

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

SMARTFLASH LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case CBM2015-00015  
Patent 8,118,221

---

**CORRECTED PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD  
PATENT REVIEW OF UNITED STATES PATENT NO. 8,118,221  
PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 321, 37 C.F.R. § 42.304<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> As directed by the Board in Pap. 7, Petitioner hereby resubmits this Petition to address formality issues identified therein.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	OVERVIEW OF FIELD OF THE CLAIMED INVENTION .....	4
III.	PETITIONER HAS STANDING.....	8
	A. The '221 Patent Is a Covered Business Method Patent.....	8
	1. Exemplary Claim 32 Is Financial In Nature .....	9
	2. Claim 32 Does Not Cover A Technological Invention .....	12
	B. Related Matters and Mandatory Notice Information; Petitioner Is a Real Party In Interest Sued for and Charged With Infringement .....	17
IV.	DETAILED EXPLANATION OF REASONS FOR RELIEF REQUESTED, SHOWING IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT AT LEAST ONE CHALLENGED CLAIMS IS UNPATENTABLE .....	18
	A. Claim Construction.....	18
	B. The Challenged Claims Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. §101 .....	22
	1. Claims Are Directed To Abstract Ideas .....	23
	2. Claims Do Not Disclose An “Inventive Concept” That Is “Significantly More” Than an Abstract Idea .....	26
	3. Field Of Use Limitations Cannot Create Patent Eligibility .....	26
	4. Generic Computer Implementation Cannot Transform Abstract Ideas Into Patent Eligible Inventions .....	27
	5. Functional Nature Confirms Preemption and Ineligibility.....	32
	6. Machine-or-Transformation Test Confirms Ineligibility .....	33
	C. The Challenged Claims Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 .....	34
	1. Overview of Stefik .....	34
	2. Motivation to Combine Stefik with Poggio .....	38
	3. Motivation to Combine Stefik and Poggio with Kopp .....	42
	4. Motivation to Combine Stefik with Poggio, Kopp, and Smith .....	46
	5. Claim 32 is Obvious.....	48
V.	CONCLUSION.....	79

<b>EXHIBIT LIST</b>	
1201	U.S. Patent No. 8,118,221
1202	Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint
1203	File History for U.S. Patent No. 8,061,598
1204	File History for U.S. Patent No. 8,336,772
1205	U.S. Patent No. 5,675,734
1206	U.S. Patent No. 4,999,806
1207	U.S. Patent No. 4,878,245
1208	U.S. Patent No. 7,334,720
1209	U.S. Patent No. 7,942,317
1210	U.S. Patent No. 5,940,805
1211	File History for U.S. Patent No. 8,118,221
1212	U.S. Patent No. 5,103,392
1213	U.S. Patent No. 5,530,235
1214	U.S. Patent No. 5,629,980
1215	U.S. Patent No. 5,915,019
1216	European Patent Application, Publication No. EP0809221A2
1217	International Publication No. WO 99/43136
1218	JP Patent Application Publication No. H11-164058 (translation)
1219	International Publication No. WO 95/34857
1220	Eberhard von Faber, Robert Hammelrath, and Franz-Peter Heider, "The Secure Distribution of Digital Contents," IEEE

EXHIBIT LIST	
	(1997)
1221	Declaration of Anthony J. Wechselberger In Support of Apple Inc.'s Petition for Covered Business Method Patent Review
1222	Declaration of Michael P. Duffey In Support of Apple Inc.'s Petition for Covered Business Method Patent Review
1223	Declaration of Flora D. Elias-Mique In Support of Apple Inc.'s Petition for Covered Business Method Patent Review
1224	U.S. Patent No. 8,033,458
1225	U.S. Patent No. 8,061,598
1226	U.S. Patent No. 8,336,772
1227	File History for U.S. Patent No. 7,334,720
1228	File History for U.S. Patent No. 7,942,317
1229	File History for U.S. Patent No. 8,033,458
1230	Claim Construction Memorandum Opinion from <i>Smartflash LLC v. Apple Inc.</i> , No. 6:13cv447 (Dkt. 229)
1231	U.S. Patent No. 4,337,483
1232	U.S. Patent No. 7,725,375
1233	U.S. Patent No. 5,925,127

## I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to § 321 and Rule § 42.304,<sup>2</sup> the undersigned, on behalf of and in a representative capacity for Apple Inc. (“Petitioner”), petitions for review under the transitional program for covered business method patents of claim 1, 2, 11, and 32 (“challenged claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 8,118,221 (“the ’221 Patent” or “’221”), issued to Smartflash Technologies Limited and assigned to Smartflash LLC (“Patentee”). Petitioner asserts it is more likely than not that the challenged claims are unpatentable for the reasons herein and requests review of, and judgment against, claim 1, 2, 11, and 32 as unpatentable under § 101, and claim 32 as unpatentable under § 103. As discussed in Section III.B, *infra*, Petitioner previously filed CBM2014-00102/103 seeking CBM review of the ’221 Patent. Those petitions were instituted for trial (and consolidated) with respect to claims 1, 2, and 11-14 on grounds based on § 103, but the Board did not institute trial on claim 32. In its Institution Decision, the Board construed the term “access rule” as “a rule specifying a condition under which access to content is permitted,” *id.* Pap. 8, 8, and determined Petitioner had not shown it was more likely than not that it would prevail in demonstrating that Stefik, Poggio, and/or Sato rendered obvious code “responsive to payment validation data”

---

<sup>2</sup> Petitioner is demonstrating, in pending litigation, that these claims are invalid for numerous additional reasons. All section cites herein are to 35 U.S.C. or 37 C.F.R., as the context indicates, and all emphasis herein is added unless otherwise noted.

# 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.