

1 Ryan E. Hatch (SBN 235577)
rhatch@linerlaw.com
2 Jason L. Haas (SBN 217290)
jhaas@linerlaw.com
3 LINER LLP
1100 Glendon Avenue, 14th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90024.3518
4 Telephone: (310) 500-3500
5 Facsimile: (310) 500-3501

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff SIGNAL IP, INC.

7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 SIGNAL IP, INC., a California
11 corporation,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 AMERICAN HONDA MOTOR CO.,
INC., a California corporation;
15 HONDA OF AMERICA MFG, INC.,
an Ohio corporation,

16 Defendant.

Case No. 2:14-cv-02454-JAK (JEMx)
(Related to 2:14-cv-02962-JAK
(JEMx); SA CV14-00497-JAK (JEMx);
8:14-cv-00491-JAK (JEMx); 2:14-cv-
02963 JAK (JEMx); 2:14-cv-02457-
JAK (JEMx); 2:14-cv-03111-JAK
(JEMx); LA CV14-03109 JAK (JEMx);
2:14-cv-03107-JAK (JEMx); 2:14-cv-
03113-JAK (JEMx); 2:14-cv-03108-
JAK (JEMx); 2:14-cv-03114-JAK
(JEMx))

**JOINT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION
BRIEF**

17
18 AND RELATED CASES

Date: March 31, 2015
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Crtrm.: 750

The Hon. John A. Kronstadt

Trial Date: TBD

LINER^{LLP}
1100 Glendon Avenue | 14th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90024.3518

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1	
2 I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
3 II. LEGAL STANDARDS.....	2
4 A. Defendants’ Statement.....	2
5 B. Signal’s Statement.....	3
6 III. DISCUSSION.....	5
7 A. Defendants’ Statement on Indefiniteness.....	5
8 B. VWGOA and Bentley’s Statement – Extrinsic Evidence is Not 9 Required to Prove Indefiniteness.....	6
10 C. Signal’s Statement.....	9
11 1. Defendants Failed to Meet Their Burden of Proof to Show 12 Indefiniteness.....	9
13 D. ‘927 Patent.....	13
14 Defendants’ Summary of ‘927 Patent.....	13
15 1. Preamble (Claim 1).....	16
16 (a) Defendants’ Statement.....	16
17 (b) Honda’s Statement.....	17
18 (c) Signal’s Statement.....	18
19 2. “Variable sustain time” (Claims 1 and 2).....	18
20 (a) Defendants’ Statement.....	18
21 (b) Signal’s Statement.....	24
22 3. “Wherein the zone of coverage appears to increase 23 according to the variable sustain time” (Claim 1).....	25
24 (a) Defendants’ Statement.....	25
25 (b) VWGoA and Bentley’s Separate Statement.....	31
26 (c) Honda’s Alternative Construction.....	32
27 (d) Signal’s Statement.....	34
28 4. “A threshold time” (Claim 1).....	40
(a) Defendants’ Statement.....	40

LINER^{LLP}
 1100 Glendon Avenue | 14th Floor
 Los Angeles, CA 90024.3518

LINER^{LLP}
1100 Glendon Avenue | 14th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90024-3518

