

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

In re *Post-Grant Review* of:)
)
U.S. Patent No. 6,675,151) U.S. Class: 705/9
)
Issued: Jan. 6, 2004) Group Art Unit: 3623
)
Inventors: Michael S. BLACKSTONE) Proceeding No. CBM2012-00005
Roland R. THOMPSON)
)
Application No.: 09/419,266)
)
Filed: Oct. 15, 1999)
) FILED ELECTRONICALLY
For: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR) PER 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(b)(1)
PERFORMING SUBSTITUTE)
FULFILLMENT INFORMATION)
COMPILATION AND)
NOTIFICATION)

Mail Stop Patent Board (37 C.F.R. § 42.6(b)(2)(ii))
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S.P.T.O.
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

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

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 321, section 18 of the Leahy–Smith America
Invents Act (“AIA”), and 37 C.F.R. § 4.300 (2012), the undersigned hereby
requests post-grant review of claims 3, 6, 7, 16, 24, and 33 of U.S. Patent No.
6,675,151 (“the ‘151 patent,” attached as Exhibit 1001), which issued to Roland
R. THOMPSON and Michael S. BLACKSTONE on Jan. 6, 2004, as reissued by

Ex Parte Reexamination Certificate No. 7116 (attached as Exhibit 1002) on Oct. 20, 2009 (amending claims 3, 6, and 9, and adding new claims 14–55).

An electronic payment for \$35,800 for the post-grant review petition is included. There are fewer than 21 claims, no additional fees are necessary. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.15.¹

¹ The fee may change, as the PTO has proposed. *See* Patent Fees Proposed Rule, 77 Fed. Reg. 55,028 (Sept. 6, 2012) (suggesting a \$30,000 fee, \$18,000 of which the USPTO will return \$18,000 if it does not institute a review). Petitioner respectfully requests the fees be returned in the case of a rule change.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	GROUND FOR STANDING.....	5
A.	At Least One Challenged Claim Is Unpatentable (37 C.F.R. § 42.208(c))	5
B.	Claims 3, 6, 7, 16, 24, and 33 Are a Covered Business Method	6
C.	Claims 3, 6, 7, 16, 24, and 33 Are Not a “Technological Invention” (37 C.F.R. § 42.301(b) (2012))	10
D.	Petitioner Has Been Sued for Infringement of the ‘151 Patent (AIA § 18(a)(1)(B) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.302)	12
E.	Real Party-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)).....	13
F.	Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	13
G.	Lead and Back-Up Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)).....	13
H.	Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4))	14
III.	STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED FOR EACH CLAIM CHALLENGED	15
A.	Claims Challenged	15
B.	Statutory Grounds of Challenge.....	15
C.	Claim Construction	17
1.	Broadest Reasonable Interpretation	17
2.	Plain Language of Claims, Specification, Prosecution History.....	19
IV.	CLAIMS 3, 6, 7, 16, 24, AND 33 OF THE ‘151 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE.....	20
A.	Claims 3, 6, 7, 16, 24, and 33 are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 101	20

1.	Standard of Review	20
2.	Claims 3, 6, 7, 16, 24, and 33 Fail the Test for Patentable Subject Matter and are Thus Invalid	20
a.	The ‘151 Patent Claims Do Not Claim Any “Specific” Machine and thus Fail the Machine-or-Transformation Test	24
i.	“One or More Computers”	26
ii.	“A Website”	27
iii.	“Communication link” (or “Internet communication link”).....	28
b.	The ‘151 Patent Preempts the Use of an Abstract Idea Across Disciplines	29
c.	Claim 6 Embodies Claim 3 and Is Thus Likewise Invalid	31
d.	All Dependent Claims Are Invalid	32
B.	Claims 3, 6, 7, 16, 24, and 33 Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as Lacking Written Description Support in the Specification as Originally Filed.....	33
1.	The Claims 3, 6, 7, 16, 24, and 33 of the ‘151 Patent Are Not Supported by the Specification of the ‘133 Patent	35
2.	The Challenged Claims of the ‘151 Patent Are Not Supported by the Specification of the ‘151 Patent	48
C.	The Invalidity of Claims 3, 6, 7, 16, 24, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103 Is Not Challenged Here	53
1.	Prior Art Applicable under AIA § 18	53
2.	Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 Is Not Challenged Here	53
3.	Obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 Is Not Challenged Here	53

..

V. CONCLUSION.....53

...

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.