UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TRW AUTOMOTIVE U.S. LLC

Petitioner

V.

MAGNA ELECTRONICS, INC.

Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-00 Patent 8,710,969

PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW

Respectfully submitted,

LATHROP & GAGE LLP

Jon R. Trembath, Reg. No. 38,344

Allan Sternstein, Reg. No. 27,396

Nikhil U. Patel, Reg. No. 70,706

Timothy K. Sendek, Reg. No. 64,542

Douglas W. Link, Reg. No. 68,949



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. Threshold ISSUES	2
A. Challenge/relief request – Rules 42.22(a)(1) and 42.104(b)(1)-(2)	2
B. <u>Standing – Rule 42.104(a)</u>	3
C. Real party in interest – Rule 42.8(b)(1)	3
D. Other proceedings – Rule 42.8(b)(2)	3
E. <u>Counsel – Rule 42.8(b)(3)</u>	3
F. <u>Service – Rule 42.8(b)(4)</u>	4
G. <u>Fees – Rule 42.103</u>	4
H. Certification of service – Rules 42.6(e)(4)(iii) and 42.105(a)	4
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION – RULE 42.104(b)	5
IV. THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT TRW WILL PREV – RULES 42.22(a)(2) and 104(b)(4); 35 U.S.C. §314(a)	
A. Background and Introduction	5
1. Vehicle accessory technology	5
2. The original prosecution	6
3. State of the art	6
4. The earliest possible priority date is August 18, 2004	6
B. Grounds of Rejection	6
1. Ground 1: Claims 1–7, 9–16, and 21-22 are anticipated	7
a. Ground 1: Claim 1 is anticipated	8
b. Ground 1: Claim 2 is anticipated	14
c. Ground 1: Claim 3 is anticipated	17
d. Ground 1: Claim 4 is anticipated	17
e. Ground 1: Claim 5 is anticipated	18
f. Ground 1: Claim 6 is anticipated	19



٤	g .	Ground 1: Claim 7 is anticipated	20
1	n.	Ground 1: Claim 9 is anticipated	21
i	i .	Ground 1: Claim 10 is anticipated	22
j	į.	Ground 1: Claim 11 is anticipated	23
1	ζ.	Ground 1: Claim 13 is anticipated	23
1	l .	Ground 1: Claim 14 is anticpated	25
1	m.	Ground 1: Claim 15 is anticipated	25
1	n.	Ground 1: Claim 16 is anticipated	26
(Э.	Ground 1: Claim 21 is anticipated	27
1	9.	Ground 1: Claim 22 is anticipated	29
2.	C	Ground 2: Claims 1–7, 9–16, and 21-22 are obvious	29
		Background determinations, per KSR	30
ä	1 .	Dackground determinations, per KSK	50
ć	a. i.	. Scope and content of the prior art, and differences between prior	r
6			r
· ·	i.	. Scope and content of the prior art, and differences between prior	r 30
	i.	Scope and content of the prior art, and differences between prior art and claims	r 30 30
ł	i. ii	Scope and content of the prior art, and differences between prior art and claims Level of ordinary skill	r 30 30
l	i. ii o.	Scope and content of the prior art, and differences between prior art and claims Level of ordinary skill Ground 2: Claim 1 is Obvious	r 30 30 31
11	i. ii o. c.	Scope and content of the prior art, and differences between prior art and claims i. Level of ordinary skill Ground 2: Claim 1 is Obvious Ground 2: Claim 2 is Obvious	r 30 31 35
11 00	i. ii o. e.	Scope and content of the prior art, and differences between prior art and claims i. Level of ordinary skill Ground 2: Claim 1 is Obvious Ground 2: Claim 2 is Obvious Ground 2: Claim 3 is Obvious	r 30 31 35 36
1	i. ii o. c. d.	Scope and content of the prior art, and differences between prior art and claims i. Level of ordinary skill Ground 2: Claim 1 is Obvious. Ground 2: Claim 2 is Obvious. Ground 2: Claim 3 is Obvious. Ground 2: Claim 4 is Obvious.	r 30 31 35 36
1	i. ii o. c. d. f.	Scope and content of the prior art, and differences between prior art and claims i. Level of ordinary skill Ground 2: Claim 1 is Obvious. Ground 2: Claim 2 is Obvious. Ground 2: Claim 3 is Obvious. Ground 2: Claim 4 is Obvious. Ground 2: Claim 5 is Obvious.	r 30 31 35 36 36
1	i. ii o. c. d. e. f.	Scope and content of the prior art, and differences between prior art and claims i. Level of ordinary skill Ground 2: Claim 1 is Obvious. Ground 2: Claim 2 is Obvious. Ground 2: Claim 3 is Obvious. Ground 2: Claim 4 is Obvious. Ground 2: Claim 5 is Obvious. Ground 2: Claim 5 is Obvious.	r 30 31 35 36 38 38
1 0 1 1	i. ii o. d. e. f. n.	Scope and content of the prior art, and differences between prior art and claims i. Level of ordinary skill Ground 2: Claim 1 is Obvious Ground 2: Claim 2 is Obvious Ground 2: Claim 3 is Obvious Ground 2: Claim 4 is Obvious Ground 2: Claim 5 is Obvious Ground 2: Claim 6 is Obvious Ground 2: Claim 7 is Obvious	r 30 31 35 36 38 38



