

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PNC BANK, N.A., JP MORGAN CHASE & CO.
AND JP MORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A.
Petitioner

v.

MAXIM INTEGRATED PRODUCTS, INC.
Patent Owner

Case CBM2014-00040
Patent 6,105,013

**PATENT OWNER MAXIM INTEGRATED PRODUCTS, INC.'S
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS
METHOD PATENT REVIEW OF UNITED STATES PATENT NO.
6,105,013 PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 321, 37 C.F.R. § 42.304**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(a)(1) AND AMERICA INVENTS ACT § 18(a)(1), INSTITUTION OF REVIEW IS BARRED BY PNC’S PRIOR CIVIL ACTION.	3
A. PNC Previously “Filed A Civil Action Challenging The Validity Of A Claim Of The Patent.”	4
B. For Purposes Of 35 U.S.C. § 325(a)(1), A CBM Patent Review Is A “Post-Grant Review.”	8
1. <i>The Plain Meaning Of AIA § 18(a)(1) Requires CBM Patent Reviews To Employ The Standards And Procedures Of Post-Grant Reviews.....</i>	<i>10</i>
2. <i>Legislative History Confirms That CBM Patent Review Functions Like Post- Grant Review.</i>	<i>14</i>
3. <i>The Office Has Consistently Interpreted Post-Grant Review Procedures To Apply To CBM Patent Review.</i>	<i>17</i>
C. Regulations Cannot Narrow The § 325(a)(1) Bar.	20
D. The Inclusion Of The JP Morgan Entities As “Petitioner” In Addition To PNC Does Not Change The Applicability Of The 35 U.S.C. § 325(a)(1) Statutory Bar.	25
1. <i>PNC’s Prior Action Satisfies § 325(a)(1)’s Requirement That “The Petitioner” Have Filed A Prior Action Challenging The Patent.</i>	<i>26</i>
2. <i>PNC’s Status As “Real Party In Interest” Is An Independently Sufficient Reason For PNC’s Prior Action To Raise The § 325(a)(1) Bar Against All Entities Forming Petitioner.</i>	<i>29</i>
III. REVIEW IS BARRED BECAUSE PETITIONER FAILED TO SHOW THE PATENT IS A “COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT.” .35	
A. The Claimed Subject Matter Of The Patent As A Whole Includes Novel And Nonobvious Technological Features.	38
B. The Claimed Subject Matter Of The Patent Solves A Technical Problem Using A Technical Solution.	47

IV. IF INSTITUTION OF REVIEW WERE NOT BARRED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325 AND AIA § 18, THE PETITION WOULD STILL FAIL TO SATISFY THE 35 U.S.C. § 324 THRESHOLD.	51
A. The Petition Makes No Showing Of Ineligible Subject Matter.....	53
1. <i>The Claims Do Not Merely Recite An Abstract Idea</i>	54
2. <i>Recent Case Law Confirms Petitioner’s Failure Of Proof</i>	57
B. Petitioner Fails To Set Forth A <i>Prima Facie</i> Case Of Anticipation Or Obviousness.....	60
V. CONCLUSION	61

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
COURT DECISIONS	
<i>Andrus v. Glover Construction Co.</i> , 446 U.S. 608 (1980).....	12, 13
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 130 S. Ct. 3218 (2010).....	54, 56
<i>Conte v. Justice</i> , 996 F.2d 1398, 1402 (2d Cir. 1993)	34
<i>Cook v. Principi</i> , 318 F.3d 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	10, 13, 14
<i>Diamond v. Diehr</i> , 450 U.S. 175 (1981).....	54, 60
<i>Fireman’s Fund Ins. Co. v. England</i> , 313 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	16
<i>Ford Motor Co. v. United States</i> , 715 F.3d 906 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	19
<i>Gottschalk v. Benson</i> , 409 U.S. 63 (1972).....	59
<i>Hillman v. Marietta</i> , 569 U.S. ___, 133 S. Ct. 1943 (2013).....	13
<i>In re Lueders</i> , 111 F.3d 1569 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	11
<i>K Mart Corp. v. Cartier</i> , 486 U.S. 281 (1988).....	24

Law v. Siegel,
571 U.S. ____, ____, S. Ct. ____, 2014 U.S. LEXIS 1784 (Mar. 4, 2014).... 11, 13

Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.,
132 S. Ct. 1289 (2012) 54, 56

Milam v. Director, Office of Worker’s Comp. Progs.,
874 F.2d 223 (4th Cir. 1989)..... 14

Mills Music, Inc. v. Snyder,
469 U.S. 153 (1985) 9

TRW Inc. v. Andrews,
534 U.S. 19 (2001) 12

Ultramercial, Inc. v. Hulu, LLC,
722 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2013), *pet. for cert. filed sub nom, Wild Tangent, Inc. v. Ultramercial, LLC*, No. 13-255 (Aug. 23, 2013) 55, 57, 59

Versata Dev. Gp. v. Rea,
2013 WL 4014649 (E.D. Va. Aug. 7, 2013), *appeal filed*, No. 14-1145 (Fed. Cir. Dec. 2, 2013)..... 18

Watts v. Swiss Bank Corp.,
27 N.Y.2d 270, 278 (1970) 34

ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS

Agilsys, Inc. et al. v. Ameranth, Inc.,
Case No. CBM 2014-00014 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 11, 2014)
(per Lee, APJ.) 27, 28

Apple, Inc. v. SightSound Tech., LLC,
Case No. CBM2013-00019, paper No. 17 (P.T.A.B. Oc. 8, 2013) (per Arbes, APJ)..... 45, 54, 56, 57

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.