

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

**LIBERTY MUTUAL INSURANCE CO.**  
**Petitioner**

**v.**

**PROGRESSIVE CASUALTY INSURANCE CO.**  
**Patent Owner**

---

**Case CBM2012-00002**  
**Patent 6,064,970**

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**  
**PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.207**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Background Information/Claim Construction.....	9
III.	The Petition Relies on Art that is Not New and Missing Key Limitations, Thereby Failing to Satisfy the Elevated Threshold Standard Requiring a Showing that it is More Likely Than Not that the Challenged Claim will be Found Invalid.....	10
A.	Contrary to the Express Intent of 35 U.S.C. § 325(d), the Cited References are the Same or Substantially the Same as the References in the Reexamination.....	11
B.	Claim 1 is Not Rendered Obvious by Kosaka in View of Black Magic and Herrod (Alleged Ground 1-1).....	16
1.	Kosaka and Herrod Cannot be Combined in View of Fundamental Differences in Their Disclosures .....	17
2.	The Combination of Kosaka and Herrod Does Not Disclose the Claimed Invention.....	22
C.	Claim 1 is Not Rendered Obvious by Kosaka in View of Black Magic and New York Guide (Alleged Ground 1-2) .....	31
D.	Claim 4 is Not Anticipated by Kosaka (Alleged Ground 4-1).....	33
E.	Claim 4 is Not Rendered Obvious by Kosaka in View of Florida Guide (Alleged Ground 4-2).....	38
F.	Claim 4 is Not Rendered Obvious by Kosaka in View of New York Guide (Alleged Ground 4-3).....	40
G.	Claim 5 is Not Anticipated by Kosaka (Alleged Ground 5-1).....	42
H.	Claim 5 is Not Rendered Obvious by Kosaka in View of Florida Guide (Alleged Ground 5-2) or Rendered Obvious by Kosaka in View of New York Guide (Alleged Ground 5-3) .....	43
I.	Claims 6 and 18 are Not Rendered Obvious by Kosaka in View of Herrod (Alleged Grounds 6-1, 18-1) .....	43
J.	Claims 6 and 18 are Not Rendered Obvious by Kosaka in View of the New York Guide (Alleged Grounds 6-2, 18-2) .....	48

:

K.	The Dependent Claims are Allowable at Least for the Reasons Noted Above.....	50
IV.	The ‘970 Patent is a Patent for a Technological Invention and is Ineligible for Covered Business Method Review.....	50
A.	A Comparison of the Claimed Subject Matter of the ‘970 Patent to the Examples from the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide Demonstrates that the ‘970 Patent is a Patent for a Technological Invention that is Not Subject to Covered Business Method Review .....	52
B.	The Claimed Subject Matter of the ‘970 Patent as a Whole Recites a Technological Feature that is Novel and Unobvious Over the Prior Art.....	56
C.	The Claimed Subject Matter as a Whole Solves a Technical Problem Using a Technical Solution.....	64
D.	The ‘970 Patent is Not Subject to Covered Business Method Review .....	68
V.	Conclusion .....	68

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Cybersource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	53
<i>Ex parte Acharya</i> , App. No. 2010-3919 (BPAI June 19, 2012) .....	18, 20, 21
<i>Ex parte Hirsch</i> , App. No. 1999-1037 (BPAI Mar. 17, 2000).....	30
<i>Ex parte Krivokapic</i> , App. No. 1998-2649 (BPAI July 18, 2001).....	29
<i>Ex parte Levy</i> , 17 U.S.P.Q.2d 1461 (BPAI 1990) .....	23, 35, 47
<i>Ex parte Oetiker</i> , 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1651 (BPAI 1992) .....	29
<i>Ex parte Taguchi</i> , App. No. 2000-0768 (BPAI Dec. 17, 2001).....	28, 29
<i>In re Kotzab</i> , 217 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	3
<i>In re Robertson</i> , 169 F.3d 743 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	25, 35
<i>In re Rouffet</i> , 149 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....	3
<i>Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.</i> , 810 F.2d 1561 (Fed. Cir. 1987) .....	3
<b>STATUTES</b>	
35 U.S.C. § 103 .....	28, 29, 30

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(continued)

Page

35 U.S.C. § 325(d) .....passim

Leahy-Smith America Invents Act, Section 18 ..... 1, 8, 50

### RULES

37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c).....9

37 C.F.R. § 42.207 ..... 1

37 C.F.R. § 42.301 .....50, 51, 55

37 C.F.R. § 42.304(a).....51

### OTHER AUTHORITIES

157 Cong. Rec. S1042 (daily ed. Mar. 1, 2011) (statement of Sen. Kyl)..... 12

Changes to Implement Transitional Program for Covered Business Method

Patents,

77 Fed. Reg. 48702 (Aug. 14, 2012) ..... 16

77 Fed. Reg. 48709 (Aug. 14, 2012) ..... 51

*Fuzzy Thinking Has Merits When It Comes to Elevators*, New York, Sept.  
22, 1993..... 18

Office Patent Trial Practice Guide,

77 Fed. Reg. 48764 (Aug. 14, 2012) .....52, 58

*The Telematics Advantage: Growth, Retention and Transformational  
Improvement with Usage-Based Insurance*, Cognizant 20-20 Insights,  
January 2012 .....4

Transitional Program for Covered Business Method Patents,

77 Fed. Reg. 48734 (Aug. 14, 2012) ..... 8, 50

U.S. Patent No. 5,465,079..... 15, 25

*Usage-Based Insurance Next Wave for Personal Auto*, PropertyCasualty360,  
July 14, 2011 .....5

# 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.