UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

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

v.

MAXIM INTEGRATED PRODUCTS, INC.
Patent Owner

Case CBM2014-00179
Patent 5,940,510

PATENT OWNER MAXIM INTEGRATED PRODUCTS, INC.'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT REVIEW OF UNITED STATES PATENT NO. 5,940,510 PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 321, 37 C.F.R. § 42.304

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

II. THIS RE-FILED PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT IS A RE-FILING OF A PETITION BARRED BY 35 U.S.C. § 325(A)(1)...6

A. The Board Held That § 325(a)(1) Bars Initiation. 10

B. The Board's § 325(a)(1) Bar Determination Also Applies To The Re-Filed Petition. 13

C. The Changed Participation Level Of Barred Petitioner Co-Constituent PNC Does Not Change Its Real Party-In-Interest Status. 15

1. PNC Exerted Control Over The First And Re-Filed Petitions. 16

2. PNC Contributed To Both The First And Refiled Petitions. 17

3. Exempting The Second Petition From § 325(a)(1) Would Open The Door To Easy Evasion Of The Statutory Bar. 22

D. Even If The Bar Did Not Still Apply, The Board Should Exercise Its Discretion To Deny This Re-Filed Petition Under § 325(d). 27

E. Even If Initiation Were Appropriate, Petitioner's Bolstering Of This Re-Filed Petition With Waived Arguments Is Not Permitted. 30

III. REVIEW IS BARRED BECAUSE PETITIONER FAILED TO SHOW THE PATENT IS A "COVERED BUSINESS METHOD" PATENT. .31

A. Petitioner Has Taken Advantage Of The Rejection Of The First Petition To Unfairly Try To Bolster Its Standing Arguments. 32

B. Petitioner Fails To Show That The Patent "Claims A Method Or Corresponding Apparatus For Performing Data Processing Or Other Operations Used In The Practice, Administration, Or Management Of A Financial Product Or Service.". 34

1. The Claims Challenged In The First Petition Contain No Financial Product Or Service Limitations. 35

2. The Belated Addition Of Claim 2 Is Improper. 37

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

C. Even If The Patent Claimed A Method Or Apparatus For Performing Data Processing Or Other Operations Used In The Practice, Administration, Or Management Of A Financial Product Or Service, Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That The Patent Is Not A "Patent[] For [A] Technological Invention[]." 39

1. The Claimed Subject Matter Of The Patent As A Whole Recites Novel And Unobvious Technological Features. *42*

a. Counsel Has Told The Court, On Petitioner's Behalf, That The Patent Claimed "New" Hardware. 42

b. Petitioner Ignores The Claims As A Whole. 45

c. The Intrinsic Evidence Confirms That The Patent Claims Novel And Unobvious Features. 46

2. The Claimed Subject Matter Solves A Technical Problem Using A Technical Solution. *52*

3. The Office's Own Official Guidance Shows That The Patent Is For Technological Inventions. *56*

D. The Board Should Not Consider Petitioner's Belated, Improperly Augmented Standing Arguments. 59

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 60

A. The Petition Fails To Show That Review Of Patent-Eligibility Under § 101 Should Be Granted. 62

1. The Petition Makes No Showing Of Ineligible Subject Matter. *63*

a. The Claims Are Not Drawn To Abstract Ideas. 64

b. Even If The Claims Were Drawn To An Abstract Idea, The Claim Elements Transform The Nature Of The Claim Into A Patent-Eligible Application. 69

2. The Board Lacks Authority To Review The Patent-In-Suit Under Section 101 In This Proceeding. *73*

B. Petitioner Fails To Set Forth A Prima Facie Case Of Obviousness. 77

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

V. CONCLUSION.....77

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

COURT DECISIONS

Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank International,
573 U.S. ___, 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014) 63, 65, 68-70, 72

Bilski v. Kappos,
561 U.S. 593 (2010) 64, 68-69

Diamond v. Chakrabarty,
447 U.S. 303 (1980) 64

Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.,
132 S. Ct. 1289 (2012) 63, 65, 72

MySpace, Inc. v. GraphOn Corp.,
672 F.3d 1250 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 74-75

ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS

Bloomberg Inc., et al. v. Markets-Alert PTY LTD.,
Case No. CBM2013-00005 Paper No. 18 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 29, 2013)
(per Medley, APJ) 50, 51

Conopco, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co.,
Case No. IPR2014-00507, Paper No. 17 (P.T.A.B. Jul, 7, 2014)
(per Obermann, ALJ) 26, 28, 30-31, 59

Customplay, LLC v. Clearplay, Inc.,
Case No. IPR2014-00783, Paper No. 9 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 7, 2014)
(per Grossman, ALJ) 27, 59

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.