

1 Ryan E. Hatch (SBN 235577)  
rhatch@linerlaw.com  
2 Jason L. Haas (SBN 217290)  
jhaas@linerlaw.com  
3 LINER LLP  
1100 Glendon Avenue, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
4 Los Angeles, California 90024.3518  
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 MRG, 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-03106-JAK  
(JEMx); 2:14-cv-03111-JAK (JEMx);  
LA CV14-03109 JAK (JEMx); 2:14-cv-  
03105-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  
AND PREHEARING STATEMENT**

*Markman* Hearing: March 16, 2015  
Time: 10:00 a.m.  
Crtrm.: 750

The Hon. John A. Kronstadt

Trial Date: TBD

17  
18 AND RELATED CASES  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Case No. 2:14-cv-02454-JAK (JEMx)

JOINT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND PREHEARING STATEMENT

LINER<sup>LLP</sup>  
1100 Glendon Avenue | 14th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90024.3518

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>1</b>		<b><u>Page</u></b>
<b>2</b>	I. CONSTRUCTION OF TERMS UPON WHICH PARTIES AGREE .....	1
<b>3</b>	II. PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF EACH DISPUTED CLAIM	
<b>4</b>	TERM AND IDENTIFICATION OF SUPPORTING EVIDENCE .....	3
<b>5</b>	A. '927 Patent .....	3
<b>6</b>	B. '375 Patent .....	11
<b>7</b>	C. '486 Patent .....	18
<b>8</b>	D. '601 Patent .....	20
<b>9</b>	E. '007 Patent .....	30
<b>10</b>	F. '374 Patent .....	39
<b>11</b>	G. '775 Patent .....	42
<b>12</b>	III. IDENTIFICATION OF MOST SIGNIFICANT TERMS .....	46
<b>13</b>	A. Signal's Statement.....	46
<b>14</b>	B. Defendants' Statement .....	46
<b>15</b>	IV. ANTICIPATED LENGTH OF TIME NECESSARY FOR THE	
<b>16</b>	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION HEARING .....	48
<b>17</b>	A. Signal's Statement.....	48
<b>18</b>	B. Defendants' Statement .....	48
<b>19</b>	V. DESCRIPTION OF EXPERT WITNESS PROPOSED TESTIMONY .....	48
<b>20</b>	A. Signal's Statement.....	48
<b>21</b>	B. Defendants' Statement (not including VWGoA and Bentley) .....	48
<b>22</b>	C. VWGoA and Bentley Statement.....	49
<b>23</b>		
<b>24</b>		
<b>25</b>		
<b>26</b>		
<b>27</b>		
<b>28</b>		

**LINER**<sup>L.P.</sup>  
1100 Glendon Avenue | 14th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90024-3518

1 Pursuant to Standing Patent Rule (“S.P.R.”) 3.4 and the Court’s Minute Order  
 2 of September 15, 2014 (Dkt. 38 in Case No. 2:14-cv-02454) (“Minute Order”)  
 3 Plaintiff Signal IP, Inc. (“Signal”) and Defendants American Honda Motor Co. and  
 4 Honda of America Mfg., Inc. (collectively “Honda”), Nissan North America, Inc.  
 5 (“Nissan”), Mitsubishi Motors North America, Inc. (“Mitsubishi”), Mazda Motor of  
 6 America, Inc. (“Mazda”), Subaru of America, Inc. (“Subaru”), Kia Motors America,  
 7 Inc. (“KMA”), BMW of North America, LLC (“BMWNA”), Volvo Cars of North  
 8 America, LLC (“Volvo”), Mercedes-Benz USA LLC (“MBUSA”), Volkswagen  
 9 Group of America (“VWGoA”) and Bentley Motors, Inc. (“Bentley”), Jaguar Land  
 10 Rover North America, LLC (“JLRNA”), and Porsche Cars North America, Inc.  
 11 (“PCNA”) (collectively, “Defendants”) hereby submit their Joint Claim  
 12 Construction and Prehearing Statement for U.S. Pat. Nos. 5,714,927 (“the ‘927  
 13 Patent”), 5,732,375 (“the ‘375 Patent”), 6,434,486 (“the ‘486 Patent”), 6,775,601  
 14 (“the ‘601 Patent”), 6,012,007 (“the ‘007 Patent”), 5,463,374 (“the ‘374 Patent”),  
 15 and 5,954,775 (“the ‘775 Patent”) (Collectively “Patents-in-Suit” or “Asserted  
 16 Patents”).

