

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

DAIMLER AG,
Petitioner

v.

BLITZSAFE TEXAS,
Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 7,489,786

“Audio Device Integration System”

Inter Partes Review No. 2018-01214

**CORRECTED PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW PURSUANT TO
THE COURT’S ORDER (CONDUCT OF THE PROCEEDING, PAPER 6)
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,489,786
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.100 *et seq.***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	7
II. BACKGROUND	9
A. Overview of the Technology	9
1. Blitzsafe commercially sold an interface that connected third party CD changers to preexisting car stereos	9
2. Other Manufacturers Commercialized Similar Interfaces	10
B. The '786 Patent Specification	11
C. The '786 Prosecution History	12
D. The Claims of the '786 Patent	12
E. Prior Petitions	13
F. Other Pending Petitions Are Not Duplicative	13
G. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	14
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	14
A. "device presence signal"	14
B. Means Plus Function Claim Elements	15
(a) "first pre-programmed means for generating. . ."	15
(b) "first pre-programmed means for . . . transmitting"	16
(c) "second pre-programmed means for remotely controlling. . . by receiving. . ."	16
(d) "second pre-programmed means for remotely controlling. . . by processing. . ."	16
(e) "second pre-programmed means for remotely controlling. . . by transmitting. . ."	17
(f) "means for transmitting. . ."	17
IV. STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED FOR EACH CHALLENGED CLAIM	18
A. Identification of Challenge (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b))	18
B. Grounds of Challenge (37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)(2))	18

V.	IDENTIFICATION OF HOW THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE.....	19
A.	Overview of the Cited Prior Art.....	19
1.	Barnea	19
2.	Plagge.....	20
3.	Bhogal	21
4.	CAN	22
5.	Frese	23
B.	Ground 1 – Barnea, Plagge and Bhogal render claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 13, 14, 23, 24, 44 and 47 obvious	24
1.	A POSITA would have been motivated to combine Barnea, Plagge and Bhogal	25
2.	Independent Claim 1	31
(a)	1[a].....	31
(b)	1[b].....	33
(c)	1[c].....	34
(d)	1[d].....	37
(e)	1[e].....	39
(f)	1[f]	44
(g)	1[g].....	47
(h)	1[h].....	49
(i)	1[i].....	49
(j)	1[j].....	49
(k)	1[k].....	50
(l)	1[l].....	52
3.	claim 2.....	53
4.	claim 4.....	53
5.	claim 5.....	54
6.	Claim 13.....	55
7.	Claim 14.....	55

8.	Claim 23	55
9.	Claim 24	56
10.	Claims 44 & 47	56
C.	Ground 2 – Barnea, Plagge, Bhogal, and the CAN Specification render claims 6, 57, 58, 60, 63, 64, 65, 92, 94, 97, and 98 obvious.....	58
1.	claim 6.....	58
	(a) The CAN protocol discloses the claimed “device presence” signal	58
	(b) A POSITA would have included CAN’s “wake- up” command in the modified Barnea system.....	61
2.	Independent Claim 57	63
3.	Dependent Claims 58, 63-65.....	64
4.	Independent Claim 92	65
	(a) "first pre-programmed means for generating. . . "	66
	(b) "first pre-programmed means for . . . transmitting"	66
	(c) "second pre-programmed means for remotely controlling. . . by receiving. . . "	67
	(d) “second pre-programmed means for remotely controlling. . . by processing. . . ”	68
	(e) "second pre-programmed means for remotely controlling. . . by transmitting. . . "	69
	(f) "means for transmitting. . ."	69
5.	Dependent Claims 94, 97 and 98	70
D.	Ground 3 – Barnea, Plagge, Bhogal and Ohmura render claims 7 and 8 obvious.....	70
1.	Claim 7	70
2.	Claim 8	73
E.	Ground 4 – Barnea, Plagge, Bhogal, Ohmura and CAN render claims 61 and 62 obvious	75
1.	Dependent Claims 61 and 62	75

F.	Ground 5 – Barnea, Plagge, Bhogal and Frese render claim 10 obvious	76
1.	Claim 10	76
G.	Ground 6 – Barnea, Plagge, Bhogal, Frese and CAN render 86, 88, 89, 90 and 91 obvious	80
1.	Independent Claim 86	80
2.	Dependent Claims 88-91	81
H.	Secondary Considerations Do Not Support A Finding Of Non-Obviousness.....	82
VI.	MANDATORY NOTICES	82
A.	Real Party-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)).....	83
B.	Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	83
1.	Related Patent Office Proceedings.....	83
2.	Related Litigation.....	83
C.	Lead and Back-Up Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)) and Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)-(4))	84
A.	Payment of Fees (37 C.F.R. § 42.15(a))	84
B.	Service	84
IX.	REQUIREMENTS FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW (37 C.F.R §§ 42.101, 42.104, AND 42.108)	85
A.	Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a); 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.101(a)-(c))	85
X.	CONCLUSION.....	85

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.