Paper No. 35 April 3, 2015

RECORD OF ORAL HEARING UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

- - - - - -

- - - - - -

TRW AUTOMOTIVE US LLC, Petitioner, v. MAGNA ELECTRONICS INC., Patent Owner.

> Case IPR2014-00256 U.S. Patent No. 7,459,664

Oral Hearing Held on Thursday, February 19, 2015

Before: JUSTIN T. ARBES, NEIL T. POWELL, and JO-ANNE M. KOKOSKI, Administrative Patent Judges.

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Thursday, February 19, 2015, at 10:29 a.m., in Hearing Room B, taken at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia.

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

TIMOTHY SENDEK, ESQ. Lathrop & Gage LLP 155 North Wacker Drive, Suite 3000 Chicago, Illinois 60606 312-920-3319

A. JUSTIN POPLIN, ESQ.
HISSAN ANIS, ESQ.
Lathrop & Gage LLP
10851 Mastin Boulevard
Building 82, Suite 1000
Overland Park, Kansas 66210
913-451-5100

ON BEHALF OF THE PATENT OWNER:

DOCKET

ARM

ROBERT GREENE STERNE, ESQ. DAVID K.S. CORNWELL, ESQ. RICHARD D. COLLER, III, ESQ. JASON D. EISENBERG, ESQ. Sterne Kessler Goldstein Fox 1100 New York Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 202-371-2600

DOCKET

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(10:29 a.m.)
3	JUDGE ARBES: Good morning, everyone. Please
4	be seated. This is the second day of cases in a set of six
5	related cases.
6	This morning we will hear IPR2014-00256,
7	involving Patent 7,459,664. IPR2014-00260 and
8	IPR2014-00264 have been consolidated with IPR-00256.
9	We will follow the same procedures as yesterday.
10	Both parties will have 45 minutes to present arguments.
11	Petitioner will go first and present its case. Patent Owner
12	will respond. And then Petitioner may use any remaining time
13	within the 45 minutes.
14	Any questions before we begin today?
15	MR. CORNWELL: Your Honor, I do have one
16	question.
17	JUDGE ARBES: Yes.
18	MR. CORNWELL: Yesterday you asked us not to
19	interrupt the other side with objections, and I think that's
20	correct, I think that's the proper procedure, but yesterday
21	everything that you saw on the ELMO were not
22	demonstratives that had been produced to us. They were
23	outside the demonstratives.
24	And I'm wondering and it has been my
25	understanding, that unless we were served with

3

Case IPR2014-00256 U.S. Patent No. 7,459,664

demonstratives, they are really not supposed to be using them.
 And it seems to me they are using the ELMO as an excuse to
 put things up that have not been served on us, and so they
 were surprises.

5 And I was wondering if -- I mean, obviously if you 6 don't agree with that characterization, that's fine -- do you 7 want us to let you know during our session, during our talks 8 that, in fact, most of their demonstratives, in fact yesterday 9 all of the things you saw on the ELMO, were not things that 10 had been served on us?

JUDGE ARBES: Sure. I think some of the things
that were shown were some of the Patent Owner's
demonstratives and some were pages from the record.

So why don't we deal with those today on a
case-by-case basis. So if that does occur today, please raise it
in your presentation.

17MR. CORNWELL: Okay. I certainly don't want to18sound petty, but I did want to address the Court on that.

19JUDGE ARBES: Thank you.

20 MR. CORNWELL: Thank you.

21 JUDGE ARBES: Any other questions before we 22 begin?

23 MR. SENDEK: No, Your Honor.

24 JUDGE ARBES: Okay. Petitioner, you may

25 proceed.

RM

4

Case IPR2014-00256 U.S. Patent No. 7,459,664

1	MR. SENDEK: Thank you, Your Honor. And I
2	would like to reserve 15 minutes of my time for rebuttal. And
3	my co-counsel will hand up hard copies of our demonstratives.
4	And these, like all of the items in the record, were served on
5	counsel for the Patent Owner.
6	Your Honors, my name is Tim Sendek. I am acting
7	as lead counsel here today for the Petitioner TRW Automotive
8	U.S. LLC.
9	With me today also from Lathrop & Gage are Mr.
10	Hissan Anis and Mr. Justin Poplin.
11	If you go to slide 1 of the demonstratives we just
12	handed out, as the Board just noted, today we are here to
13	discuss several consolidated cases regarding the '664 patent.
14	There are three grounds of review covering 28 claims total.
15	In so instituting those grounds of review, the
16	Board has determined that Petitioner is reasonably likely to
17	prevail on the showings made in the petition.
18	This patent shares the same specification with all
19	of the patents we discussed yesterday, the '023, the '248, the
20	'149, as well as both patents we will be talking about this
21	afternoon.
22	The prior art at issue is various combinations of
23	the Kenue, Kakinami, Vellacott and Yanagawa reference. The
24	primary reference, the Kenue reference, is a General Motors
25	patent using a CCD camera to detect lane markers in the

5

DOCKET A L A R M



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.