

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

CRS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

Patent of FRONTLINE TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case CBM2012-00005  
Patent 6,675,151C1

---

**PETITIONER CRS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGIES, INC.'S REPLY  
TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.220**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION .....1

II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....2

    A. “Website” .....2

    B. “One or More Computers” .....3

    C. “Receiving,” “Generating,” “Posting,” and “Providing” .....4

    D. “Information” .....4

III. THE ASSERTED CLAIMS COVER PATENT-INELIGIBLE SUBJECT MATTER .....4

    A. *CLS Bank* Did Not Change the Law of Patent Eligibility under 35 U.S.C. § 101 .....4

    B. Method Claims 3, 16, 24, and 33 Only Recite an Abstract Idea.....5

    C. System Claims 6 and 7 Only Recite an Abstract Idea .....7

    D. Frontline’s Attempts to Distinguish *Bancorp* Are Unavailing .....11

    E. The PTO Has Consistently Found Claims such as Those at Issue Ineligible for Patent Protection .....12

    F. The Claims Are Not Patent-Eligible Even Considering Them in Their Entirety as Frontline Urges.....13

IV. ADDITIONAL FACTS BEARING ON THE JURISDICTIONAL RECORD .....14

V. CONCLUSION.....15

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>FEDERAL CASES</b>	
<i>Bancorp Services, LLC v. Sun Life Assur. Co. of Canada (US)</i> , 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	11
<i>In re Bilski</i> , 545 F.3d 943 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (en banc) .....	6
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 130 S. Ct. 3218 (2010).....	11, 14
<i>Ex Parte Caccavale</i> , No. 2009-006026, 2010 WL 2901727 (B.P.A.I. July 23, 2010) .....	12
<i>CLS Bank International v. Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd.</i> , Appeal No. 2011-1301 (Fed. Cir. May 10, 2013) .....	4-5
<i>Diamond v. Diehr</i> , 450 U.S. 175 (1981).....	11
<i>Ex Parte Edelson</i> , No. 2011-004285, 2012 WL 417467 (B.P.A.I. Feb. 7, 2012).....	12
<i>Fuzzysharp Technologies Inc. v. 3dLabs Inc.</i> , 447 F. Appx. 182 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 4, 2011) .....	10
<i>Ex Parte Guetta</i> , No. 2008-4366, 2009 WL 2563524 (B.P.A.I. Aug. 10, 2009) .....	12
<i>Ex Parte Kelkar</i> , No. 2009-004635, 2010 WL 3768175 (B.P.A.I. Sept. 24, 2010).....	12
<i>In re Nuijten</i> , 500 F.3d 1346, 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	7
<i>Ex Parte Ramanujam</i> , No. 2009-002483, 2010 WL 3214559 (B.P.A.I. Aug. 12, 2010).....	10, 13
<i>Ex Parte Russo</i> , No. 2009-001876, 2010 WL 3441058 (B.P.A.I. Aug. 30, 2010) .....	13

*Ex Parte Starkey*,  
No. 2010-007809, 2011 WL 4434501 (B.P.A.I. Sept. 20, 2011).....12

*Ex Parte Venkata*,  
No. 2009-007302, 2010 WL 3934573 .....13

*Ex Parte Webb*,  
No. 2010-008274, 2012 WL 417450 (B.P.A.I. Feb. 7, 2012).....13

**FEDERAL STATUTES**

35 U.S.C. § 101 .....passim

## I. INTRODUCTION

Frontline concedes that “[a] claim that does nothing more than recite an abstract idea and then state that the idea should be implemented on a computer is not patent-eligible; it is akin to simply taking a law of nature and saying ‘apply it.’” Frontline Response at 24. Frontline, however, never explains why its claims do more than recite an abstract idea—automated substitute fulfillment—implemented on a computer.

Frontline relies heavily on the declaration of its expert, Edward Yourdon (Frontline Ex. 2003), but Mr. Yourdon never reviewed the Board’s decision instituting this proceeding and he disclaimed any intention to address the scope of any claim. CRS Ex. 1013 at 4-5, 43-44. The thrust of his testimony was that computers, web sites, and databases had to be “intentionally programmed,” but he conceded that the elements recited in the claims were not “specially” programmed or formatted in the sense of requiring anything out of the ordinary or even requiring any particular types of computers, web sites, or databases programmed or formatted in any particular way. CRS Ex. 1013 at 8-14, 19-20, 23-27, 33-42.

The ‘151 patent neither claims nor discloses anything other than a generic system and method for automated substitute fulfillment. This is not eligible for patent protection.

# 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.