UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

REGIONS FINANCIAL CORPORATION, ADVANCE AMERICA, CASH ADVANCE CENTERS, INC., and CNU ONLINE HOLDINGS, LLC F/K/A CASH AMERICA NET HOLDINGS, LLC Petitioners

v.

RETIREMENT CAPITAL ACCESS MANAGEMENT COMPANY LLC
Patent Owner

Case CBM2014-00012 Patent No. 6,625,582

PETITIONERS' REPLY



TABLE OF CONTENTS

		<u>Page</u>
Table	e of Authorities	ii
I.	Statement of Relief Requested	1
II.	Preliminary Statement	1
III.	Statement Identifying Material Facts in Dispute	3
IV.	The Claim Limitations Identified by RCAMC Do Not Limit the Scope of Claims to Less than the Abstract Idea and Thus are Not Directed To Patentable Subject Matter Under 35 U.S.C. § 101	
	A. Despite RCAMC's Assertions, the Claims are Not Eligible Subject Mar Under Supreme Court Precedent and Recent Guidelines	
	B. The "Without Encumbering" Limitation Does Not Meaningfully I the Claims	
	C. The "Computerized Method" or "Computer" Is Not an Integral Component Of and Does Not Meaningfully Limit The Claims	8
	D. Other Limitations and Purported Admissions	12
V.	RCAMC's Remaining Arguments Are Irrelevant	14
	A. Expert Testimony Is Not Required To Show Claims Are Ineligible	14
	B. The PTAB Has Authority to Grant CBM Review On Section 101	15
VI.	Conclusion	15



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES	Page(s)
Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int'l et al., 134 S.Ct. 2347 (2014)	passim
Bancorp Servs., L.L.C. v. Sun Life Assur. Co. of Can., 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	10, 11, 12, 13
Comark Commc'ns, Inc. v. Harris Corp., 156 F.3d 1182 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	9
CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc., 654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	9, 11
Dealertrack, Inc. v. Huber, 674 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	10
Digitech Image Tech., LLC v. Electronics for Imaging, Inc., 2014 WL 3377201 (Fed. Cir. July 11, 2014)	3
Lee v. Mike's Novelties, Inc., 2013-1049, 2013 WL 6097232 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 21, 2013)	14, 15
Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc., 132 S. Ct. 1289 (2012)	5, 12
Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	9
SiRF Tech., Inc. v. ITC, 601 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	9
SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Apotex Corp., 439 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	4
Ultramercial, Inc. v. Hulu, LLC, 722 F 3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	7 14



STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 101	passim
PTAB DECISIONS	
Apple, Inc. v. Sightsound Technologies, LLC (CBM2013-00019)	11
Fidelity Nat'l Information Svcs, Inc. v. Cashedge, Inc., (CBM2013-00028)	7
SAP America, Inc. v. Versata Development Group, Inc., (CBM2012-00001)	15
PATENTS	
U.S. Patent No. 6,625,582	passim



I. STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED

Petitioners Regions Financial Corporation ("Regions"), Advance America, Cash Advance Centers, Inc. ("AA"), and CNU Online Holdings ("CNU") (collectively, "Petitioners") respectfully request cancellation of asserted claims 1, 13, 14, 18, 30, and 31 of U.S. Patent No. 6,625,582 ("the '582 patent," Ex. 1003) under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for the reasons set forth herein and in their Petition for CBM Review.

II. Preliminary Statement

Petitioners set forth sufficient evidence for the PTAB to find, based on the claims, specification, and file history, that the asserted claims of the '582 patent are not patentable under § 101. Petitioners demonstrated that the claims-at-issue do not include *any* meaningful, concrete limitations that would limit the claims to a specific application of the abstract idea of advancing funds based on the present value of future retirement payments. Rather, the claims merely state that the funds are advanced without violating U.S. law. The claimed inventions can be accomplished without a computer, and even if one were needed, do not require specific computer hardware or software. For these reasons, the Board should find the asserted claims are not patentable under § 101.

RCAMC's arguments contradict the proper analysis set forth under the Supreme Court's recent decision in *Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int'l et al.*, 134 S.Ct. 2347 (2014) and the "Preliminary Examination Instructions in view of the Supreme Court Decision in *Alice Corporation Ply. Ltd. v. CLS Bank International, et al.*,"



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.

