# EXHIBIT C

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

UNIFIED PATENTS INC.
Petitioner
v.

BLITZSAFE TEXAS, LLC
Patent Owner

Patent No. 8,155,342
Issue Date: April 10, 2012
Title: MULTIMEDIA DEVICE INTEGRATION SYSTEM

---

# BLITZSAFE TEXAS, LLC'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,155,342

Case No. IPR2016-00118

---

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. THE PETITION SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED BECAUSE UNIFIED PATENTS FAILED TO NAME ALL REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST ..... 4

III. THE PETITION SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED BECAUSE PETITIONER'S CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS ARE INCORRECT IN LIGHT OF THE SPECIFICATION AND CLAIMS ..... 10

A. Petitioner's Proposed Construction of Integration Subsystem is Incorrect ..... 11

B. Petitioner's Proposed Construction of Multimedia Device Integration System is Incorrect ..... 14

IV. PETITIONER HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED A REASONBLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS FOR ANY OF GROUNDS 1-19 AND THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED. ..... 14

A. Requirements for Showing Anticipation Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 ..... 14

B. Claims 1-4 and 49 Are Not Anticipated by Ohmura (Ground 1) ..... 17

1. Integration subsystem ..... 17

2. 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/receives] audio generated by the portable device . . . ..... 19

3. Ground 1 Also Fails with Respect to Claim 49 Because Petitioner's Argument Consists of Impermissible Incorporation by Reference ..... 22

4. The Dependent Claims 2-4 Are Valid over Ohmura ..... 22

C. Claims 1-4, 19, and 49 Are Not Obvious Over Owens in View of Ahn (Grounds 2 and 15) ..... 23

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

1. Ground 2 Fails to Specify Any Differences Between the Claims and the Cited References. ....24

2. Grounds 2 and 15 Fail to Articulate with Particularity Where Each Element of Claims 1-4 or 49 are Allegedly Found. ....26

3. The Petition Does Not Explain Why a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Have Had Reason to Modify Owens and/or Ahn to Render Obvious Claims 1-4, 19, or 49 ....29

4. Because Claim 1 is Valid in View of Ground 2, Its Dependent Claims Are Also Valid in View of Grounds 2 and 15. ....35

D. Claims 25 and 73 are Not Obvious Over Ohmura in View of Ahn (Ground 3) ....36

E. Combinations of Ohmura in View of Flick (Ground 4) or Owens and Ahn in View of Flick (Ground 5) Do Not Render Claims 5 and 97 Obvious ....37

F. Combinations of Ohmura in View of Tranchina (Ground 6) or Owens and Ahn in View of Tranchina (Ground 7) Do Not Render Claims 6 and 120 Obvious ....40

G. Combinations of Ohmura in View of Coon (Ground 8) or Owens and Ahn in View of Coon (Ground 9) Do Not Render Claims 7-10 Obvious ....43

H. Combinations of Ohmura in View of Lutter (Ground 10) or Owens and Ahn in View of Lutter (Ground 11) Do Not Render Claim 11 Obvious ....46

I. Combinations of Ohmura in View of McConnell (Ground 12) or Owens and Ahn in View of McConnell (Ground 13) Do Not Render Claims 12-18, 20, 21, 23, and 24 Obvious ....48

J. The Combination of Ohmura in View of Beckert (Ground 14) Does Not Render Claim 19 Obvious ....51

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

K. Combinations of Ohmura in View of McConnell and Further in View of Tranchina (Ground 16) or Owens and Ahn in Further View of Tranchina (Ground 17) Do Not Render Claim 22 Obvious....52

L. Combinations of Ohmura in View of Eiche (Ground 18) or Owens and Ahn in View of Eiche (Ground 19) Do Not Render Claim 121 Obvious....54

V. CONCLUSION....57

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

# 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.