

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor: Robert John McMillan et al.	§	Attorney Docket No.:
United States Patent No.: 6,064,970	§	LMIC-018-802
Formerly Application No.: 09/135,034	§	Customer No. 28120
Issue Date: May 16, 2000	§	
Filing Date: Aug. 17, 1998	§	Requester: Liberty Mutual
Former Group Art Unit: 2761	§	Insurance Company
Former Examiner: Edward R. Cosimano	§	

For: Motor Vehicle Monitoring System for Determining a Cost of Insurance

MAIL STOP PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Post Office Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

**PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT REVIEW OF
UNITED STATES PATENT NO. 6,064,970 PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 321,
37 C.F.R. § 42.304**

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 321 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.304, the undersigned, on behalf of and acting in a representative capacity for petitioner, Liberty Mutual Insurance Company (“Petitioner” and real party in interest), hereby petitions for review under the transitional program for covered business method patents of claims 1 and 3-18 (all claims) of U.S. Pat. No. 6,064,970 (“the ‘970 Patent”), issued to Progressive Casualty Insurance Company (“Progressive”). A reexamination certificate (6,064,970 C1) issued on January 10, 2012. Petitioner hereby asserts that it is more likely than not that at least one of the challenged claims is unpatentable and respectfully requests institution of a covered business method review of the ‘970 Patent for judgment against Claims 1 and 3-18 (all claims) as unpatentable under § 103, with prior art

rejections based on the Bouchard, Pettersen, Herrod, New York Guide, and Florida Guide references cited herein.¹

¹ As discussed in Section III, *infra*, Petitioner has simultaneously filed a Petition seeking a covered business method review of the '970 Patent requesting judgment against these claims based on different prior art references. Petitioner notes that the Director, pursuant to Rule 325(c), may determine at the proper time that merger of these proceedings may be appropriate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	PETITIONER HAS STANDING.....	3
A.	The ‘970 Patent Is a Covered Business Method Patent.....	3
B.	Petitioner Is a Real Party In Interest Sued for Infringement	5
III.	OVERVIEW OF SPECIFIC GROUNDS FOR WHICH IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS (1 AND 3- 18) ‘970 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE.....	5
IV.	Background Information For the ‘970 Patent	6
A.	Overview of the ‘970 Patent	6
B.	The ‘970 Patent Prosecution History	7
C.	The ‘970 Patent Reexamination File History.....	10
V.	DETAILED EXPLANATION OF REASONS FOR RELIEF REQUESTED SHOWING IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT AT LEAST ONE OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS IS UNPATENTABLE.....	17
A.	The Challenged Claims Are Invalid Under § 103	18
1.	Claim Construction	19
2.	The Challenged Claims (1 and 3-18) Are Rendered Obvious Under § 103 by Combinations of the Bouchard, Pettersen, Herrod, New York Guide, and Florida Guide References.....	22
(a)	Overview of Bouchard	22
(b)	Overview of Pettersen.....	24
(c)	Overview of Florida Guide	26
(d)	Overview of New York Guide	27
(e)	Overview of Herrod.....	29
(f)	Overview of Dorweiler.....	30
(g)	Overview of Camhi	30
(h)	Motivations to Combine.....	31
(i)Bouchard with Pettersen.....	31
(ii)	...Bouchard, Pettersen, and New York Guide.....	32

(iii)	.Bouchard, Pettersen, and Herrod	32
(iv)	..Bouchard, Pettersen, and Florida Guide	33
(v)	...Bouchard, Pettersen, and Dorweiler	33
(vi)	..Bouchard, Pettersen, and Camhi.....	34
3.	Independent Claim 1	34
(a)	Claim 1 is Rendered Obvious Under § 103 by Bouchard in View of Pettersen.....	34
(b)	Claim 1 is Rendered Obvious Under § 103 by Bouchard in View of Pettersen and New York Guide	38
(c)	Claim 1 is Rendered Obvious Under § 103 by Bouchard in View of Pettersen and Herrod.....	38
4.	Dependent Claim 3 is Rendered Obvious by: (1) Bouchard and Pettersen; (2) Bouchard, Pettersen, and New York Guide; or (3) Bouchard, Pettersen, and Herrod.....	39
5.	Independent Claim 4.....	41
(a)	Claim 4 is Rendered Obvious by Bouchard in View of Pettersen	41
(b)	Claim 4 is Rendered Obvious by Bouchard in View of Pettersen and Florida Guide	43
(c)	Claim 4 is Rendered Obvious by Bouchard in View of Pettersen and New York Guide	44
6.	Independent Claim 5.....	45
(a)	Claim 5 is Rendered Obvious by Bouchard in View of Pettersen	45
(b)	Claim 5 is Rendered Obvious by Bouchard in View of Pettersen and Florida Guide	50
(c)	Claim 5 is Rendered Obvious by Bouchard in View of Pettersen and New York Guide	50
7.	Independent Claim 6	50
(a)	Claim 6 is Rendered Obvious by Bouchard in View of Pettersen	50

(b)	Claim 6 is Rendered Obvious by Bouchard in View of Pettersen and New York Guide	55
(c)	Claim 6 is Rendered Obvious by Bouchard in View of Pettersen and Herrod.....	56
8.	Dependent Claim 7 is Rendered Obvious by: (1) Bouchard and Pettersen; (2) Bouchard, Pettersen, and New York Guide; or (3) Bouchard, Pettersen, and Herrod.....	56
9.	Dependent Claim 8 is Rendered Obvious by: (1) Bouchard and Pettersen; (2) Bouchard, Pettersen, and New York Guide; or (3) Bouchard, Pettersen, and Herrod.....	58
10.	Dependent Claim 9	61
(a)	Claim 9 is Rendered Obvious by: (1) Bouchard in View of Pettersen and Dorweiler; (2) Bouchard in View of Pettersen, New York Guide, and Dorweiler; or (3) Bouchard in View of Pettersen, Herrod, and Dorweiler	61
(b)	Claim 9 is Rendered Obvious by: (1) Bouchard in View of Pettersen and Camhi; (2) Bouchard in View of Pettersen, New York Guide, and Camhi; or (3) Bouchard in View of Pettersen, Herrod, and Camhi.....	62
11.	Dependent Claim 10 is Rendered Obvious by: (1) Bouchard and Pettersen; (2) Bouchard, Pettersen, and New York Guide; or (3) Bouchard, Pettersen, and Herrod	63
12.	Dependent Claim 11 is Rendered Obvious by: (1) Bouchard and Pettersen; (2) Bouchard, Pettersen, and New York Guide; or (3) Bouchard, Pettersen, and Herrod	64
13.	Dependent Claim 12	65
(a)	Claim 12 is Rendered Obvious by: (1) Bouchard in View of Pettersen; (2) Bouchard in View of Pettersen and New York Guide; or (3) Bouchard in View of Pettersen and Herrod.....	65
(b)	Claim 12 is Rendered Obvious by: (1) Bouchard in View of Pettersen and Dorweiler; (2) Bouchard in View of Pettersen, New York Guide, and	

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.