17 **I. CONSTRUCTION OF TERMS UPON WHICH PARTIES AGREE<sup>1</sup>**

18 The below chart reflects the constructions agreed to between Signal and the  
 19 Defendants accused of infringing the patents and claims noted in the first column of  
 20 the chart. Defendants take no position on (and do not agree to any construction for)  
 21 claims that are not asserted in their particular cases.  
 22

23 \_\_\_\_\_  
 24 <sup>1</sup> Defendants VWGoA and Bentley take no position on the constructions offered in  
 25 this Section I. VWGoA and Bentley contend only that certain terms in the asserted  
 26 patents are indefinite, as set forth in Section II below. VWGoA and Bentley further  
 27 contend that the other terms in the patents asserted against them require no  
 28 construction other than “plain and ordinary meaning.” Rather than repeat the phrase  
 “plain and ordinary meaning” in each section below, VWGoA and Bentley simply  
 note their position here. VWGoA and Bentley reserve the right to contend that any  
 specific construction proposed below by any party is incorrect.

1	<b>Terms (&amp; Claims)</b>	<b>Agreed Construction</b>
2	“blind spot”	<b>An area on a side or on a side and to the rear</b>
3	(‘927 Patent, Claim 1)	<b>of the host vehicle not visible to the driver</b>
4		<b>through the mirrors</b>
5	“relative vehicle speed”	<b>Speed in relation to another vehicle.</b>
6	(‘927 Patent, Claim 1)	
7	“alert signal”	<b>A signal for alerting the driver</b>
8	(‘927 Patent, Claim 1)	
9	“detecting target vehicle	<b>Detecting that the target vehicle is present at</b>
10	presence and producing an alert	<b>least partially in the blind spot and producing</b>
11	command”	<b>an alert command</b>
12	(‘927 Patent, Claim 1)	
13	“total threshold force”	<b>A minimum force that allows airbag</b>
14	(‘375 Patent, Claim 1)	<b>deployment based on the total force sensed by</b>
15		<b>the entire sensor array</b>
16	“providing an alarm”	<b>Providing a warning for the driver</b>
17	(‘486 Patent, Claims 21 & 28)	
18	“traction motor”	<b>An electric motor used to propel a vehicle<sup>2</sup></b>
19	(‘601 Patent, Claims 8, 10-11,	
20	15, 17)	
21	“force”	<b>Pressure that is indicative of weight</b>
22	(‘375 Patent, claim 1)	
23	“vehicle torque demand”	<b>Torque requested by the driver</b>
24	(‘601 Patent, claim 8)	
25	“means for storing	<b><u>Function:</u></b>
26	identification codes from the	

27 <sup>2</sup> BMWNA agrees to the construction of “traction motor,” but takes no position on  
 28 the constructions of the terms agreed upon by Signal and the other defendants.

**LINER**<sup>LUP</sup>  
 1100 Glendon Avenue | 14th Floor  
 Los Angeles, CA 90024-3518

1	<b>Terms (&amp; Claims)</b>	<b>Agreed Construction</b>
2	transmitted sign up messages	<b>“storing identification codes from the transmitted sign-up messages for comparison with subsequently transmitted data messages to differentiate data transmitted from various tire locations”</b>  <u>Structure:</u>  <b>the processor 24 and its associated non-volatile memory.</b>
3	for comparison with	
4	subsequently transmitted data messages to differentiate data transmitted from various tire locations”	
5		
6	(‘374 Patent, Claim 3)	
7		
8		
9	“yaw rate sensor”	<b>Sensor that measures a vehicle’s deviation from a straight course</b>
10	(‘486 Patent, Claims 27, 34)	

**II. PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF EACH DISPUTED CLAIM TERM AND IDENTIFICATION OF SUPPORTING EVIDENCE**

**A. ‘927 Patent**

The ‘927 Patent is asserted in these actions against defendants Honda, KMA, Mazda, Nissan, Volvo, JLRNA, MBUSA, BMWNA, VWGoA, and PCNA.

	Terms & Claims	Plaintiff’s Position	Defendants’ Position
18	1. “In a radar system wherein a host vehicle uses radar to detect a target vehicle in a blind spot of the host vehicle driver, a method of improving the perceived zone of coverage response of automotive radar comprising the steps of”	Signal is of the view that this term does not require a construction by the Court, and should be given its plain and ordinary meaning. However, if the Court determines that a construction is necessary, Signal proposes the following:	<u>KMA, Mazda, Nissan, Volvo, JLRNA, MBUSA, PCNA, BMWNA</u> : The preamble is limiting.
19			<u>Honda</u> : Preamble does not limit claim to radar.
20			Field of the Invention; Abstract; Figs. 3d, 4, cols. 2:28-32; 2:62-65; 3:52 – 4:21; 4:35:44; claim 1.
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26		<b>The preamble is limiting.</b>	
27		<u>Evidence</u> : ‘927 Patent, Abstract; Figs. 1 and 3-7;	
28			

# 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.