

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Motherson Innovations Co., Ltd.,
Petitioner,

v.

Magna Mirrors of America, Inc.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2020-00777
Patent No. 10,261,648

Patent Owner's Preliminary Response

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iv
LIST OF EXHIBITS	v
I. Introduction.....	1
II. The '648 Patent.....	2
III. A Person Having Ordinary Skill In The Art.....	7
IV. Claim Construction.....	8
A. “Exterior Mirror Reflective Element Fixedly Attached At Said Mirror Head”	8
B. “A Bracket To Which Said Exterior Mirror Reflective Element Is Fixedly Attached”	15
C. “Wherein The Outermost Front Perimeter Edge Of Said Exterior Mirror Reflective Element Is Rounded”	19
D. “Rearward Field of View”	22
E. “Yaw” And “Roll”	27
V. The Petition Fails To Establish A Reasonable Likelihood That Petitioner Will Prevail	30
A. Ground 1: Lupo, Alone or In Combination With Other References, Does Not Disclose All Of The Elements Of The Challenged Claims	30
1. Lupo Does Not Disclose “An Exterior Mirror Reflective Element Fixedly Attached At Said Mirror Head” (Claim 1, 15, 26)	30
2. Lupo Does Not Disclose “A Bracket To Which Said Exterior Mirror Reflective Element Is Fixedly Attached” (Claims 3–4, 6–7, 17–18, 21–22, 29–30, 32)	32

3.	Lupo Does Not Disclose “Wherein Said Mirror Head Is Disposed At One End Of Said Support Structure And Wherein Said Attachment Portion Is At A Distal Other End Of Said Support Structure” (Claims 5, 20, 26)	34
4.	Lupo Does Not Disclose “Wherein Said First Electrically-Operable Actuator Is Operable At A Speed Different Than A Speed Of Operation Of Said Second Electrically-Operable Actuator” (Claims 13, 28)	37
5.	Lupo Does Not Disclose “Wherein Said First And Second Pivot Axes Are Angled Non-Orthogonally Relative To One Another” And “At An Angle That Is Greater Than 15 Degrees And Is Less Than 90 Degrees” (Claims 10–11, 23, 34–35).....	41
6.	Lupo Does Not Disclose “Wherein Said Multi-Axis Adjustment Mechanism Is Operable For ... Roll Adjustment” (Claims 9, 25, 31, and 36)	45
B.	Ground 1(b): The Combination Of Lupo and McCabe Does Not Render The Challenged Claims Obvious.....	47
1.	Lupo In Combination With McCabe Does Not Disclose “Wherein The Outermost Front Perimeter Edge Of Said Exterior Mirror Reflective Element Is Rounded” (Claims 2, 16, 33)	47
2.	There Is No Motivation To Combine McCabe With Lupo	50
3.	One Of Skill In The Art Would Avoid Combining The Electro-optic Feature Of McCabe With Lupo (Claims 16–23, 26–36)	51
C.	Ground 2(a): Tsuyama Does Not Render The Challenged Claims Obvious	52
1.	Tsuyama Fails To Disclose Or Render Obvious An “Exterior Rearview Mirror Assembly” As Required By Every Claim	53

- 2. Tsuyama Does Not Disclose “An Exterior Mirror Reflective Element Fixedly Attached At Said Mirror Head” (Claims 1, 15, 26)57
- 3. Tsuyama Does Not Disclose Both An “Attachment Portion” And A “Support Structure” That Moves Relative To The Vehicle (Claims 5, 20, 26)59
- 4. Tsuyama Does Not Disclose Wherein Said First And Second Electrically-Operable Actuators Are “Cooperatively Operable” To Adjust Said Mirror Head (Claims 12, 24, 27).....61
- 5. Tsuyama Does Not Disclose “Wherein Said Multi-Axis Adjustment Mechanism Is Operable For ... Yaw Adjustment” (Claims 9, 25, 31, and 36)62
- D. Ground 2(b): The Combination of Tsuyama and McCabe Does Not Render the Challenged Claims Obvious65
 - 1. Tsuyama In Combination With McCabe Does Not Disclose “Wherein The Outermost Front Perimeter Edge Of Said Exterior Mirror Reflective Element Is Rounded” (Claims 2, 16, 33).....65
 - 2. Because Tsuyama Is Not A Rear-View Mirror Used For Driving, There Is No Reason To Modify It In View Of McCabe66
- VI. Conclusion68
- CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH 37 C.F.R. § 42.24.....70
- CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE71

Note: All *emphasis* in this brief added, unless otherwise indicated.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Page(s)****CASES**

<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)	8, 21
<i>SciMed Life Sys., Inc. v. Advanced Cardiovascular Sys., Inc.</i> , 242 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	14
<i>Transclean Corp. v. Bridgewood Services, Inc.</i> , 290 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	44
<i>Verizon Services Corp. v. Vonage Holdings Corp.</i> , 505 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	13

OTHER AUTHORITIES

49 C.F.R. § 571.111	21
ECE 324, Regulation 46	21, 22

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.