

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 6,675,151

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Background.....	4
	A. Frontline’s 151 Patent	5
	B. Prior Litigation For Patent Infringement.....	7
	C. Pending District Court Action.....	8
III.	Statement of the Relief Requested.....	9
IV.	Statement of Reasons Why No Post-Grant Review Should Be Instituted Under 35 U.S.C. § 324	10
	A. The Petition Fails to Demonstrate that the 151 Patent Is A Covered Business Method Patent Under Section 18 of The AIA.....	10
	B. 35 U.S.C. § 101 Does Not Fall Within the Available Grounds for Challenging Patentability	17
	C. The Petition Fails To Demonstrate That It Is More Likely Than Not That Claims 3, 6, 7, 16, 24, and 32 Are Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 101	28
	1. Claim 3 Is Not Directed To An Abstract Idea	30
	2. Petitioner’s Analysis is Deficient	38
	3. Claim 3 Does Not Preempt Use of an Abstract Idea	39
	4. Claim 6 is Likewise Not Directed to an Abstract Idea	41
	5. Dependent claims 7, 16, 24, and 33 Are Not Directed to an Abstract Idea	43
	D. The Petition Fails To Demonstrate That It Is More Likely Than Not That Claims 3, 6, 7, 16, 24, and 33 Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph As Lacking Written Description Support in the Specification as Originally Filed.....	43
	1. Claims 3, 6, 7, 16, 24, and 33 Have Written Description Support in the 133 Patent.....	46

2.	Claims 3, 6, 7, 16, 24, and 33 Have Written Description Support in the 151 Patent.....	58
V.	Conclusion.....	59

Table of Authorities

CASES

<i>American Sterilizer Co. v. Sybron Corp.</i> , 614 F.2d 890 (3d Cir. 1980)	16
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	44, 45
<i>Aristocrat Techs. Austl. Pty Ltd. v. Int’l Game Tech.</i> , 543 F.3d 657 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	26, 27
<i>Bancorp Servs., L.L.C. v. Sun Life Assur. Co. of Canada</i> , 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	30, 36, 37, 39
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 130 S. Ct. 3218 (2010).....	29
<i>Blonder-Tongue Lab. v. Univ. of Ill. Found.</i> , 402 U.S. 313 (1971).....	25
<i>Brotherhood of R.R. Trainmen v. Baltimore & Ohio R.R. Co.</i> , 331 U.S. 519 (1947).....	20
<i>Classen Immunotherapies, Inc. v. Biogen IDEC</i> , 659 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	22
<i>CLS Bank International v. Alice Corp.</i> , 685 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	36
<i>Cohens v. Virginia</i> , 19 U.S. 264 (1821).....	26
<i>Crown Packaging Tech., Inc. v. Ball Metal Beverage Container Corp.</i> , 635 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	44, 45, 49
<i>Diamond v. Chakrabarty</i> , 447 U.S. 303 (1980)	28, 29
<i>Diamond v. Deihl</i> , 450 U.S. 175 (1981).....	20, 21, 38

<i>Fuzzysharp Techs., Inc. v. 3DLabs Inc., Ltd.</i> , 447 Fed. Appx. 182 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	29
<i>Garcia v. United States</i> , 469 U.S. 70 (1984).....	27
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	24, 25, 26, 27
<i>In re Bergy</i> , 596 F.2d 952 (C.C.P.A. 1979), <i>vacated as moot</i> , 444 U.S. 1028 (1980).....	21, 22, 23, 24
<i>In re Wright</i> , 866 F.2d 422 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	45, 48, 55
<i>Kewanee Oil Co. v. Bicron Corp.</i> , 416 U.S. 470 (1974).....	25
<i>Koito Mfg., Ltd. v. Turn-Ke-Tech, LLC</i> , 381 F.3d 1142 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	45, 46
<i>Lampi Corp. v. American Power Prod. Inc.</i> , 228 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	45, 48, 55
<i>Mayo Collab. Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.</i> , 132 S. Ct. 1289 (2012).....	25
<i>MySpace, Inc. v. Graphon Corp.</i> , 672 F.3d 1250 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	21, 22
<i>Pennsylvania Dept. of Corrections v. Yeskey</i> , 524 U.S. 206 (1998).....	19
<i>Research Corp. Techs., Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 627 F.3d 859 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	29, 30, 34, 35
<i>Russello v. United States</i> , 464 U.S. 16 (1983).....	20
<i>SiRF Tech., Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 601 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	28, 30, 31, 32, 34, 37, 39

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.