

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

DAIMLER AG,

Petitioner,

v.

BLITZSAFE TEXAS, LLC,

Patent Owner.

Patent No. 8,155,342

Issue Date: June 27, 2006

Title: MULTIMEDIA DEVICE INTEGRATION SYSTEM

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Case No. IPR2018-01209

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page(s)</u>
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.....	4
F. Asserted Prior Art.....	9
1. Simonds.....	9
2. Ekstrom	12
3. MOST Specification	14
II. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE NOT OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF THE CITED REFERENCES.....	16
A. The Obviousness Standard	17
B. The Cited References Do Not Teach or Disclose an Integration Subsystem Instructing a Portable Device to Play an Audio File in Response to a User Selecting the Audio File Using Controls of a Car Audio/Video System	18
1. Simonds Does Not Teach or Disclose a User Issuing a Command from a Car Audio/Video System to Play an Audio File From a Portable Device	20
2. The MOST Specification Does Not Teach or Disclose Any Missing “Implementation Details” To Enable a User Issuing a Command from a Car Audio/Video System to Play an Audio File From a Portable Device	23
3. Ekstrom Does Not Teach or Disclose Any Missing “Implementation Details” To Enable a User Issuing a Command from a Car Audio/Video System to Play an Audio File From a Portable Device	25

C.	The Cited References Do Not Teach or Disclose an Integration System Receiving Audio Generated by a Portable Device for Playing on a Car Audio/Video System	31
1.	Simonds Does Not Teach or Disclose Generating Audio on a Portable Device for Playing on a Car Audio/Video System.....	33
2.	Ekstrom Does Not Teach or Disclose Any Missing “Implementation Details” for Generating Audio on a Portable Device for Playing on a Car Audio/Video System.....	39
3.	The MOST Specification Does Not Teach or Disclose Any Missing “Implementation Details” for Generating Audio on a Portable Device for Playing on a Car Audio/Video System.....	40
III.	EKSTROM IS NOT A PRIOR ART PRINTED PUBLICATION.....	43
A.	The Printed Publication Standard.....	44
B.	Petitioner Has Not Established that Ekstrom Was Publicly Available on the Linkoping University Website.....	47
1.	Strawn is Not Qualified to Opine on the Functionality of Webpages and Web Search Engines in the 2003–2005 Time Frame	48
2.	The Evidence Does Not Establish that Ekstrom Was Publicly Available on the Linkoping University Website.....	49
i.	The Evidence Does Not Establish that a POSA Could Have Found Ekstrom on the Linkoping University Website Through Search Engines.....	50
ii.	The Evidence Does Not Establish that a POSA Could Have Found Ekstrom on the Linkoping University Website Through Keyword Searching on the Website Itself.....	53
C.	Petitioner Has Not Established that Ekstrom Was Publicly Available Through DiVA.....	55

- 1. Petitioner’s “Evidence” is Inadmissible55
- 2. The Evidence Does Not Establish that Ekstrom Was Publicly Available on DiVA58
- D. Petitioner Has Not Established that Ekstrom Was Publicly Available Through the Linkoping University Library Catalog61
- IV. CONCLUSION.....62

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Apple Inc. v. Saint Lawrence Commc'ns LLC,
IPR2017-01075, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 21, 2017).....46

Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.,
815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016)44, 45

Bruckelmyer v. Ground Heaters, Inc.,
445 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006)45

C.B. Distribs., Inc. v. Fontem Holdings I B.V.,
IPR2013-00387, Paper 43 (PTAB Dec. 24, 2014)18

Graham v. John Deere Co.,
383 U.S. 1 (1966).....17

Groupon, Inc. v. Blue Calypso LLC,
CBM2013-00044, Paper 47 (PTAB Dec. 17, 2014).....46

In re Hall,
781 F.2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986)45

In re Hedges,
783 F.2d 1038 (Fed. Cir. 1986)18

Int'l Bus. Mach. Corp. v. Envisionit, LLC,
IPR2017-01248, Paper 7 (PTAB Oct. 16, 2017).....45

Intel Corp. v. Alacritech, Inc.,
IPR2017-01395, Paper 8 (PTAB Nov. 22, 2017).....46

In re Kahn,
441 F.3d 997 (Fed. Cir. 2006)17, 34

Rohm & Hass Co. v. Brotech Corp.,
127 F.3d 1089 (Fed. Cir. 1997)34

SRI Int'l, Inc. v. Internet Sec. Sys., Inc.,
511 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2008)45

Tempur Sealy Inter'l Inc. v. Select Comfort Corp.,
IPR2014-01419, Paper 7 (PTAB Feb. 17, 2015).....25

Voter Verified, Inc. v. Premier Election Sols., Inc.,
698 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2012)45

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.