

Case CBM2014-00180
Patent 5,949,880
Attorney Docket No. 140828-004USCBM

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 CBM2014-00180
Patent 5,949,880

**PATENT OWNER MAXIM INTEGRATED PRODUCTS, INC.'S
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS
METHOD PATENT REVIEW OF UNITED STATES PATENT NO.
5,949,880 PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 321, 37 C.F.R. § 42.304**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THIS SECOND PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT IS BASED ON A FIRST PETITION BARRED BY 35 U.S.C. § 325(A)(1). 5	
A.	The Board Held That § 325(a)(1) Bars Initiation Of The Petition.	9
B.	The Board’s Determination That § 325(a)(1) Barred Initiation Of The First Petition Applies To The Re-Filed Petition As Well.	12
C.	The Changed Participation Level Of Barred Co-Constituent PNC Does Not Change Its Real Party-In-Interest Status.....	14
1.	<i>PNC Exerted Substantial Control Over The First And Re-Filed Petitions.</i>	<i>15</i>
2.	<i>PNC Contributed To Both The First And Re-Filed Petitions.</i>	<i>16</i>
3.	<i>Exempting The Second Petition From § 325(a)(1) Would Open The Door To Easy Evasion Of The Statutory Bar.....</i>	<i>20</i>
D.	Even If The Bar Did Not Still Apply, The Board Should Exercise Its Discretion To Deny This Re-Filed Petition Under § 325(d).	25
E.	Even If Initiation Were Appropriate, Petitioner’s Bolstering Of The Re-Filed Petition With Waived Arguments Is Not Permitted.	27
III.	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.....	28
A.	The Petition Fails To Show That Review Of Patent-Eligibility Under § 101 Should Be Granted.....	30
1.	<i>Petitioner Fails To Show That The Claims Are More Likely Than Not Patent-Ineligible Under § 101.</i>	<i>31</i>
a)	<u>The Claims Are Not Drawn To Abstract Ideas.....</u>	31
b)	<u>Even If The Claims Were Drawn To An Abstract Idea, The Claim Elements Transform The Nature Of The Claims Into A Patent- Eligible Application.....</u>	36

2. *The Board Lacks Authority To Review The Patent-In-Suit Under Section 101 In This Proceeding*38

B. Petitioner Fails To Set Forth A Prima Facie Case of Anticipation..... 42

IV. CONCLUSION **42**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
COURT DECISIONS	
<i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank International</i> , 573 U.S. ___, 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014)	31, 35, 36, 37
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 561 U.S. 593 (2010)	32, 35
<i>Diamond v. Chakrabarty</i> , 447 U.S. 303 (1980)	32
<i>Diamond v. Diehr</i> , 450 U.S. 175 (1981)	35
<i>Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.</i> , 132 S. Ct. 1289 (2012).....	31, 32
<i>MySpace, Inc. v. GraphOn Corp.</i> , 672 F.3d 1250 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	39, 40
ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS	
<i>Conopco, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co.</i> , Case No. IPR2014-00507, Paper No. 17 (P.T.A.B. Jul, 7, 2014) (per Obermann, ALJ).....	24, 26, 27
<i>Customplay, LLC v. Clearplay, Inc.</i> , Case No. IPR2014-00783, Paper No. 9 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 7, 2014) (per Grossman, ALJ).....	24, 25, 26

First Data Corp. v. Cardsoft, LLC,
Case No. IPR2014-00715, Paper No. 9 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 17, 2014)
(per curiam) 17, 18, 19

PNC Bank, N.A., JP Morgan Chase & Co. and JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A. v. Maxim Integrated Prods., Inc., Case No. CBM2014-00039, Paper No. 19
(P.T.A.B. Jun. 3, 2014) (per Weatherly, APJ)..... passim

PNC Bank Nat’l Assoc. v. Secure Axxess, LLC,
Case No. CBM2014-00100 Paper No. 10 (P.T.A.B. Sep. 9, 2014)
(per Benoit, APJ) 31, 33, 34, 35

Reloaded Games, Inc. v. Parallel Networks LLC,
Case No. IPR2014-00950, Paper No. 12 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 22, 2014)
(per Jung, APJ) 24

RPX Corp. v. Virnetx Inc.,
Case No. IPR2014-00171, Paper No. 49 (P.T.A.B. Jun. 5, 2014)
(per Easthom, J.)..... 23

STATUTES AND RULES

Leahy-Smith America Invents Act,
Pub. L. No. 112-29, 125 Stat. 284 (2011), § 18 1, 40

35 U.S.C. § 101..... 5, 30, 31, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41

35 U.S.C. § 102..... 39

35 U.S.C. § 103..... 39

35 U.S.C. § 112..... 41

35 U.S.C. § 251..... 41

35 U.S.C. § 282..... 38, 41

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.