

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

U.S. BANCORP
Petitioner

v.

RETIREMENT CAPITAL ACCESS MANAGEMENT COMPANY LLC
Patent Owner

Case CBM2013-00014
Patent No. 6,625,582

PETITIONER U.S. BANCORP'S OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.64

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), Petitioner U.S. Bancorp hereby submits the following objections to Exhibits 2015 and 2016 attached to Patent Owner Retirement Capital Access Management Company LLC's ("Patent Owner" or "RCAMC") Response. *See* CBM2013-00014, Paper 19 (and exhibits thereto).

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.62, U.S. Bancorp's objections below apply the Federal Rules of Evidence ("F.R.E.").

I. Objections to Exhibit 2015 and Any Reference to or Reliance Thereon

U.S. Bancorp hereby objects to Exhibit 2015, an excerpt from U.S. Bancorp's First Supplemental Responses to Plaintiff Benefit Funding Systems LLC's First Set of Interrogatories provided in the parallel district court litigation between U.S. Bancorp and RCAMC (C.A. No. 12-803-LPS (D. Del.)). The excerpt submitted as Exhibit 2015 contains U.S. Bancorp's interrogatory responses providing U.S. Bancorp's contentions regarding why the accused Checking Account Advance ("CAA") service does not infringe the asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,625,582 ("the '582 patent").

As explained in more detail below, the grounds for objection are as follows: F.R.E. 402 (Relevance, *i.e.*, "[i]rrelevant evidence is not admissible"), and F.R.E. 403 (Excluding Relevant Evidence for Prejudice, Confusion, Waste of Time, or Other Reasons, *i.e.*, "[t]he court may exclude relevant evidence if its probative

value is substantially outweighed by a danger of one or more of the following:
unfair prejudice, confusing the issues. . .”).

U.S. Bancorp’s non-infringement contentions included in Exhibit 2015 are not relevant to the Board’s Section 101 analysis of the ‘582 patent because “patent infringement and invalidity are separate and distinct issues.” *Commil USA, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.*, 720 F.3d 1361, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2013). RCAMC argues that because U.S. Bancorp has identified particular claim limitations that the accused product does not practice, U.S. Bancorp is somehow precluded from simultaneously asserting that the claims are invalid under Section 101. *See* Paper 19 (“Resp.”), at 26-29. However, that argument fails for two reasons.

First, the differing claim construction standards used by the PTO and district courts further confirm that U.S. Bancorp’s non-infringement contentions are irrelevant to the invalidity analysis. *See* MPEP § 2111.01 (“The USPTO uses a different standard for construing claims than that used by district courts; during examination the USPTO must give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification.”). U.S. Bancorp’s non-infringement contentions were provided in part under the district court’s narrower claim construction standard, and are therefore not relevant to the Board’s analysis, which employs the broader claim construction standard.

Second, the non-infringement contentions are submitted under the legal fallacy that if a patent is not infringed it cannot be invalid at the same time. The fact that the accused CAA service is not practicing each element of the abstract idea claimed by the '582 patent does not mean that the '582 patent is not directed to an abstract idea. For this reason, preliminary contentions submitted by U.S. Bancorp regarding non-infringement have no relevance to invalidity under Section 101.

RCAMC's conflation of infringement and invalidity is an apparent attempt to confuse the sole issue before the Board -- patent eligibility under Section 101 -- and to lob inflammatory accusations at U.S. Bancorp rather than address issues. *See, e.g.*, Response at 28. For these additional reasons, Exhibit 2015 should also be excluded on the basis that reference to, or reliance on, this exhibit is confusing and unduly prejudicial to U.S. Bancorp.

II. Objections to Exhibit 2016 and Any Reference to or Reliance Thereon

U.S. Bancorp hereby objects to Exhibit 2016, which purports to be an April 23, 2013 article by Jessica Silver-Greenberg entitled, "Regulators to Restrict Big Banks' Payday Lending" ("Greenberg Article").

Grounds for objection: F.R.E. 402 (Relevance), F.R.E. 403 (Excluding Relevant Evidence for Prejudice, Confusion, Waste of Time, or Other Reasons), F.R.E. 801, 802 (Impermissible Hearsay), and F.R.E. 901 (Authentication).

A. Exhibit 2016 is Irrelevant

The Greenberg Article is completely irrelevant to the Section 101 issue before the Board, and is a blatant attempt to create prejudice against U.S. Bancorp. In addition to arguing that U.S. Bancorp's non-infringement contentions preclude its Section 101 invalidity challenge, RCAMC further argues that the non-infringing service is not merely hypothetical, but an actual service offered by U.S. Bancorp "that is so important to U.S. Bancorp that it is willing to risk subjecting itself to a 'crack down' on 'big bank' payday loans by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation." Response at 28. RCAMC cites the Greenberg Article to substantiate its claim that these federal agencies are "cracking down" on U.S. Bancorp.

As discussed above, U.S. Bancorp's non-infringement arguments are irrelevant to whether the challenged claims are patent-eligible under Section 101. Moreover, even if the commercial availability of the non-infringing service was relevant, the service's relative importance to U.S. Bancorp and any investigation of the service by federal regulators is plainly irrelevant to the Section 101 analysis.

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.