IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor: Hulst et al.§United States Patent No.: 7,334,720§Formerly Application No.: 11/336,758§Issue Date: February 26, 2008§Filing Date: January 19, 2006§Former Group Art Unit: 2876§Former Examiner: Steven S. Paik§

Attorney Docket No.: 104677-5008-804 Customer No. 28120

Petitioner: Apple Inc.

For: Data Storage and Access Systems

MAIL STOP PATENT BOARD Patent Trial and Appeal Board United States Patent and Trademark Office Post Office Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT REVIEW OF UNITED STATES PATENT NO. 7,334,720 PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 321, 37 C.F.R. § 42.304¹

¹ As authorized by the Board on May 19, 2014, and without opposition from Patent Owner, Petitioner hereby submits this replacement copy of the Petition to correct certain typographical errors in the original.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTE	RODUCTION	1
OVE	RVIEW OF FIELD OF THE CLAIMED INVENTION	4
PETI	TIONER HAS STANDING	12
А.	The '720 Patent Is a Covered Business Method Patent	13
В.	Related Matters; Petitioner Is a Real Party In Interest Sued for and Charged With Infringement	21
SHO	WING IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT AT LEAST ONE	l
А.	Claim Construction	23
В.	The Challenged Claims Are Invalid Under §§ 102 and/or 103	28
CON	ICLUSION	79
	OVE PETI A. B. DETA SHO OF T A. B.	 B. Related Matters; Petitioner Is a Real Party In Interest Sued for and Charged With Infringement DETAILED EXPLANATION OF REASONS FOR RELIEF REQUESTER SHOWING IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT AT LEAST ONE OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS IS UNPATENTABLE. A. Claim Construction.

EXHIBIT LIST			
1101	U.S. Patent No. 7,334,720		
1102	Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint		
1103	File History for U.S. Patent No. 8,118,221		
1104	File History for U.S. Patent No. 8,336,772		
1105	U.S. Patent No. 5,675,734		
1106	U.S. Patent No. 4,999,806		
1107	U.S. Patent No. 4,878,245		
1108	U.S. Patent No. 5,754,654		
1109	File History for U.S. Patent No. 7,334,720		
1110	Declaration of Michael P. Duffey In Support of Apple Inc.'s Petition for Covered Business Method Patent Review		
1111	Declaration of Flora D. Elias-Mique In Support of Apple Inc.'s Petition for Covered Business Method Patent Review		
1112	U.S. Patent No. 5,103,392		
1113	U.S. Patent No. 5,530,235		
1114	U.S. Patent No. 5,629,980		
1115	U.S. Patent No. 5,915,019		
1116	European Patent Application, Publication No. EP0809221A2		
1117	PCT Application Publication No. WO 99/43136		
1118	JP Patent Application Publication No. H11-164058 (transla- tion)		
1119	JP Patent Application Publication No. H10-269289 (transla- tion)		

EXHIBIT LIST			
1120	Eberhard von Faber, Robert Hammelrath, and Franz-Peter Heider, "The Secure Distribution of Digital Contents," IEEE (1997)		
1121	Declaration of Anthony J. Wechselberger In Support of Apple Inc.'s Petition for Covered Business Method Patent Review		
1122	U.S. Patent No. 7,942,317		
1123	U.S. Patent No. 8,033,458		
1124	U.S. Patent No. 8,061,598		
1125	U.S. Patent No. 8,118,221		
1126	U.S. Patent No. 8,336,772		
1127	File History for U.S. Patent No. 7,942,317		
1128	File History for U.S. Patent No. 8,033,458		
1129	File History for U.S. Patent No. 8,061,598		

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 321 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.304, the undersigned, on behalf of and acting in a representative capacity for petitioner, Apple Inc. ("Petitioner" and the real party in interest), hereby petitions for review under the transitional program for covered business method patents of claims 1, 3, 11, and 13-15 of U.S. Patent No. 7,334,720 ("the '720 Patent"), issued to Smart-Flash Limited and currently assigned to Smartflash LLC ("Smartflash," also referred to as "Applicant," "Patent Owner," or "Patentee"). Petitioner hereby asserts that it is more likely than not that at least one of the challenged claims is unpatentable for the reasons set forth herein and respectfully requests review of, and judgment against, claims 1, 3, 11, and 13-15 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated and/or § 103 as obvious.² As discussed in Section III.B, *infra*, Petitioner has concurrently filed a Petition seeking covered business method review of the '720 Patent, requesting judgment against these same claims based on different prior art. Petitioner notes that the Director, pursuant to Rule 325(c), may determine at the proper time that merger of these proceedings, or at minimum coordination of proceedings involving the same patent, is appropriate.

The challenged claims of the '720 Patent merely recite steps and corresponding systems well-known in the field of data storage and access, including the use of a

² Petitioner is demonstrating, in pending litigation, that these claims are invalid for numerous additional reasons. All emphasis added unless otherwise noted.

DOCKET A L A R M



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.