

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION**

BLITZSAFE TEXAS, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

HONDA MOTOR CO., LTD., ET AL.,

Defendants.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Case No. 2:15-cv-1274-JRG-RSP  
[Lead Case]

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

On July 1, 2016, the Court held a hearing to determine the proper construction of the disputed terms in U.S. Patent No. 7,489,786 (“the ’786 Patent”) and U.S. Patent No. 8,155,342 (“the ’342 Patent”) (collectively, the “Asserted Patents”). The Court has considered the arguments made by the parties at the hearing and in their claim construction briefs. (Dkt. Nos. 98, 101 & 106.) The Court has also considered the intrinsic evidence and made subsidiary factual findings about the extrinsic evidence. *See Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2005); *Teva Pharm. USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.*, 135 S. Ct. 831, 841 (2015). The Court issues this Claim Construction Memorandum and Order in light of these considerations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. BACKGROUND ..... 3

II. APPLICABLE LAW ..... 5

III. CONSTRUCTION OF AGREED TERMS ..... 10

IV. CONSTRUCTION OF DISPUTED TERMS ..... 11

A. Collateral Estoppel ..... 11

B. Disputed Constructions ..... 15

1. “interface” ..... 15

2. “integration subsystem” ..... 23

3. “generated by the portable device over the wireless communication link for playing on the car audio/video system” ..... 31

4. “device presence signal” ..... 35

5. “maintaining . . . in a state responsive” / “maintain . . . in a state responsive”  
40

6. “external” ..... 43

7. “portable” ..... 46

8. “pre-programmed” ..... 48

9. “car stereo” / “car audio/video system” ..... 51

10. “format incompatible with the [after-market audio device, MP3 player, portable device]” / “format incompatible with the [car stereo / car audio/video system]” ..... 56

11. “video information” ..... 59

12. “connector electrically connectable to” / “electrical connector” / “connectable” ..... 61

13. Claims 49 and 73 of the ‘342 Patent do not Claim Two Statutory Categories  
65

V. CONCLUSION ..... 67

## I. BACKGROUND

The '786 Patent is titled "Audio Device Integration System," and relates "to an audio device integration system for integrating after-market components such as satellite receivers, CD players, CD changers, MP3 players, Digital Audio Broadcast (DAB) receivers, auxiliary audio sources, and the like with factory-installed (OEM) or after-market car stereo systems." '786 Patent at col. 1, ll. 7–12. The '786 Patent was filed on December 11, 2002, and issued on February 10, 2009.

Claim 1 of the '786 Patent is an exemplary claim and recites the following elements (disputed term in italics):

1. An audio device integration system comprising:
  - a first *connector electrically connectable to a car stereo*;
  - a second *connector electrically connectable to an after-market audio device external to the car stereo*;
  - a third *connector electrically connectable to one or more auxiliary input sources external to the car stereo and the after-market audio device*;
  - an *interface* connected between said first and second *electrical connectors* for channeling audio signals to the *car stereo* from the after-market audio device, said *interface* including a microcontroller in electrical communication with said first and second *electrical connectors*, said microcontroller *pre-programmed* to execute:
    - a first *pre-programmed* code portion for remotely controlling the after-market audio device using the *car stereo* by receiving a control command from the *car stereo* through said first connector in a *format incompatible with the after-market audio device*, processing the received control command into a formatted command compatible with the after-market audio device, and transmitting the formatted command to the after-market audio device through said second connector for execution by the after-market audio device;
    - a second *pre-programmed* code portion for receiving data from the after-market audio device through said second connector in a *format incompatible with the car stereo*, processing the received data into formatted data compatible with the *car stereo*, and transmitting the

formatted data to the *car stereo* through said first connector for display by the *car stereo*; and  
a third *pre-programmed* code portion for switching to one or more auxiliary input sources connected to said third *electrical connector*.

The '342 Patent is titled "Multimedia Device Integration System," and relates "to a multimedia device integration system for integrating after-market components such as satellite receivers, CD players, CD changers, digital media devices (e.g., MP3 players, MP4 players, WMV players, Apple iPod devices, portable media centers, and other devices), Digital Audio Broadcast (DAB) receivers, auxiliary audio sources, video devices (e.g., DVD players), cellular telephones, and other devices for use with factory-installed (OEM) or after-market car stereo and video systems." '342 Patent at col. 1, ll. 20–28. The '342 Patent is a continuation-in-part of the '786 Patent. The '342 Patent was filed on June 27, 2006, and issued on April 10, 2012.

Claim 1 of the '342 Patent is an exemplary claim and recites the following elements (disputed term in italics):

1. A multimedia device integration system, comprising:  
an *integration subsystem* in communication with a *portable device*, the *portable device* external to a *car audio/video system*; and  
a first *wireless interface* in communication with said *integration subsystem*, said first *wireless interface* establishing a wireless communication link with a second *wireless interface* in communication with the *car audio/video system*,  
wherein said *integration subsystem* obtains information about an audio file stored on the *portable device*, transmits the information over said wireless communication link to the *car audio/video system* for subsequent display of the information on a display of the *car audio/video system*, instructs the *portable device* to play the audio file in response to a user selecting the audio file using controls of the *car audio/video system*, and transmits audio *generated by the portable device over said wireless communication link to the car audio/video system for playing on the car audio/video system*.

## II. APPLICABLE LAW

### A. Claim Construction

“It is a ‘bedrock principle’ of patent law that ‘the claims of a patent define the invention to which the patentee is entitled the right to exclude.’” *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc) (quoting *Innova/Pure Water Inc. v. Safari Water Filtration Sys., Inc.*, 381 F.3d 1111, 1115 (Fed. Cir. 2004)). To determine the meaning of the claims, courts start by considering the intrinsic evidence. *Id.* at 1313; *C.R. Bard, Inc. v. U.S. Surgical Corp.*, 388 F.3d 858, 861 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *Bell Atl. Network Servs., Inc. v. Covad Commc’ns Group, Inc.*, 262 F.3d 1258, 1267 (Fed. Cir. 2001). The intrinsic evidence includes the claims themselves, the specification, and the prosecution history. *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1314; *C.R. Bard, Inc.*, 388 F.3d at 861. The general rule—subject to certain specific exceptions discussed *infra*—is that each claim term is construed according to its ordinary and accustomed meaning as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in the context of the patent. *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1312–13; *Alloc, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n*, 342 F.3d 1361, 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *Azure Networks, LLC v. CSR PLC*, 771 F.3d 1336, 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (“There is a heavy presumption that claim terms carry their accustomed meaning in the relevant community at the relevant time.”) (vacated on other grounds).

“The claim construction inquiry . . . begins and ends in all cases with the actual words of the claim.” *Renishaw PLC v. Marposs Societa’ per Azioni*, 158 F.3d 1243, 1248 (Fed. Cir. 1998). “[I]n all aspects of claim construction, ‘the name of the game is the claim.’” *Apple Inc. v. Motorola, Inc.*, 757 F.3d 1286, 1298 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (quoting *In re Hiniker Co.*, 150 F.3d 1362, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 1998)). First, a term’s context in the asserted claim can be instructive. *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1314. Other asserted or unasserted claims can also aid in determining the claim’s

# 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.