

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

GROUPON, INC.  
Petitioner

v.

MAXIM INTEGRATED PRODUCTS, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case CBM2014-00090  
Patent 5,805,702

---

**PATENT OWNER MAXIM INTEGRATED PRODUCTS, INC.'S  
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS  
METHOD PATENT REVIEW OF UNITED STATES PATENT NO.  
5,805,702 PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 321, 37 C.F.R. § 42.304**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. THE '702 PATENT.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION. ....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>IV. REVIEW IS BARRED BECAUSE PETITIONER FAILED TO SHOW THAT THE PATENT IS A “COVERED BUSINESS METHOD” PATENT. ....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>V. THE PETITION AND ITS PURPORTED EXPERT TESTIMONY DISREGARD ESTABLISHED AND PROPER LEVELS OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART. ....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>VI. PETITIONER FAILS TO MEET ITS STATUTORY BURDEN TO SHOW THAT IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT JONES ANTICIPATES THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS. ....</b>	<b>17</b>
A. Petitioner Provides No Explanation Of How Its Collection Of Quotations From Jones Anticipates The Challenged Claims. ....	17
B. The Petition Fails To Show That Jones Anticipates The Challenged Claims. ....	20
1. <i>The Petition Fails To Show That Jones Discloses “Communicating A Random Number From Said Module To Said Electronic Device.”</i> ....	20
2. <i>Petitioner Fails To Show That Jones Discloses “Combining Said Random Number And Said Amount Requested Thereby Creating A Said Data Packet In Said Electronic Device.”</i> ....	22
3. <i>Petitioner Fails To Show That Jones Discloses “Decrypting Said Signed Certificate In Said Module With A Second Key Thereby Creating A Decrypted Random Number And A Decrypted Amount Requested.”</i> .....	23
<b>VII. THE PETITION FAILS TO MEET ITS STATUTORY BURDEN TO SHOW THAT IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT JONES IN VIEW OF ISHIGURO RENDERS THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OBVIOUS. ....</b>	<b>27</b>
A. The Petition Offers No Explanation How Jones And Ishiguro Should Be Combined To Render The Challenged Claims Obvious. ....	27
B. The Deficiencies And Contradictory Approaches Of The Petition Render The Second Requested Ground Of Review Redundant. ....	30

C.	The Petition Fails To Explain How Its Collected Quotations From Jones And Ishiguro Render The Challenged Claims Obvious. ....	32
D.	The Petition Identifies No Reason Why A Person Of Ordinary Skill In The Art Would Be Motivated And Able To Combine Jones And Ishiguro. ....	35
E.	The Petition Fails To Make Any Showing That Jones In Combination With Ishiguro Renders The Challenged Claims Obvious. ....	42
1.	<i>The Petition Fails To Show That Ishiguro Discloses “Indicating An Amount Requested To Said Electronic Device.”</i> .....	43
2.	<i>The Petition Fails To Show That Ishiguro Discloses “Communicating A Random Number From Said Module To Said Electronic Device.”</i> .....	48
3.	<i>The Petition Fails To Show That Ishiguro Discloses “Combining Said Random Number And Said Amount Requested Thereby Creating A First Data Packet In Said Electronic Device.”</i> .....	49
4.	<i>The Petition Fails To Show That Ishiguro Discloses “Encrypting Said First Data Packet With A First Key Thereby Creating A Said Signed Certificate In Said Electronic Device.”</i> .....	50
5.	<i>The Petition Fails To Show That Ishiguro Discloses “Communicating Said Signed Certificate From Said Electronic Device To Said Module.”</i> .....	51
6.	<i>The Petition Fails To Show That Ishiguro Discloses “Decrypting Said Signed Certificate In Said Module With A Second Key Thereby Creating A Decrypted Random Number And A Decrypted Amount Requested.”</i> .....	51
7.	<i>The Petition Fails To Show That Ishiguro Discloses “Comparing Said Random Number With Said Decrypted Random Number And Determining If They Match In Said Module.”</i> .....	52
8.	<i>The Petition Fails To Show That Ishiguro Discloses “Adding Said Decrypted Amount Requested To A Money Register In Said Module.”</i> .....	53

