

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BMW OF NORTH AMERICA, LLC,

Petitioner,

v.

BLITZSAFE TEXAS, LLC,

Patent Owner.

Patent No. 8,155,342

Filing Date: June 27, 2006

Issue Date: April 10, 2012

Title: MULTIMEDIA DEVICE INTEGRATION SYSTEM

**BLITZSAFE TEXAS, LLC'S
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

Case No. IPR2018-00927

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Background..... 1
 - A. The '342 Patent 1
 - B. Effective Filing Date 2
 - C. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art 3
 - D. Claim Construction..... 3
 - E. Prior Unsuccessful Challenges..... 5
 - F. Asserted Prior Art..... 9
 - 1. Marlowe 11
 - 2. Michmerhuizen 12
 - 3. The ID3v2 References 14
- II. The Challenged Claims are Not Obvious in View of the Cited References..... 15
 - A. The Obviousness Standard 16
 - B. The Cited References Do Not Teach or Disclose an Integration Subsystem Receiving Audio Generated by a Portable Device for Playing on a Car Audio/Video System..... 17
 - 1. Petitioner Concedes that Marlowe Does Not Teach or Suggest Generating Audio on a Wirelessly Connected Portable Device for Playing on a Car Audio/Video System..... 18
 - 2. Michmerhuizen Does Not Teach or Disclose Generating Audio on a Portable Device for Playing on a Car Audio/Video System..... 18
 - (a) Petitioner’s Assertion That “Streaming Audio” Using “A2DP” Satisfies This Limitation Has Already Been Rejected by the Board 19
 - (b) Petitioner’s Argument That Audio Streaming Via A2DP Discloses Audio Generated by a Portable Device for Playing on a Car Audio/Video System is Contrary to the Evidence 23

III.	Michmerhuizen is Not Prior Art.....	28
A.	The '342 Patent is Entitled to Priority to the Filing Date of the '667 Application.....	29
B.	The '342 Patent is Entitled to Priority to at Least the Conception of the Claimed Invention, at Least as Early as March 21, 2006.....	33
IV.	The ID3v2 References are Not Prior Art.....	42
A.	The Printed Publication Standard.....	43
B.	There is No Evidence That the ID3v2 References Were Available on the Internet Prior to the Critical Date	46
C.	Even if the ID3v2 References Were Available on the Internet, There is No Evidence That They Were Indexed or Cataloged to the Extent That They Were “Publicly Available”.....	46
D.	The Inclusion of the ID3v2 References in the File History for Meyer Does Not Make Them Prior Art Printed Publications.....	48
V.	The <i>General Plastics</i> Factors Favor Denial of Institution	49
VI.	Conclusion	54

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Apple Inc. v. Saint Lawrence Communications LLC</i> , IPR2017-01075, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 21, 2017).....	45
<i>Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	43, 44
<i>Brown v. Barbacid</i> , 436 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	34
<i>Bruckelmyer v. Ground Heaters, Inc.</i> , 445 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	44
<i>C.B. Distributors, Inc. v. Fontem Holdings I B.V.</i> , IPR2013-00387, Paper 43 (PTAB Dec. 24, 2014)	16, 17
<i>General Plastic Industrial Co. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , IPR2016-01357, Paper 19 (PTAB Sept. 6, 2017).....	49, 51
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	16
<i>Groupon, Inc. v. Blue Calypso LLC</i> , CBM2013-00044, Paper 47 (PTAB Dec. 17, 2014).....	45
<i>In re Hall</i> , 781 F.2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	44
<i>In re Hedges</i> , 783 F.2d 1038 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	16
<i>Intel Corp. v. Alacritech, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-01395, Paper 8 (PTAB Nov. 22, 2017).....	45
<i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , IPR2013-00324, Paper 19 (PTAB Nov. 21, 2013).....	49
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	16, 25
<i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Sci., Inc.</i> , 261 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	33, 34

<i>Netapp, Inc. v. Realtime Data LLC</i> , IPR2017-01195, Paper 9 (PTAB Oct. 12, 2017)	50
<i>Perfect Surgical Techniques, Inc. v. Olympus Am., Inc.</i> , 841 F.3d 1004 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	33, 42
<i>Rohm & Hass Co. v. Brotech Corp.</i> , 127 F.3d 1089 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	25
<i>SRI International, Inc. v. Internet Security Systems, Inc.</i> , 511 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	44
<i>Tyco Healthcare Grp. v. Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc.</i> , 774 F.3d 968 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	34
<i>Voter Verified, Inc. v. Premier Election Solutions, Inc.</i> , 698 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	44

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 314	49
35 U.S.C. § 316	51

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.65	25
37 C.F.R. § 42.100	3
37 C.F.R. § 42.104	18
Fed. R. Evid. 801	18
Fed. R. Evid. 802	25
Fed. R. Evid. 901	25, 46

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.