

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

American Honda Motor Co., Inc.  
Petitioner

v.

Blitzsafe Texas, LLC  
Patent Owner

Patent No. 7,489,786  
Filing Date: December 11, 2002  
Issue Date: February 10, 2009  
Title: AUDIO DEVICE INTEGRATION SYSTEM

---

*Inter Partes* Review No. IPR2016-01472

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW  
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 *ET SEQ.***

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Grounds for Standing Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a) .....	2
III. The ‘786 Patent.....	2
A. Summary of the ‘786 Patent.....	2
B. Prosecution History of the ‘786 Patent .....	4
IV. Identification of Challenge Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b) .....	6
A. 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(1): Claims For Which Inter Partes Review Is Requested .....	6
B. 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(2): The Prior Art and Specific Grounds On Which The Challenge to the Claims Is Based.....	6
C. 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3): Claim Construction .....	9
D. 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4): How the Construed Claims are Unpatentable.....	10
E. 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(5): Supporting Evidence .....	10
V. There Is a Reasonable Likelihood That at Least One Claim of the ‘786 Patent Is Unpatentable .....	10
A. Ground 1: Claims 57, 60, 61, 64, and 65 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bhogal, Berry, and Onishi .....	10
1. Bhogal .....	11
2. Berry.....	12
3. Onishi .....	14
4. Claim 57 .....	15
5. Claims 60 and 61.....	21
6. Claims 64 and 65.....	23
B. Ground 2: Claim 62 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bhogal, Berry, Onishi, and Ohmura .....	24
C. Ground 3: Claims 64 and 65 are Unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bhogal, Berry, Onishi, and Okagaki .....	26

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
(continued)

	<b>Page</b>
D. Ground 4: Claims 1, 6, 7, 10, and 14 are Unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bhogal, Onishi, and Owens .....	28
1. Claims 1 and 14.....	30
2. Claim 6.....	34
3. Claim 7.....	35
4. Claim 10.....	35
E. Ground 5: Claim 5 is Unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bhogal, Onishi, Owens, and Berry.....	37
F. Ground 6: Claim 8 is Unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bhogal, Onishi, Owens, and Ohmura.....	38
G. Ground 7: Claim 10 is Unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bhogal, Onishi, Owens, and Knobl .....	39
H. Ground 8: Claims 1, 6, 7, 10, 14, 57, 60, and 61 are Unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over JP ‘954, Onishi, and Owens .....	41
1. Claims 1, 7, and 14 .....	43
2. Claim 6.....	48
3. Claim 10.....	49
4. Claim 57.....	50
5. Claim 60 and 61 .....	53
I. Ground 9: Claim 5 is Unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over JP ‘954, Onishi, Owens, and Berry .....	54
J. Ground 10: Claims 8 and 62 is Unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over JP ‘954, Onishi, Owens, and Ohmura .....	56
K. Ground 11: Claims 64 and 65 is Unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over JP ‘954, Onishi, Owens, and Okagaki.....	57
VI. Mandatory Notices Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1) .....	58
A. C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(a): Real Party-In-Interest .....	58
B. C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2): Related Matters .....	58

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
(continued)

	<b>Page</b>
C. C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3) and (4): Lead and Back-up Counsel and Service Information .....	59
VII. Conclusion .....	59

## LIST OF EXHIBITS

- Exhibit 1001: U.S. Patent No. 7,489,786 to Marlowe (“the ’786 patent”)
- Exhibit 1002: File History of U.S. Patent No. 7,489,786 (Part 1 of 2)
- Exhibit 1003: Decision, Institution of *Inter Partes* Review, Paper 13, in Case IPR2016-00421 (July 7, 2016)
- Exhibit 1004: U.S. Patent No. 6,629,197 to Bhogal et al. (“Bhogal”)
- Exhibit 1005: U.S. Patent No. 6,559,773 to Berry (“Berry”)
- Exhibit 1006: Japanese Unexamined Patent Application Publication No. JP 2001-128280A to Onishi et al.
- Exhibit 1007: English Translation of Japanese Unexamined Patent Application Publication No. JP 2001-128280A to Onishi et al. (“Onishi”)
- Exhibit 1008: U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0028717 A1 to Ohmura et al. (“Ohmura”)
- Exhibit 1009: European Patent Application No. EP 0 953 486 A2 to Okagaki et al. (“Okagaki”)
- Exhibit 1010: U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0084910 A1 to Owens et al. (“Owens”)
- Exhibit 1011: Japanese Unexamined Utility Model Application Publication No. JP H7-6954 to Ouchida
- Exhibit 1012: English Translation of Japanese Unexamined Utility Model Application Publication No. JP H7-6954 to Ouchida (“JP ‘954”)
- Exhibit 1013: U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0025376 to Knobl (“Knobl”)
- Exhibit 1014: Declaration of James T. Geier (“Geier Decl.”)
- Exhibit 1015: File History of U.S. Patent No. 7,489,786 (Part 2 of 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.