### IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

In re CBM Review of:	)
U.S. Patent 7,908,304	) U.S. Class: 707/945; 235/376; 705/7
Issued: March 15, 2011	) Group Art Unit: 3687
Inventor: David Chao et al.	) Confirmation No. 6193
Application No. 09/810,514	) Petition filed: August 30, 2013
Filed: March 15, 2001  For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR	) ) FILED ELECTRONICALLY ) PER 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(B)(1)
MANAGING DISTRIBUTOR INFORMATION	) ) )
Mail Stop Patent Board	)
Patent Trial and Appeal Board	
U.S.P.T.O.	
P.O. Box 1450	
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	

# PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT REVIEW UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 321 AND §18 OF THE LEAHY-SMITH AMERICA INVENTS ACT

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 321 and § 18 of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act ("AIA") and pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.300 *et seq.*, the undersigned hereby requests covered business method ("CBM") patent review of claims 1, 12-25, 30-



32, and 42-43 of U.S. Patent 7,908,304 ("the '304 Patent," attached as Petition Exhibit 1001), which issued to David Chao et al. on March 15, 2011.

An electronic payment in the amount of \$32,750.00 for the covered business method review fee specified by 37 C.F.R. § 42.15(b)(1) is being paid at the time of filing this petition, charged to deposit account No. 041073.



### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	Page No.
I.	PRELIMINARY STATEMENT
II.	GROUNDS FOR STANDING
	A Petitioner has Been Sued for Infringement of the '304 Patent and is Not Estopped
	B At Least One Challenged Claim is Unpatentable4
	C The '304 Patent is a CBM Patent4
	1 Claims 1, 12-25, 30-32, and 42-43 are Directed to Financial Products or Services
	2 Claims 1, 12-25, 30-32, and 42-43 are Not Directed to a "Technological Invention"
III.	STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED FOR EACH CLAIM CHALLENGED
	A Claims for which Review is Requested
	B Statutory Grounds of Challenge
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION
	A Broadest Reasonable Interpretation
	B Support for Petitioner's Broadest Reasonable Interpretation19
	1 "Module" / "Modules"
	2 "To Generate a Selling Agreement" / "To Define and Create A Selling Agreement"
	<b>3.</b> "Engine"
	4 "Backhone" 22



	5 "Interface"
V.	CLAIMS 1, 12-25, 30-32, AND 42-43 OF THE '304 PATENT ARE DIRECTED TO NON-PATENTABLE SUBJECT MATTER25
	A Inventions Covering Abstract Ideas are Not Eligible for Patent Protection, Regardless of their Form
	B Claim 12 of the '304 Patent is Directed to an Abstract Idea27
	<ol> <li>No More than General Purpose Computer Hardware and Programming are Used to Implement the Validating a Distributor to Begin Selling Products of Claim 1231</li> </ol>
	2 Validating a Distributor to Begin Selling Products Can be Accomplished by Hand
	3 Claim 12 Fails the Machine-or-Transformation Test
	C Claim 1 of the '304 Patent is Directed to an Abstract Idea41
	<ol> <li>No More than General Purpose Computer Hardware and Programming are Used to Determine Compensation for a Validated Distributor of Claim 1</li></ol>
	2 Determining Compensation for a Validated Distributor Can be Accomplished by Hand
	3 Claim 1 Fails the Machine-or-Transformation Test
	D Claim 32 of the '304 Patent is Directed to an Abstract Idea52
	<ol> <li>No More than General Purpose Computer Hardware and Programming are Used to Implement the Determining Compensation for a Validated Distributor of Claim 3256</li> </ol>
	2 Determining Compensation for Validated Distributors Can be Accomplished by Hand
	3 Claim 32 Fails the Machine-or-Transformation Test 50



	E Dependent Claims 13-25, 30-31, and 42-43 Fail to Tie Down the Abstract Idea of Independent Claim 12.	.59
	1 Because Dependent Claims 18, 23-25, 30, and 43 Add Only Rudimentary Data Manipulations to the Abstract Idea of Claim 12, They are Not Patent Eligible	.59
	2 Dependent Claims 13-15 and 20 Add Nothing More Than Basic Computer Functions to the Abstract Idea of Claim 12	.62
	3 Dependent Claims 16, 17, 21, and 22 Add Only Insignificant Post-Solution Activity to the Abstract Idea of Claim 12	.63
	4 Dependent Claims 19, 31 and 42 Are Likewise Unpatentable Because They Fail to Add Any Meaningful Specificity to the Abstract Idea of Claim 12	.65
VI	CONCLUSION	67



# DOCKET

## 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.

