

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

Issued: Apr. 10, 2012

Filed: Jun. 27, 2006

Inventor: Ira Marlowe

Title: MULTIMEDIA DEVICE INTEGRATION SYSTEM

Inter Partes Review No.: Unassigned

DECLARATION OF THOMAS G. MATHESON, Ph.D.

**IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR *INTER PARTES*
REVIEW**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS	1
A. Educational Background	1
B. Relevant Professional Experience.....	1
III. SUMMARY OF MY OPINIONS.....	4
A. Instructions	5
1. Claim Interpretation	6
2. Anticipation	7
3. Obviousness	7
4. “means-plus-function” claims.....	11
B. Effective Filing Dates and Prior Art Patents and Printed Publications	13
IV. OVERVIEW OF THE TECHNOLOGY	17
A. Summary of the ‘342 Patent Disclosure	17
B. Summary of the Challenged Claims	20
C. Summary of the Prosecution History of the ‘342 Patent	23
D. The “Problem” the ‘342 Patent Claims to Solve	25
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	30
VI. ALL CHALLENGED CLAIMS OF THE ‘342 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE	39
A. Grounds 1-3: Clayton.....	39
1. Ground 1: Claims 49-55, 57, 62-64, 71, 73-80, 95, 97, 99-103, 109-111, and 120 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by Clayton in view of Berry....	39
2. Ground 2: Claims 49-57, 62-64, 66, 70, 71, 73-80, 94, 95, 97, 99-103, 106, 109-111, 113, and 120 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by Clayton in view of Berry and Marlowe	72
3. Ground 3: Claims 68 and 115 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by Clayton in view of Berry, Marlowe, and Gioscia	83
VII. CONCLUSION	87

Declaration of Thomas G. Matheson, Ph.D.
U.S. Patent No. 8,155,342

EXHIBITS AND ATTACHMENTS

I may refer to the following Exhibits that I understand were submitted by
Petitioner in connection with the Inter Partes Review petition:

Exhibit	Description
1001	U.S. Patent No. 8,155,342 ("the '342 patent")
1002	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0181963 ("Clayton")
1003	U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/651,963 ("Clayton Provisional")
1004	U.S. Patent No. 6,559,773 ("Berry")
1005	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0215102 ("Marlowe")
1006	U.S. Patent No. 6,421,305 ("Gioscia")
1007	Claim Construction Ruling in Marlowe Patent Holdings LLC v. DICE Electronics, LLC et al., 3:10-cv-01199 (D. NJ) and Marlowe Patent Holdings LLC v. Ford Motor Company, 3:10-cv-07044 (D. NJ)
1008	U.S. Patent Application No. 11/475,847 ("the '847 application")
1009	U.S. Patent Application No. 11/071,667 ("the '667 application")
1010	U.S. Patent Application No. 10/732,909 ("the '909 application")
1011	U.S. Patent Application No. 10/316,961 ("the '961 application")
1012	Highlighted '342 Patent (Showing the New Matter)
1013	Plaintiff's Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions, served in Blitzsafe Texas, LLC v. Toyota Motor Corp. et al., 2-15-cv-01277 (E.D. TX)
1014	File History of the '342 Patent
1015	1999 ID3v2.3 Metadata Standard (1999)
1016	Declaration of Dr. Thomas Matheson
1017	Canadian Patent Application Publication No. CA 2347648 ("Kandler")
1018	International Publication No. WO 01/67266 A1 ("Lau")
1019	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0028717 ("Ohmura")
1020	Bluetooth ESDP for UPnP (2001)
1021	Universal Plug and Play Device Architecture (2000)

ATTACHMENT A: Curriculum Vitae of Thomas G. Matheson, Ph.D.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I have been retained by counsel for Toyota Motor Corporation (“Toyota” or “Petitioner”), and asked to review and provide my opinion on the patentability of claims 49-57, 62-64, 66, 68, 70, 71, 73-80, 94, 95, 97, 99-103, 106, 109-111, 113, 115, and 120 of U.S. Patent No. 8,155,342 (Ex. 1001, “the ’342 Patent”). I am being compensated for my time at my normal consulting rate of \$350 per hour. My compensation is not contingent on the outcome of this proceeding or the content of my opinions.

II. BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS

A. Educational Background

2. In 1974, I received a B.S. in Physics from Abilene Christian University. In 1976, I received an M.A. in Physics from the University of Oregon. In 1980, I received a Ph.D. from the University of Oregon in Physics. In 1998, I received an M.B.A. from The Wharton School of Business at the University of Pennsylvania.

B. Relevant Professional Experience

3. While working on my technical degrees I taught laboratory courses in Electronics and Instrumentation and published papers on applications of microcomputers to signal processing. The experimental apparatus that I developed as part of my thesis research in experimental Solid State Physics was a highly automated, multiple-computer instrumentation system capable of controlling

laboratory equipment (including 100-amp currents through a superconducting solenoid) while automatically measuring and analyzing low-frequency electromagnetic signals from Silicon ICs under vacuum, near zero Kelvin, and in a high magnetic field.

4. While working at AT&T Bell Laboratories most of my work focused on the design of large digital systems, including investigation of both low-bandwidth and high-bandwidth networks. As part of that work, I designed network-interface integrated circuits that were fabricated and used in prototype network systems. I also researched and built an automated system that automatically designed fabrication-ready single-chip microcomputers/controllers starting from a high level specification.

5. In 1984, I founded Silicon Design Labs (later named Silicon Compiler Systems), an IC CAD company that commercialized “Silicon Compilation.” (Silicon Compilation is the application of language compiler and related programming techniques to IC design and layout.) We also provided custom IC design services and sold libraries of standardized IC circuit designs and layouts. I performed marketing and engineering functions, managing groups that developed IC layout, analysis, extraction, and Silicon Compilation tools. During this period, I published several technical papers on our IC design tools. Although our tools were general-purpose electronic- and IC-design tools, most of our customers focused on



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.