IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

| In re Post-Grant Review of: | |
|---|---|
| U.S. Patent No. 6,105,013 | U.S. Class: 705/65 |
| Issued: August 15, 2000 | |
| Inventors: Stephen M. Curry et al. | |
| Application No. 09/041,190) | |
| Filed: March 10, 1998) | EILED ELECTRONICALIA |
| For: METHOD, APPARATUS, SYSTEM) AND FIRMWARE FOR SECURE) TRANSACTIONS) | FILED ELECTRONICALLY PER 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(b)(1) |

Mail Stop Patent Board

Patent Trial and Appeal Board U.S.P.T.O. P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

<u>PETITION FOR POST-GRANT REVIEW UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 321 AND</u> § 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.*, PNC Bank, N.A., JP Morgan Chase & Co., and JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A. (collectively, "Petitioner") hereby request post-grant review of claims 1-6, 8-12, 14, and 15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,105,013 ("the '013 patent," Exhibit 1001), now purportedly assigned to Maxim Integrated Products, Inc. ("Maxim").



An electronic payment in the amount of \$30,000.00 for the post-grant review fee specified by 37 C.F.R. § 42.15(b)(1)—comprising the \$12,000.00 request fee and \$18,000.00 post-institution fee—is being paid at the time of filing this petition. If there are any additional fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge the required fees to our deposit account no. 06-0916.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| I. | PRE | PRELIMINARY STATEMENT | | | | |
|------|--|--|----|--|--|--|
| II. | MAI | MANDATORY NOTICES | | | | |
| | Α. | Real Party-in-Interest | 1 | | | |
| | В. | Related Matters | 1 | | | |
| | C. | Lead and Back-Up Counsel and Service Information | 4 | | | |
| III. | I. GROUNDS FOR STANDING | | | | | |
| | Α. | Background | 4 | | | |
| | | 1. The '013 Patent | 4 | | | |
| | | 2. The Claims of the '013 Patent | 6 | | | |
| | | 3. Prosecution History of the '013 Patent | 7 | | | |
| | В. | At Least One Challenged Claim Is Unpatentable | 9 | | | |
| | C. | The '013 Patent Is a Covered Business Method Patent | 9 | | | |
| | D. | Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14, and 15 Are Not Directed to a "Technological Invention" | 11 | | | |
| | Е. | Petitioner Has Been Sued for Infringement of the '013 Patent and Is Not Estopped | 13 | | | |
| IV. | V. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED FOR EACH CLAIM CHALLENGED | | | | | |
| | Α. | Claims for which Review Is Requested | 14 | | | |
| | В. | Statutory Grounds of Challenge | 14 | | | |
| | C. | Claim Construction | 14 | | | |
| | | Broadest Reasonable Interpretation | 14 | | | |



| | | l-6, 8-12, 14, AND 15 OF THE '013 PATENT ARE NTABLE | ••• |
|----|-------|---|-------|
| Α. | | ns 1-6, 8-12, 14, and 15 Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 for 103 | ••• |
| | 1. | Hawkes anticipates claims 1-3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, and 15 | ••• |
| | 2. | Hawkes renders claims 1-3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, and 15 obvious | ••• |
| | 3. | Hawkes in combination with Cooper renders claims 4 and 10 obvious | ••• |
| | 4. | Hawkes in combination with Hardware Hacker renders claim 5 obvious | ••• |
| | 5. | Chorley anticipates claims 1-3, 6, 9, 11, 12, 14, and 15 | ••• |
| | 6. | Chorley in combination with Hawkes renders claims 1-3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, and 15 obvious | ••• |
| | 7. | Chorley in combination with Cooper or in combination with Hawkes and Cooper renders claims 4 and 10 obvious | · • • |
| | 8. | Chorley in combination with Hardware Hacker or in combination with Hawkes and Hardware Hacker renders claim 5 obvious | ••• |
| | 9. | Blandford anticipates claims 1-4, 6, 9, 10, 12, and 15 | ••• |
| | 10. | Blandford in combination with Hardware Hacker renders claim 5 obvious | ••• |
| В. | Clair | ms 1-6, 8-12, 14, and 15 Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 | ••• |
| | 1. | The '013 Patent Claims are Directed to an Abstract Idea | ••• |
| | 2. | The '013 Patent Claims do not Recite "Significantly More" than the Abstract Idea | ••• |
| CO | NCLU | SION | ••• |



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | Page(s) |
|---|------------|
| FEDERAL CASES | |
| Bilski v. Kappos, 130 S. Ct. 3218 (2010) | 71 |
| CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc., 654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011) | 71 |
| Dystar Textilfarben GMBH & Co. Deutschland KG v. C.H. Patrick Co., 464 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2006) | 35, 55 |
| Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63 (1972) | 72 |
| In re Bilski, 545 F.3d 943 (Fed. Cir. 2008) | 71 |
| KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007) | passim |
| Leapfrog Enterprises, Inc. v. Fisher-Price, Inc., 485 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2007) | 35, 55 |
| Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc., 132 S. Ct. 1289 (2012) | 71, 72, 73 |
| Parker v. Flook, 437 U.S. 584 (1978) | 72 |
| Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc) | 14 |
| FEDERAL STATUTES | |
| 35 U.S.C. § 101 | passim |
| 35 U.S.C. § 102 | passim |
| 35 U.S.C. § 103 | nassim |



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.

