

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. 7,489,786

Issue Date: Feb. 10, 2009

Title: AUDIO DEVICE INTEGRATION SYSTEM

**BLITZSAFE TEXAS, LLC'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION
FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,489,786**

Case No. IPR2016-00421

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, CLAIMS, AND THE LAW5

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

B. The Term “Means for Generating a Device Presence Signal” Is
Not Indefinite.....6

C. Petitioner’s Proposed Construction of “Interface” Is Internally
Inconsistent and Should Not Be Applied in This Proceeding7

D. Petitioner’s Proposed Construction of “Portable” Improperly
Reads Out the Limitation Itself9

III. PETITIONER HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED A REASONBLE
LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS FOR ANY OF GROUNDS 1-7 AND
THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED. 11

A. Requirements for Showing Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. §
103..... 11

B. Claims 57, 58, 60, 64, 86, 88, 90, 91, 92, 94 and 97 are Not
Obvious Over JP ‘954 in view of Lau (Ground 1)..... 13

1. Interface and Connectors 15

2. Portable Device/MP3 Player (Claims 57, 58, 60, 64)..... 18

3. Converting Data / Remotely Controlling the MP3 Player
/ Video Device 19

4. Device Presence Signal.....21

5. Means Plus Function Claims 92, 94, and 97.....23

C. Claim 44 Is Not Obvious Over JP ‘954 in View of Lau and
Bhogal (Ground 2).....28

D. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 13, 14, and 23 Are Not Obvious Over JP '954 in View of Sony XR-C5120 and Sony XA-C30 (Ground 3)30

1. The Combination of JP '954 with the Sony References Does Not Cure the Deficiencies in JP '954 Concerning "Interface," "Portable" Device, and "Device Presence Signal"31

2. The Combination of JP '954 with the Sony References Does Not Teach the "Auxiliary Input Source" or "Switching"33

3. Petitioner's Obviousness Arguments Concerning "Obvious to Process 'Track and Time' and 'Title and Artist' Information" Are Unsupported34

4. Petitioner's Obviousness Arguments Impermissibly Rely on Prior Art Systems35

E. Petitioner's Arguments Regarding the Combination of JP '954 and Known Bus Technology are Unfounded (Ground 4)36

F. Claims 6 and 10 Are Not Obvious Over JP '954 in view of Sony XR-C5120, Sony XA-C30 and Lau (Ground 5)38

G. Claims 61, 62, and 63 Are Not Obvious Over JP '954 in View of Lau and Sony XR-C5120 (Ground 6)39

H. Claims 57 and 86 Are Not Obvious in View of Bhogal (Ground 7)40

IV. CONCLUSION41

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Federal Cases	
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00355, Paper 9 (PTAB June 26, 2015).....	11
<i>C.B. Distributors, Inc. v. Fontem Holdings I B.V.</i> , IPR2013-00387, Paper 43 (PTAB Dec. 24, 2014).....	12
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc., v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2014)	12, 25, 27
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	4, 11, 12
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	11
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	11, 12, 23, 38, 40, 41
<i>Plant Science, Inc. v. The Andersons, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00939, Paper 8 (PTAB, Dec. 17, 2014).....	12
<i>Space Exploration Techs. Corp. v. Blue Origin LLC</i> , IPR2014-01378, Paper 6 (PTAB Mar. 3, 2015)	5, 24
<i>Unified Patents Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2015-01045, Paper 15 (PTAB Oct. 7, 2015)	5
<i>Whole Space Indus. v. Zipshade Indus.</i> , IPR2015-00488, Paper 14 (PTAB July 24, 2015).....	12, 13

Federal Statutes

35 U.S.C.
§ 102.....1, 5
§ 103.....1, 5, 11
§ 112.....5, 6
§ 311(b)1, 5, 35
§ 314(a)4

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3).....4, 12, 25, 27
37 C.F.R. § 42.12(a)(7).....2, 6
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)3, 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.