

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

EBAY INC. AND GSI COMMERCE SOLUTIONS, INC.
Petitioner

v.

LANDMARK TECHNOLOGIES LLC
Patent Owner

Case CBM2014-00026
U.S. Patent No. 5,576,951

LANDMARK'S PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Table of Contents

Table of Authorities	iv
I. The Board should not institute covered business methods review of the 5,576,951 Patent.	1
II. Overview of the '951 Patent.....	6
III. The Petitioners lack standing to petition for CBM review.....	9
A. The Petition provided no evidence that GSI is obligated to indemnify iRobot.....	9
B. Landmark's letter requesting a dialog with eBay did not create declaratory judgment standing.....	14
C. Proper consideration of the state-of-the-art in the early 1980s shows that the '951 Patent falls into the technological invention exception.	15
IV. The Petition failed to show that the applied references qualify as prior art.	19
A. The effective filing date of the claims is May 24, 1984, and Mr. Lockwood's § 131 evidence and declaration establish a date of invention as early as the Summer of 1982.	20
1. The Petition ignored the evidence Mr. Lockwood provided during original prosecution that established benefit to May 24, 1984.	20
2. The Petition ignored Mr. Lockwood's § 131 evidence and declaration that establish a date of invention as early as the Summer of 1982.	23
B. The Reed and Johnson references have been antedated.	24
C. Even if Reed qualified under §102(e), it is not eligible under the CBM rules.	24
D. The Petition did not establish that Shortliffe, Johnson, Gordon, and EMYCIN are prior art references.....	26
V. The Petition failed to present proper claim construction as statutorily required.....	31
A. The Petition failed to properly define a person having ordinary skill at the time of the invention (POSA).	32

B. The Petition incorrectly construed the claims under BRI even though the '951 Patent expired two weeks after the Petition was filed.....38

C. The Petition did not provide any evidence of how a POSA would have understood the claim terms, resulting in an unsupported and improper claim construction.....39

D. The Petition failed to perform the required two-step analysis to construe means-plus-function elements and to consider the '951 Patent's algorithms to construe computer-implemented functions, resulting in an improper claim construction.40

VI. The claims of the '951 Patent satisfy the definiteness requirement and are nonobvious..... 44

A. The Petition failed to meet the minimal showing required to institute trial of the challenged claims for indefiniteness under the “more likely than not” standard.45

1. The '951 Patent provides a POSA extensive support for “means for interrelating said textual and graphical information,” which is not “insolubly ambiguous.” 46

2. The '951 Patent provided a POSA extensive support for “indicating means for indicating a pathway that accesses information related in one of said entry path means to information accessible in another one of said entry path means,” which is not “insolubly ambiguous.” 49

B. The Petition failed to provide the threshold showing that the claims are “more likely than not” obvious.....51

1. The Petition failed to provide a showing that it satisfied the four *Graham* factors. 52

(a) The Petition failed to consider the scope of the claims before applying the alleged prior art, failing to satisfy the first and second *Graham* factors. 53

(b) The Petition failed to define a POSA, failing to satisfy the third *Graham* factor..... 54

(c) The Petition failed to consider the objective indicia of nonobviousness, failing to satisfy the fourth *Graham* factor..... 54

- (d) The Petition failed to provide a showing that the references are obvious to combine, resulting in a fatally flawed obviousness analysis under *Graham*. 56
- 2. The Petition failed to provide a showing that it satisfied the analysis outlined in *KSR*. 59
 - (a) The Petition failed to provide a showing that the references are analogous..... 60
 - (b) The Petition failed to provide a showing that the disparate and non-analogous references would be combined absent impermissible hindsight. 63
 - (c) The Petition failed to provide a showing that the disparate and non-analogous references would be combined without changing the principle of operation of at least one reference. 64
- 3. The Petition’s five rationales for combining the references are fatally flawed. 65
- VII. The additional shortcomings of the Petition should provide no incentive for the Board to cure such deficiencies..... 67
 - A. The Petition failed to provide adequate notice to the Board how certain claims are unpatentable as required by 37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(4).68
 - B. The Petition failed to identify all related matters, including matters Petitioners themselves filed violating 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)......69
- VIII. Conclusion and Relief Requested..... 71

Table of Authorities

Cases

<i>ABB Inc. v. Cooper Indus., LLC.</i> , 635 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	12
<i>AllVoice Computing PLC v. Nuance Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 504 F.3d 1236 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	passim
<i>Already v. Nike</i> , 133 S.Ct. 721 (2013).....	14
<i>Arris Group, Inc. v. British Telecommunications</i> , 639 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	11, 12, 13
<i>Arrowhead Indus. Water, Inc. v. Ecolochem, Inc.</i> , 846 F.2d 731 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	12
<i>ATD Corp. v. Lydall, Inc.</i> , 159 F.3d 534 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	63
<i>Biosig Instruments, Inc. v. Nautilus Inc.</i> , 715 F.3d 891 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	45
<i>Boyden Power-Brake Co. v. Westinghouse</i> , 170 U.S. 537 (1898).....	6, 17
<i>CNET Networks, Inc. v. Etilize, Inc.</i> , 584 F.Supp.2d 1260 (N.D. Cal. 2008).....	30
<i>Cooper Cameron Corp. v. Kvaerner Oilfield Prods.</i> , 291 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	28
<i>Custom Accessories, Inc. v. Jeffery-Allan Industries, Inc.</i> , 807 F.2d 955 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	34
<i>DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	64
<i>Enzo Biochem. Inc. v. Applera Corp.</i> , 599 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	53
<i>Finisar Crop. v. DirecTV Grp.</i> , 523 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	41, 42
<i>Function Media v. Google</i> , 708 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	45
<i>Golight, Inc. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> , 355 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	40
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	32, 37, 52, 62
<i>Honeywell Int'l. Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 341 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	53
<i>In re Aoyama</i> , 656 F.3d 1293, 1296-97 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	40, 41, 42

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.