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- (b) Signal’s Statement..... 44
- 5. “Improving the perceived zone of coverage” (Claim 1) 45
 - (a) Defendants’ Statement 45
 - (b) VWGoA and Bentley’s Separate Statement 47
 - (c) Signal’s Statement..... 48
- E. ‘375 Patent 49
- Defendants’ Summary of ‘375 Patent 49
- 6. “Force distribution” (Claim 1)..... 51
 - (a) Defendants’ Statement 51
 - (b) Signal’s Statement..... 53
- 7. “On the passenger seat” (Claim 1) 55
 - (a) Defendants’ Statement 55
 - (b) Signal’s Statement..... 58
- 8. “Seat area” (Claim 1)..... 60
 - (a) Defendants’ Statement 60
 - (b) Signal’s Statement..... 64
- 9. “Sensor array” / “Array of force sensors” (Claim 1)..... 66
 - (a) Defendants’ Statement 66
 - (b) Signal’s Statement..... 69
- 10. “Seat area threshold force” (Claim 1)..... 71
 - (a) Defendants’ Statement 72
 - (b) Signal’s Statement..... 74
- 11. “Concentrated” (Claim 1)..... 75
 - (a) Defendants’ Statement 75
 - (b) Signal’s Statement..... 78
- F. ‘007 Patent 80
- Defendants’ Summary of the ‘007 Patent 80
- 12. “Seat sensors” (Claims 1, 17, 18 & 19)..... 80

LINER^{LLP}
 1100 Glendon Avenue | 14th Floor
 Los Angeles, CA 90024-3518

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

(a) Defendants’ Statement 80

(b) Signal’s Statement..... 83

13. “Lock flag” / “Flag” (Claims 1 & 17) 84

(a) Defendants’ Statement 85

(b) Signal’s Statement..... 87

14. “For a time” / “For a given time” (Claims 1 & 17)..... 88

(a) Defendants’ Statement 88

(b) Signal’s Statement..... 91

15. “A second threshold” (Claim 20) 92

(a) Defendants’ Statement 93

(b) Signal’s Statement..... 94

16. “Relative weight parameter” (Claims 1, 17, 20-22)..... 95

(a) Defendants’ Statement 96

(b) Signal’s Statement..... 99

17. “Setting” / “Set a lock flag when...” (Claims 1, 17)..... 100

(a) Defendants’ Statement 101

(b) Signal’s Statement..... 103

18. “A level indicative of an empty seat” (Claims 1, 17)..... 104

(a) Defendants’ Statement 104

(b) Signal’s Statement..... 106

19. “Arrayed in an interface defined by the bottom surface”
 (Claim 19)..... 109

(a) Defendants’ Statement 110

(b) Signal’s Statement..... 112

20. “Means for selectively allowing deployment according to
 the outputs of seat sensors responding to the weight of an
 occupant” (Claim 1)..... 113

(a) Defendants’ Statement 114

(b) Signal’s Statement..... 117

LINER^{LLP}
 1100 Glendon Avenue | 14th Floor
 Los Angeles, CA 90024-3518

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- (i) Legal Standard for Means-Plus-Function Analysis..... 117
- (ii) The Limitations Are Not in Means-Plus-Function Format Because a POSA Would Identify Structure in the Claims..... 118
- (iii) Defendants’ Arguments Fail Because they Provide No Evidence from a POSA..... 120
- (iv) If the Claims are in Means-Plus-Function Format, then the Corresponding Structure is the Microprocessor..... 121
- 21. “Means for inhibiting and allowing deployment according to whether a seat is occupied by a person of at least a minimum weight” (Claim 17)..... 124
 - (a) Defendants’ Statement 125
 - (b) Signal’s Statement..... 127
- G. ‘486 Patent 128
- Defendants’ Summary of the ‘486 Patent 128
- 22. “Desired warning distance based upon the current steering angle” / “Desired Warning Distance” (Claims 21 and 28)..... 129
 - (a) Defendants’ Statement 129
 - (b) Honda’s Position 132
 - (c) BMWNA’s Position on “desired warning distance” 133
 - (d) Signal’s Statement..... 135
 - (i) The Warning Distance Need Not Always “Vary” Depending On the Current Steering Angle..... 135
 - (ii) Not All Objects Within the Warning Distance Will Result in an Alarm 137
 - (iii) There is No Basis for Requiring the Distance to be “Defined” 138
- H. ‘601 Patent 138
- Defendants’ Summary of the ‘601 Patent 138
- 23. “During conditions when...” (Claims 8 and 15)..... 139
 - (a) Defendants’ Statement 139

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.