

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AGILYSYS, INC., ET AL.
Petitioners

v.

AMERANTH, INC.
Patent Owner

Case CBM2014-00015
Patent No. 6,384,850

MAIL STOP PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Post Office Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Submitted Electronically via the Patent Review Processing System

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED.....	1
II. BACKGROUND	5
III. PETITIONERS LACK STANDING BECAUSE THE ‘850 PATENT IS NOT A COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT UNDER THE AIA	7
A. The ‘850 Patent Does Not Claim A Financial Product or Service	7
1. Legislative History Of AIA And Intent Of CBM Review.....	8
2. The ‘850 Claims Are Not Directed To Financial Services.....	9
B. The ‘850 Patent Is Directed To A Technological Invention Which Is Novel And Unobvious Over The Prior Art And Is Directed To A Technical Solution To A Technical Problem	11
1. The Technological Nature Of The ‘850 Patent	11
2. Many Others Have Found Ameranth’s Claimed Inventions To Be Novel and Innovative.....	16
3. The Petition Grossly Misstates The Actual Claims.....	21
4. The Petition Fails To Provide Any Credible Basis For Its Contention That The Claims Do Not Define A Technological Feature That Is Novel And Unobvious Over The Prior Art	23
5. The Petition Also Failed To Consider The Claims As A Whole As Required By The AIA And The PTAB Rules.....	28
6. The ‘850 Patent Claims Technological Inventions Directed To Technical Solutions To Technical Problems	31
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	33
V. THE PETITION DID NOT ESTABLISH THAT ANY CLAIM IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT INVALID.....	43

A. Petitioners Have Not Established That The Claims Of The ‘850 Patent Are Invalid On The Asserted Ground Based On 35 U.S.C. §112.....43

 1. The Claims Do Not Mix Apparatus And Method Elements43

 2. Petitioners’ Other Section 112 Arguments Fail.....50

B. Petitioners Have Not Established That The Claims Of The ‘850 Patent Are Invalid on the Asserted Ground Based on 35 U.S.C. §101.....59

 1. The Petition Grossly Mischaracterized The Actual Claimed Subject Matter.....61

 2. The ‘850 Patent Claims Fall Squarely Within The Federal Circuit’s And Supreme Court’s Bounds Of Patent Eligible Subject Matter65

 3. 35 U.S.C. §101 Is Not A Condition For Patentability And Thus Cannot Form A Ground For CBM Review75

VI. CONCLUSION.....76

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Cases</u>	
<i>Alstom Power Inc. v. Hazelmere Res. Ltd.</i> Reexam. No. 95/001,368 (Dec, 17, 2013)	59
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elec. Co.</i> 877 F.Supp.2d 838 (N.D. Cal. 2012)	47, 48
<i>Apple v. SightSound</i> CBM2013-00019, Paper No. 17, Non-Institution Decision at 7.....	35, 67
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	50
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> 130 S. Ct. 3218 (2010).....	59, 60, 63, 68, 73, 74
<i>Bilstad v. Wakalopulos</i> 386 F.3d 1116 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	59
<i>Biosig Inst. v. Nautilus, Inc.</i> 715 F.3d 891 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	48
<i>CLS Bank Intl v. Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd.</i> 717 F.3d 1269 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	60, 75, 76
<i>Crown Pkg. Tech., Inc. v. Ball Container Corp.</i> 635 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	55, 56
<i>Diamond v. Chakrabarty</i> 447 U.S. 303 (1980).....	60
<i>Diamond v. Diehr</i> 450 U.S. 175 (1981).....	63, 67
<i>Eltech Sys. Corp. v. PPG Indus., Inc.</i> 903 F.2d 805 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....	39

<i>Exxon Research & Eng'g Co. v. United States</i> 265 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	52
<i>Fonar Corp. v. General Elec. Co.</i> 107 F.3d 1543 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	64
<i>Gottschalk v. Benson</i> 409 U.S. 63 (1972).....	73
<i>Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.</i> 802 F.2d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	34
<i>In re American Acad. of Sci. Tech Ctr.</i> 367 F.3d 1359, 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	34
<i>In re Bilski</i> 545 F.3d 943 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	74
<i>In re De Blauwe,</i> 736 F.2d 699 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....	36
<i>In re Koller</i> 613 F.2d 819 (CCPA 1980)	50
<i>In re Pearson</i> 494 F.2d 1399 (CCPA 1974)	36
<i>In re Roufett</i> 149 F.1350 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	12
<i>In re Skvorecz</i> 580 F.3d 1262 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	35
<i>Kara Tech. Inc. v. Stamps.com Inc.</i> 2008 WL 8089236 * 21 (C.D. Cal. April 3, 2008).....	48
<i>Kilopass Tech v. Sidense Corp.</i> No. 2013-1193 (Fed. Cir. Dec. 26, 2013).....	34, 39
<i>Mayo Coll. Svcs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.</i> 132 S. Ct. 1289 (2012).....	60

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.