

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

JPMORGAN CHASE & CO.
AND JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A.
Petitioner,

v.

MAXIM INTEGRATED PRODUCTS, INC.
Patent Owner.

Case No. To Be Assigned
Patent No. 5,949,880

**PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT REVIEW
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 321-329 AND § 18 OF THE LEAHY-SMITH AMERICA
INVENTS ACT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1))	1
A.	Real Party-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))	1
B.	Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	4
C.	Lead and Backup Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3))	7
D.	Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4)).....	8
II.	FEES (37 C.F.R. § 42.203)	8
III.	REQUIREMENTS FOR CBM REVIEW UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.304	8
A.	Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(a))	8
1.	Eligibility Requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 42.302	11
2.	Timing Requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 42.303.....	11
3.	The '880 Patent is a Covered Business Method Patent.....	11
B.	Citation of Prior Art	21
C.	Claims and Statutory Grounds (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.304(b)(1) & (b)(2)).....	22
D.	Claim Construction (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(3))	22
1.	“module” (independent claim 1).....	23
2.	“mathematical operation” (independent claim 1)	24
E.	Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	25
F.	Unpatentability of the Construed Claims (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(4))	26
G.	Supporting Evidence (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(5))	26
IV.	SUMMARY OF THE '880 PATENT	26

- A. Overview of the '880 Patent 26
 - 1. Exemplary Embodiment Applicable to Independent Claim 1 28
 - 2. Dependent Claims 2, 3 and 4 35
- B. Prosecution History Summary of the '880 Patent 35
- V. **AT LEAST ONE CLAIM OF THE '880 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE** 36
 - A. Prior Art 36
 - 1. U.S. Patent No. 5,428,684 to Akiyama *at al.* (Ex. 1004) 36
 - B. Ground I: Akiyama Anticipates Claims 1, 2, 3 and 4 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) 44
 - C. Ground II: Claims 1, 2, 3, and 4 Fail to Claim Patentable Subject Matter Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 58
 - 1. The Transfer of Value Is an Abstract Idea 58
 - 2. The Limited Structure Recited in the '880 Patent Does Not Amount to an Inventive Concept 62
 - 3. The Dependent Claims Do Not Introduce An Inventive Concept 65
- VI. **CONCLUSION** 66

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Alice Corporation Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank International</i> , 573 U.S. ____, 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Apple, Inc. v. SightSound Tech., LLC</i> , Case No. CBM2013-00019.....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 561 U.S. 593 (2010).....	58
<i>Bloomberg Inc. v. Markets-Alert PTY Ltd.</i> , CBM2013-00005, Paper No. 18	20
<i>CRS Advanced Techs., Inc. v. Frontline Techs., Inc.</i> , CBM2012-00005, Paper 17	12, 16
<i>Experian Mktg. Solutions, Inc. v. RPost Commc'n Ltd.</i> , CBM2014-00010, Paper 20	15
<i>Gates Learjet Corp. v. Duncan Aviation</i> , 851 F.2d 303 (10th Cir. 1988)	10
<i>Mayo Collaborative Services v. Prometheus Laboratories, Inc.</i> , 566 U.S. ____, 132 S. Ct. 1289 (2012).....	58, 63
<i>Parker v. Flook</i> , 437 U.S. 584 (1978).....	61
<i>PNC Bank N.A. et al. v. Maxim Integrated Prods, Inc.</i> , CBM2014-00039, Paper No. 3	1
<i>PNC Fin. Servs. Grp., Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC</i> , CBM2014-00032, Paper 13	15
<i>SAP Am., Inc. v. Versata Dev. Grp., Inc.</i> , CBM2012-00001, Paper 36	13
<i>State of Ala. ex rel. Siegelman v. U.S. E.P.A.</i> , 911 F.2d 499 (11th Cir. 1990)	9

Volusion, Inc., v. Versata Software, Inc.,
 CBM2013-00018, Paper No. 8 13

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 101 *passim*
 35 U.S.C. § 102 22, 36, 37, 45
 35 U.S.C. §132(a) 35
 35 U.S.C. § 321(c) 11
 35 U.S.C. § 324(a) 36, 47
 35 U.S.C. §325 1, 8, 9, 10
 35 U.S.C. §328(a) 9

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.6 1
 37 C.F.R. § 42.8 1, 4, 7, 8
 37 C.F.R. § 42.15(b) 8
 37 C.F.R. § 42.203 8
 37 C.F.R. § 42.205 1
 37 C.F.R. § 42.300(b) 22
 37 C.F.R. § 42.301 12, 16, 20
 37 C.F.R. § 42.302 8, 11
 37 C.F.R. § 42.303 11
 37 C.F.R. § 42.304 8, 22, 26
 77 Fed. Reg. 48,734, 48,736 (Aug. 14, 2012) 12
 77 Fed. Reg. 48,735 (Aug. 14, 2012) 12

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.