1.	Ground 2: Claim 13 is Obvious	43
m	. Ground 2: Claim 14 is Obvious	44
n.	Ground 2: Claim 15 is Obvious	45
o.	Ground 2: Claim 16 is Obvious	46
p.	Ground 2: Claim 21 is Obvious	47
q.	Ground 2: Claim 22 is Obvious	49
3.	Ground 3: Claims 8, 17-20, and 23 are obvious	50
a.	Background determinations: content of the prior art, and differences between prior art and claims	50
b.	Ground 3: Claim 8 is Obvious	50
c.	Ground 3: Claim 17 is Obvious	54
d.	Ground 3: Claim 18 is obvious	56
e.	Ground 3: Claim 19 is Obvious	57
f.	Ground 2: Claim 20 is Obvious	58
g.	Ground 2: Claim 23 is Obvious	59



I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner, TRW Automotive U.S. LLC (hereinafter "TRW"), seeks *Inter Partes* Review to invalidate claims 1-11, and 13-23 of unexpired U.S. Pat. No. 8,710,969 to DeWard et al. (the "'969 Patent") titled "ACCESSORY SYSTEM FOR VEHICLE," which issued on April 29, 2014 and is attached as Exhibit 1002.¹

The '969 Patent claims relate to a camera accommodated within an accessory module that detachably mounts to a mounting element attached on a windshield of an automobile for use within a driver assistance system. (1002-001 at Abstract). The camera includes a CMOS photosensor array housed within the accessory module separate from a lens.

The '969 Patent was filed on September 19, 2013 and claims priority back to a U.S. Provisional Application filed on August 18, 2004. (1002-001). The '969 Patent consistently incorporates U.S. Patent No. 6,824,281 by reference. (*See* 1002-018 at 3:62-67; -024 at 16:4-13). The '281 Patent does not qualify as prior art under §102(b) as it was not published more than one year before the 8/18/2004 priority date of the '969 Patent. (*see* 1006-001). While Magna Electronics Inc., ("Magna") disclosed the non 102(b) prior art '281 Patent to the USPTO during prosecution of the '969 Patent, it *did not disclose its* 102(b) prior art counterpart

¹ A full listing of all exhibits, per Rule 42.63(e) is provided as Exhibit 1001. Citations to exhibits are formatted as follows: "xxxx-yyy" with xxxx and yyy representing the exhibit number and page number respectively (with column, line, and/or paragraph numbers as appropriate).



DOCKET

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.

