

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

JOHNSON SAFETY, INC.,

Petitioner, v.

VOXX INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION,

Voxx.

Case IPR2016-01070

Patent 7,245,274

**VOXX'S RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR
INTER PARTES REVIEW
(37 C.F.R. §42.120)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....	1
II. The Claimed Subject Matter	2
III. The Board Should Affirm the Patentability of the Challenged Claims	3
A. Legal Standards.....	3
1. JSI's burden to prove the Challenged Claims are unpatentable	3
2. Obviousness.	5
IV. Claim 1 is not obvious based on Chang in view of Jost and Mathias.	7
A. Chang does not teach, suggest or otherwise disclose the invention defined by claim 1.	7
1. Chang fails to disclose the invention of claim 1.	7
2. Chang explicitly teaches away from claim 1 by emphasizing limited space within the headrest	9
3. Secondary considerations of non-obviousness: commercial success. ...	11
4. Chang is substantially similar to Chang '546 considered by the USPTO.....	13
B. Jost fails to compensate for the deficiencies of Chang.....	21
1. Jost explicitly teaches only adding the monitor or screen to the headrest.....	22
2. A POSITA would not have been motivated to combine Chang in view of Jost.....	23
C. Mathias does not compensate for the deficiencies of Chang in view of Jost.....	24
1. Chang teaches away from the combination that JSI advocates.	24

2. Voxx's commercial success is evidence of non-obviousness.	25
D. Claim 1 is not obviated by Chang in view of Jost and Mathias.	26
V. Independent claim 11 is not obvious based on Chang in view of Tseng.	26
A. JSI fails to demonstrate that Chang in view of Tseng renders claim 11 obvious.	27
1. Chang fails to disclose all the elements of claim 11.	27
2. Chang teaches away from the combination JSI advocates.	28
3. Secondary considerations: commercial success.	31
VI. Conclusion	33

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>ABB INC. v. ROY-G-BIV Corp.</i> , IPR2013-00062 (PTAB Final Written Decision, 2014).....	11, 24, 31
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	7
<i>Crocs, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 598 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010).	12
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs.</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131, 195 L. Ed. 2d 423, 2016 U.S. LEXIS 3927 (2016)	5
<i>Custom Accessories, Inc. v. Jeffrey-Allan Indus., Inc.</i> , 807 F.2d 955 (Fed. Cir. 1986).	7
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)....	4
<i>Ex parte Levensgood</i> , 28 USPQ2d 1300 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993).	6
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	5
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	4
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977, 78 USPQ2d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	6
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 U.S.P.Q.2D 1541 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	3, 4
<i>In re Nuvasive</i> , 842 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	7
<i>In re Van Os</i> , 844 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	6
<i>In re Warsaw Orthopedic, Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	7
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	5, 6
<i>Leo Pharmaceutical Products, Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 107 U.S.P.Q.2d 1943 (Fed. Cir. 2013). .	12
<i>Merck & Co., Inc. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005)....	11, 31

Nike, Inc. v. Adidas AG, 812 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 3

Personal Web Technologies, Inc. v. Apple Inc., Case No. 2016-1174 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 14, 2017)..... 6

Prism Pharma Co., Ltd. V. Choongwae Pharma Corporation, Case IPR2014-00315 (PTAB 2014)..... 20

Standard Oil Co. Am. Cyanamid Co., 774 F.2d 448 (Fed. Cir. 1985) 7

Tech. Licensing Corp. v. Videotek, Inc., 545 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2008) 4

Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Maersk Drilling USA, Inc., 699 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 12, 13, 26

TriVascular, Inc. v. Samuels, 812 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 4

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102(3).....19

35 U.S.C. § 103..... 5

35 U.S.C. § 316(e)..... 2, 3, 4, 5

35 U.S.C. § 325(d) 20

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.120(a)..... 1, 2

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.