

Case CBM2015-00031
Patent 8,336,772 B2

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner

v.

SMARTFLASH LLC,
Patent Owner

Case CBM2015-00031
Patent 8,336,772 B2

Before JENNIFER S. BISK, RAMA G. ELLURU, GREGG I. ANDERSON, and
MATTHEW R. CLEMENTS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	PETITIONER’S RESPONSE TO PO’S STATEMENT OF FACTS	3
III.	THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE NOT § 101 PATENT ELIGIBLE	3
	A. PO Fails to Identify any Inventive Concept	4
	B. The <i>DDR</i> Claims Are Not Analogous to the Claims	7
	1. The Claims Do Not Address an Internet-Specific Problem.....	8
	2. The Claims Do Not “Override” Routine and Conventional Computer Action.....	10
	3. The Claims Do Not “Parallel” the <i>DDR</i> Claims	13
	C. PO’s Preemption Arguments Are Misplaced	14
IV.	PO’S OTHER ARGUMENTS ARE IRRELEVANT TO THE MERITS	17
	A. Mr. Wechselberger Was Not Required to Recite an “Evidentiary Standard” or a “Standard for Statutory Subject Matter”	18
	B. PO’s Construction of “Payment Data” Ignores the Explicit Teachings of the ’772 Patent.....	21
	C. PO’s “Estoppel” Arguments Are Unfounded.....	22
	1. Neither the ’772 Patent’s Prosecution Nor the AIA Prohibits the Board from Considering § 101 Here.....	22
	2. Non-Final § 101 Determinations in District Court Litigation Have No Impact On This Proceeding.....	23
	D. Covered Business Method Reviews Are Constitutional	24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Accenture Global Servs., GmbH v. Guidewire Software, Inc.</i> , 728 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	5, 14, 24
<i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....	passim
<i>Ariosa Diagnostics, Inc. v. Sequenom, Inc.</i> , 788 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	passim
<i>Arrhythmia Research Tech., Inc. v. Corazonix Corp.</i> , 958 F.2d 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	24
<i>Bancorp Servs., L.L.C. v. Sun Life Assurance Co. of Can.</i> , 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	4, 13, 16
<i>buySAFE, Inc. v. Google, Inc.</i> , 765 F.3d 1350-52 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	5, 10, 12
<i>Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, Nat’l Ass’n</i> , 776 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	1, 4, 5, 12
<i>DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.</i> , 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	passim
<i>Digitech Image Techs., LLC v. Elecs. For Imaging, Inc.</i> , 758 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	6
<i>Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe, Inc.</i> , 424 F.3d 1276 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	21
<i>Ethicon, Inc. v. Quigg</i> , 849 F.2d 1422 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	24
<i>Fresenius USA, Inc. v. Baxter Int’l, Inc.</i> , 721 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	23

Case CBM2015-00031	
Patent 8,336,772 B2	
<i>Gottschalk v. Benson</i> ,	
409 U.S. 63 (1972).....	1, 9
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Capital One Bank (USA)</i>	
(“IV”), 792 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	1, 10, 12
<i>Joy Techs., Inc. v. Manbeck</i> ,	
959 F.2d 226 (Fed. Cir. 1992), <i>superseded by statute on other grounds</i>	25
<i>Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs, Inc.</i> ,	
132 S. Ct. 1289 (2012).....	passim
<i>McCormick Harvesting Mach. Co. v. C. Aultman & Co.</i> ,	
169 U.S. 606 (1898).....	25
<i>OIP Techs., Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> ,	
788 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	passim
<i>Patlex Corp. v. Mossinghoff</i> ,	
758 F.2d 594 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	25
<i>SmartGene, Inc. v. Adv. Biological Labs., SA</i> ,	
555 F. App’x 950 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	6
<i>Suffolk Techs., LLC v. AOL Inc.</i> ,	
752 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	21
<i>Ultramercial, Inc. v. Hulu, LLC</i> ,	
772 F.3d 709 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	passim
<i>Versata Dev. Grp., Inc. v. SAP Am., Inc.</i> ,	
793 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	21, 22, 23

PTAB RULINGS

CBM2012-00007, Papers 15 & 58.....	24
CBM2013-00013, Paper 61	6
CBM2014-00079, Paper 28	2, 15
CBM2014-00102, Paper 52	18, 22
CBM2015-00015, Paper 28	16

Case CBM2015-00031
Patent 8,336,772 B2
CBM2015-00059, Paper 132, 15
IPR2013-00048, Paper 1521
IPR2013-00172, Paper 503, 18

STATUTES AND REGULATIONS

35 U.S.C. § 101passim
35 U.S.C. § 14525
35 U.S.C. § 282(b)23
35 U.S.C. § 324(a)23
37 C.F.R. § 42.6518

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.