence Signal" Limitation (Claim 56) 26

3. The Alleged Combination with Berry is Improper and Does Not Address the Deficiencies of Ohmura 29

C. Claims 49-57, 62, 63, 66, 70, 71, 97, 99,100, 102, 103, 106, 109, 110, 113, and 120 are not Obvious Over Ohmura in View of Berry and Marlowe (Ground 2) 31

1. Ground 2 Fails as to Car Audio/Video System and Device Presence Signal Claims (claims 49-57, 62, 63, 66, 70, 71, 97, 99, 100, 102, 103, 106, 109, 110, 113, and 120) 33

2. Ground 2 Fails as to Video Claims (claims 66, 70, and 113) 36

3. Ground 2 Fails as to Format Conversion Claims (claims 53, 54, 70, 97, 99, 100, 106, 109, 110, 113, and 120) 37

4. Ground 2 Fails as to the "Other" Claims (claims 99, 100, 109, and 110, 54, 70, 97, 99, 100, 106, 109, 110, 113, and 120) and "Voice Recognition" Claims (claims 55, 57, 102, and 103) 38

5. Ground 2 Should be Denied Because it is an Impermissible "Catch-All" Ground 38

D. Claims 64, 73-80, 94, 95, 101, and 111 are not Obvious Over Ohmura in View of Berry, Marlowe, and Kandler (Ground 3) 39

1. Kandler does not disclose "audio generated by the portable device" 39

2. Ground 3 Does Not Present a Proper Graham Analysis Because it Does Not Link the Actual Terms of the Claim Elements to Any Particular Teaching of the Asserted Prior Art References 41

E. Claims 68 and 115 are not Obvious Over Ohmura in View of Berry, Marlowe, and Gioscia (Ground 4) 45

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

F. Grounds 5, 6, and 7 Substitute the Lau reference for Marlowe, and Suffer From At Least the Same Deficiencies as Grounds 1-4 46

1. Claims 49-57, 62-64, 66, 68, 71, 73-80, 94, 95, 97, 99, 100-103, 106, 109, 110, 111, 113, 115, and 120 are not Obvious Over Ohmura in View of Berry, Kandler, and Lau (Ground 5) 48

2. Claims 66, 68, 94, 113, and 115 are not Obvious Over Ohmura in View of Berry, Kandler, Lau, and Gioscia (Ground 6) 49

3. Claim 70 Is Not Obvious Over Ohmura in View of Berry, Kandler, Lau, and Meyers (Ground 7) 51

IV. CONCLUSION 52

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Federal Cases

Apple, Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc.,
IPR2015-00355, Paper 9 (PTAB June 26, 2015).....19

Apple Inc. v. Motorola, Inc.,
757 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....14

Aristocrat Techs., Aus. Pty Ltd. v. Int'l Game Tech.,
521 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....11

C.B. Distributors, Inc. v. Fontem Holdings 1 B.V.
IPR2013-00387, Paper 43 (PTAB, Dec. 24, 2014). 20

Cisco Sys., Inc., v. C-Cation Techs., LLC,
IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2014) 20, 41

Google Inc. v. EveryMd.com LLC,
IPR2014-00347, Paper 9 (PTAB May 22, 2014).....18

Graham v. John Deere Co.,
383 U.S. 1 (1966)..... *passim*

In re Kahn,
441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....19

Kinetic Concepts v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.,
688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....18

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007)..... *passim*

Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.,
CBM-2012-00003, Paper 7 (PTAB Oct. 25, 2012) 19

Microsoft Corporation v. Bradium Techs., LLC,
IPR2015-01435, Paper 15 (PTAB Dec. 23, 2015).....42, 46

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.