

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

In re *Post-Grant Review* of: )  
)  
U.S. Patent No. 6,553,350 ) U.S. Class: 705/20  
)  
Issued: April 22, 2003 ) Group Art Unit: 3628  
)  
Inventor: Thomas J. CARTER ) Confirmation No. 5578  
)  
Application No. 09/253,427 ) Petition filed: September 16, 2012  
)  
Filed: February 19, 1999 )  
) FILED ELECTRONICALLY  
For: METHOD AND APPARATUS ) PER 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(b)(1)  
FOR PRICING PRODUCTS IN )  
MULTI-LEVEL PRODUCT AND )  
ORGANIZATIONAL GROUPS )

**Mail Stop Patent Board**

Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S.P.T.O.  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**PETITION FOR POST-GRANT REVIEW UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 321 AND  
§ 18 OF THE LEAHY-SMITH AMERICA INVENTS ACT**

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 321 and § 18 of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (“AIA”) and pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.300 *et seq.*, the undersigned hereby requests post-grant review of claims 17 and 26-29 of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,350 (“the ’350 patent,” attached as Petition Exhibit 1001), which issued to Thomas J. CARTER on April 22, 2003.

Petition for Post-Grant Review  
of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,350

An electronic payment in the amount of \$35,800.00 for the post-grant review fee specified by 37 C.F.R. § 42.15(b)(1) is being paid at the time of filing this petition, charged to deposit account no. 06-0916.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT .....1**

**II. GROUNDS FOR STANDING.....3**

A. At Least One Challenged Claim is Unpatentable .....3

B. Claims 17 and 26-29 are Directed to a Covered Business Method.....4

C. Claims 17 and 26-29 are Not Directed to a “Technological Invention” .....5

D. Petitioner has Been Sued for Infringement of the ’350 Patent and is Not Estopped.....9

**III. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED FOR EACH CLAIM CHALLENGED .....10**

A. Claims for which Review is Requested .....10

B. Statutory Grounds of Challenge.....10

C. Claim Construction .....10

1. Broadest Reasonable Interpretation .....10

2. Support for Petitioner’s Broadest Reasonable Interpretation.....12

**IV. CLAIMS 17 and 26-29 OF THE ’350 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE .....16**

A. Claims 17 and 26-29 are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 .....16

1. The ’350 Patent Is Unpatentably Abstract.....17

2. The ’350 Patent Does Not Satisfy The Machine-or-Transformation Test.....20

B. Claims 17 and 26-29 are Invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 112.....21

1.	35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph .....	22
2.	35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph.....	24
C.	Claims 17 and 26-29 are Invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 102 .....	30
1.	The R/3 2.2 SAP System .....	30
2.	Printed Publication.....	33
3.	Known by Others in the United States.....	36
4.	Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102.....	36
<b>V.</b>	<b>APPLICATION OF PRIOR ART TO CLAIMS 17 and 26-29 OF THE '350 PATENT .....</b>	<b>46</b>
A.	R/3 Documentation.....	46
<b>VI.</b>	<b>ANTICIPATION OF DENORMALIZED NUMBERS .....</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>APPLICATION OF THE ADMITTED PRIOR ART UNDER THE PATENT OWNER'S CONSTRUCTION.....</b>	<b>61</b>
	<b>CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>62</b>

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>FEDERAL CASES</b>	
<i>3M v. Chemque, Inc.</i> , 303 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	36
<i>Ariad Pharms, Inc. v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc) .....	21
<i>Bancorp Services v. Sun Life</i> , 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	19
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 130 S. Ct. 3218 (2010) .....	16
<i>CA, Inc. v. Simple.com, Inc.</i> , 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 27092 (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 17, 2009) .....	33
<i>Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc.</i> , 848 F.2d 1560 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....	36
<i>CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions</i> , 654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	17
<i>Datamize LLC v. Plumtree Software, Inc.</i> , 417 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	22
<i>Energizer Holdings, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 435 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	22
<i>Ex Parte ePlus, Inc.</i> , Decision on Appeal in Reexamination Control No. 90/008,104 14-18 (B.P.A.I. May 18, 2011) .....	34
<i>Fort Properties v. American Master Lease</i> , 671 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	20
<i>Gottschalk v. Benson</i> , 409 U.S. 63 (1972) .....	17
<i>In re Grams</i> , 888 F.2d 835 (Fed. Cir. 1989) .....	17
<i>In re Klopfenstein</i> , 380 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	34
<i>In re Lister</i> , 583 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	34
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	11

# 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.