

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

Inventor: Marc Vianello	)	Issue Date: September 9, 2008
	)	
Case No.: Unassigned	)	Filing: March 19, 2002
	)	
Patent No. 7,424,438	)	Group Art Unit: 705/9
	)	
Application No. 10/101,644	)	Confirmation Number:
	)	
For: APPARATUS AND	)	Filed Electronically Per 37 C.F.R.
METHODS FOR PROVIDING	)	§ 42.6(b)(1)
CAREER AND EMPLOYMENT	)	
SERVICES	)	

---

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

**PETITION FOR POST-GRANT REVIEW OF A COVERED BUSINESS  
METHOD PATENT UNDER § 18 OF THE LEAHY-SMITH AMERICA  
INVENTS ACT AND 35 U.S.C. § 321**

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 321, the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (“AIA”), Pub L. 112-29, § 18, and 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.300-42.304, Indeed, Inc. (“Indeed”) and Monster Worldwide Inc. (“Monster”) (collectively “Petitioner”) hereby petition the United States Patent and Trademark Office Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB”) to institute a Covered Business Method patent review (“CBM review”) of claims 1-25 of U.S. Patent No. 7,424,438 (“the ’438 Patent,” attached as Ex. 1001), which issued to Marc Vianello on September 9, 2008.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT ..... 1**

**II. REQUIRED DISCLOSURES ..... 3**

**A. Real Parties-in-Interest ..... 3**

**B. Related Matters ..... 3**

**C. Lead Counsel and Back-Up Counsel ..... 4**

**D. Service Information ..... 4**

**E. Power of Attorney ..... 4**

**F. A Legible Copy of Every Exhibit in the Exhibit List ..... 4**

**G. The Complete Covered Business Method Petition Fee ..... 4**

**H. Certificate of Service on Patent Owner ..... 5**

**III. GROUNDS FOR STANDING - 37 C.F.R. § 42.304(a) ..... 5**

**A. At Least One Challenged Claim is Unpatentable ..... 5**

**B. All Claims of The '438 Patent Are Directed To A Covered Business Method ..... 5**

**i. Overview of the Claims ..... 7**

**ii. The '438 Patent Claims a Method or Apparatus Used in the Practice, Administration, or Management of a Financial Product or Service ..... 10**

**iii. None of the Claims of the '438 Patent Are Directed To A Technological Invention ..... 14**

**C. Petitioner Have Been Sued for Infringement of the '438 Patent and Are Not Estopped From Challenging the '438 Patent Claims ..... 18**

**D. Eligibility Based on Time of Filing ..... 18**

**IV. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED FOR EACH CLAIM CHALLENGED ..... 19**

**A. Claims for Which Review is Requested ..... 19**

**B. Statutory Grounds of Challenge ..... 19**

..

C.	<b>Claim Construction</b> .....	19
i.	<b>Broadest Reasonable Interpretation</b> .....	19
ii.	<b>Support For The Broadest Reasonable Interpretation</b> .....	21
iii.	<b>Means-Plus-Function Limitations (Claim 9)</b> .....	25
V.	<b>DETAILED EXPLANATION OF REASONS THAT THE CHALLENGED '438 PATENT CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE</b> .....	28
A.	<b>Claims 1-25 Are Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 101</b> .....	28
i.	<b>Independent Method Claim 1 is Directed to an Abstract Idea</b> .....	32
ii.	<b>Independent Method Claims 12 and 17 are Directed to an Abstract Idea</b> .....	37
iii.	<b>Claims 9 and 23 Are Unpatentable for the Same Reasons as Method Claims 1, 12, and 17</b> .....	38
iv.	<b>The Remaining Claims are Unpatentable</b> .....	40
v.	<b>The Claims Do Not Satisfy the Machine-or Transformation Test</b> .....	42
B.	<b>Claims 1-5, 9-10, 12, 17, and 23 are Invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 102</b> .....	44
VI.	<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	64

...

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Accenture Global Servs., GmbH v. Guidewire Software, Inc.</i> , 728 F.3d 1336, 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	passim
<i>Ass’n for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc.</i> , 133 S. Ct. 2107, 2116 (2013) .....	29
<i>Bancorp Servs., L.L.C. v. Sun Life Assurance Co.</i> , 687 F.3d 1266, 1280 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	30, 43, 44
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 130 S. Ct. 3218, 3231 (2010) .....	passim
<i>CLS Bank Int’l v. Alice Corp.</i> , 717 F.3d 1269 at 1287 (Fed. Cir. 2013), <i>cert. granted</i> , 82 U.S.L.W. 3131 (U.S. Dec. 6, 2013) (No. 13-95) .....	35, 39
<i>CRS Advanced Tech., Inc. v. Frontline Tech., Inc.</i> , CBM2012-00005 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 23, 2013).....	15, 16
<i>CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc.</i> , 654 F. 3d 1366, 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	29, 34, 37, 42
<i>Dealertrack, Inc. v. Huber</i> , 674 F. 3d 1315, 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	30, 34
<i>Dell Inc. v. Disposition Services LLC</i> , CBM2013-00040 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 5, 2014).....	38
<i>Fort Properties, Inc. v. American Master Lease LLC</i> 671 F.3d 1317, 1323–24 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	31, 35
<i>Gottschalk v. Benson</i> , 409 U.S. 63, 68 (1972) .....	29
<i>Interthinx, Inc. v. Corelogic Solutions, LLC</i> , CBM2012-00007 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 31 2013).....	16, 17

<i>In re Donaldson</i> , 16 F.3d 1189 (Fed. Cir. 1994) .....	21
<i>In re Trans Texas Holdings Corp.</i> , 498 F.3d 1290, 1297 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	20
<i>LinkedIn Corp. v. Avmarkets, Inc.</i> , CBM2013-00025 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 12, 2013) .....	14, 35, 37
<i>Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.</i> , 132 S. Ct. 1289, 1293 (2012) .....	1, 29, 30, 41
<i>Metavante Corp. v. Checkfree Corp.</i> , CBM2013-00032 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 23, 2013) .....	36
<i>Parker v. Flook</i> , 437 U.S. 584, 593 (1978) .....	39
<i>SAP America, Inc. v. Versata Development Group, Inc.</i> , CBM2012-00001 (P.T.A.B. June 11, 2013) .....	19
<i>Volusion, Inc. v. Versata Software, Inc.</i> , CBM2013-00017 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 24, 2013) .....	6, 13, 18

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 101 .....	passim
35 U.S.C. § 102 .....	passim
35 U.S.C. § 112 .....	21
35 U.S.C. § 321(a) .....	5
35 U.S.C. § 321(c) .....	18
35 U.S.C. § 324(a) .....	5
35 U.S.C. § 325 .....	18

**Regulations**

37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b) .....	4
37 C.F.R. § 42.205(a) .....	5
37 C.F.R. § 42.300(a) .....	5
37 C.F.R. § 42.300(b) .....	20

# 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.