

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent of: Racz et al. Attorney Docket No.: 39843-0008CP1
U.S. Patent No.: 8,336,772
Issue Date: December 25, 2012
Appl. Serial No.: 13/212,047
Filing Date: August 17, 2011
Title: DATA STORAGE AND ACCESS SYSTEMS

Mail Stop Patent Board

Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CORRECTED PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT

REVIEW OF UNITED STATES PATENT NO. 8,336,772 PURSUANT TO 35

U.S.C. 321 AND § 18 OF THE LEAHY-SMITH AMERICA INVENTS ACT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R § 42.8(a)(1).....	1
	A. Real Party-In-Interest Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)	1
	B. Related Matters Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)	1
	C. Lead And Back-Up Counsel Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)	2
II.	PAYMENT OF FEES	2
III.	REQUIREMENTS FOR CBM UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.304	2
	A. Grounds for Standing Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.304(a)	2
	B. Challenge Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b) and Relief.....	2
	C. Claim Construction under 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.304(b)(3)	5
	D. The ‘772 Patent is a Covered Business Method Patent	8
	A. The ‘772 Patent Is Not Directed to a Technological Invention, And Thus, Should Not Be Excluded From the Definition of a CBM Patent. 11	
IV.	SUMMARY OF THE ‘772 PATENT	14
	A. Brief Description	14
	B. Summary of the Prosecution History of the ‘772 Patent.....	16
	C. The Effective Priority Date of the Claims of the ‘772 Patent.....	17
V.	MANNER OF APPLYING CITED PRIOR ART TO EVERY CLAIM FOR WHICH A CBM IS REQUESTED, THUS ESTABLISHING A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT AT LEAST ONE CLAIM OF THE ‘772 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE	22
	A. GROUND 1 – Gruse Anticipates Claims 14 and 26.....	22
	1. Overview of Gruse	22
	2. Gruse Anticipates claims 14 and 26.....	26
	B. GROUND 2 – Gruse In View of Stefik ‘235 Renders Obvious Claim 32. 50	
	1. Overview of Stefik ‘235	50
	2. Combinability of Gruse with Stefik	51
	3. Gruse In View of Stefik Renders Obvious Claim 32.....	54
	C. GROUND 3 – Gruse In View of Hasebe Renders Obvious Claims 5. ..	64
	1. Overview of Hasebe	64
	2. Combinability of Gruse and Hasebe	67
	3. Gruse in view of Hasebe Renders Obvious Claim 5.....	69
	D. GROUND 4 – Gruse In View of Stefik Further In View of Hasebe Renders Obvious Claim 10.	74
	1. Combinability of Gruse, Stefik and Hasebe.....	74

2.	Gruse In View of Stefik Further In View of Hasebe Renders Obvious Claims 8 and 10.	75
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	80

EXHIBITS

- SAMSUNG-1001 U.S. Patent No. 8,336,772 to Hulst et al. (“the ‘772 Patent”)
- SAMSUNG-1002 Excerpts from the Prosecution History of the ‘772 Patent (“the Prosecution History”)
- SAMSUNG-1003 Declaration of Dr. Jeffrey Bloom re the ‘772 Patent
- SAMSUNG-1004 U.S. Patent No. 5,530,235 (“Stefik ‘235”)
- SAMSUNG-1005 U.S. Patent No. 5,629,980 (“Stefik ‘980”) (incorporated by 5,530,235)
- SAMSUNG-1006 PCT Publication No. WO 00/08909 (“Gruse”)
- SAMSUNG-1007 PCT Application PCT/GB00/04110 (“the ‘110 Appln”) or (‘110)
- SAMSUNG-1008 United Kingdom Patent Application GB9925227.2 (“the ‘227.2 Appln.”) (‘227.2)
- SAMSUNG-1009 Transitional Program for Covered Business Method Patents—Definitions of Covered Business Method Patent and Technological Invention, 77 Fed. Reg. 157 (Aug. 14, 2012)
- SAMSUNG-1010 A Guide to the Legislative History of the America Invents Act; Part II of II, 21 Fed. Cir. Bar J. No. 4
- SAMSUNG-1011 Interim Guidance for Determining Subject Matter Eligibility for Process Claims in View of *Bilski v. Kappos* (Jul. 27, 2010)
- SAMSUNG-1012 *Apple Inc. v. Sightsound Technologies, LLC*, CBM2013-00019 Paper No. 17 (entered Oct. 8, 2013) at 11-13
- SAMSUNG-1013 *Volusion, Inc. v. Versata Software, Inc. and Versata Development Group, Inc.*, CBM2013-00017 Paper No. 8 (entered Oct. 24, 2013)

SAMSUNG-1014 Salesforce.com, Inc. v. VirtualAgility, Inc., CBM2013-00024
Paper No. 16 (entered Nov. 19, 2013)

SAMSUNG-1015 RESERVED

SAMSUNG-1016 U.S. Patent No. 8,118,221 (“the ‘221 Patent” or “’221)

SAMSUNG-1017 U.S. Patent No. 8,061,598 (“the ‘598 Patent” or “‘598”)

SAMSUNG-1018 U.S. Patent No. 8,033,458 (“the ‘458 Patent” or “‘458”)

SAMSUNG-1019 U.S. Patent No. 7,942,317 (“the ‘317 Patent” or “’317”)

SAMSUNG-1020 U.S. Patent Application No. 12/014,558 (“the ‘558 Appln.” or
“‘558”)

SAMSUNG-1021 U.S. Patent No. 7,334,720 (“the ‘720 Patent” or “’720”)

SAMSUNG-1022 U.S. Patent Application No. 12/943,872 (“the ‘872 Appln.” or
“‘872”)

SAMSUNG-1023 RESERVED

SAMSUNG-1024 RESERVED

SAMSUNG-1025 RESERVED

SAMSUNG-1026 U.S. Patent Application No. 13/212,047 (“the ‘047 Appln.” or
“‘047”)

SAMSUNG-1027 U.S. Patent No. 5,761,651 (“Hasebe”)

SAMSUNG-1028 Weinstein “MasterCard Plans Point-of-Sale Product for Mer-
chants Leery of Bank Cards”

SAMSUNG-1029 Mayo Collaborative Serv v. Prometheus Labs., Inc., 132 S. Ct.
1289 (2012)

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.