**VIII. THE PETITION FAILS TO MEET ITS STATUTORY BURDEN TO SHOW THAT IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT HERRING IN VIEW OF RIVEST RENDERS THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OBVIOUS. ....54**

A.	The Board Should Exercise Its Discretion To Deny This Requested Ground Because Herring Was Previously Considered By The Office And The Petition Fails To Rebut The Examiner’s Findings. ....	54
B.	The Petition Fails To Meet The Statutory Burden For Initiation Because It Fails To Explain How Herring And Rivest Should Be Combined To Allegedly Render The	

Challenged Claims Obvious, And Takes Only The Position That Herring Alone Discloses Each And Every Limitation. ....	60
C. The Petition Fails To Meet Its Statutory Burden Because It Fails To Explain How Its Collection Of Quotations From Herring And Rivest Allegedly Renders The Challenged Claims Obvious. ....	62
D. The Petition Fails To Meet Its Statutory Burden Because It Fails To Identify Any Reasons Why A Person Of Ordinary Skill In The Art Would Be Motivated And Able To Combine Herring And Rivest. ....	63
E. The Petition Fails To Show That Herring In Combination With Rivest Renders The Challenged Claims Obvious. ....	66
1. <i>The Petition Fails To Show That Either Herring or Rivest Discloses “Indicating An Amount Requested To Said Electronic Device.”</i> .....	66
2. <i>The Petition Fails To Show That Either Herring Or Rivest Discloses “Communicating A Random Number From Said Module To Said Electronic Device.”</i> .....	68
3. <i>The Petition Fails To Show That Either Herring Or Rivest Discloses “Combining Said Random Number And Said Amount Requested Thereby Creating A First Data Packet In Said Electronic Device.”</i> .....	71
4. <i>The Petition Fails To Show That Either Herring Or Rivest Discloses “Encrypting Said First Data Packet With A First Key Thereby Creating A Signed Certificate In Said Electronic Device.”</i> .....	72
5. <i>The Petition Fails To Show That Either Herring Or Rivest Discloses “Decrypting Said Signed Certificate In Said Module With A Second Key Thereby Creating A Decrypted Amount Requested.”</i> .....	73
6. <i>The Petition Fails To Show That Either Herring Or Rivest Discloses “Comparing Said Random Number With Said Decrypted Random Number And Determining If They Match In Said Module.”</i> .....	74
7. <i>The Petition Fails To Show That Either Herring Or Rivest Discloses “Adding Said Decrypted Amount Requested To A Money Register In Said Module.”</i> .....	75
<b>IX. REVIEW ALSO SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED ON CHALLENGED DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2, 6 AND 8. ....</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>X. CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>76</b>

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page(s)</b>
 <b>COURT DECISIONS</b>	
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Comm'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	40
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	59
<i>Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	39
<i>Innovention Toys, LLC v. MGA Ent., Inc.</i> , 637 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	14
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	41
 <b>AGENCY DECISIONS</b>	
<i>Bloomberg Inc., et al. v. Markets-Alert PTY Ltd</i> , CBM2013-00005, Paper 18 (PTAB Mar. 29, 2013) (per Medley, S.).....	28, 57
<i>Heart Failure Technologies, LLC v. Cardiokinetix, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-000183, Paper 12 (PTAB Jul. 31, 2013) (per Kamholz, S.) .....	18, 32, 35, 38, 61-63
<i>Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.</i> , CBM2012-00003, Paper 7 (PTAB Oct. 25, 2012) (9-judge panel) (per Lee, J.).....	27, 29, 30-31, 59-60
<i>Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.</i> , CBM 2012-00004, Paper 10 (PTAB Jan. 25, 2013) (per Chang, J.).....	16, 58

# 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.