

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE INC.
Petitioner

v.

CONTENTGUARD HOLDINGS, INC.
Patent Owner

Case CBM 2015-0040

U.S. Patent 7,774,280
Filed October 4, 2004
Issued August 10, 2010

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR MANAGING TRANSFER
OF RIGHTS USING SHARED STATE VARIABLES

Attorney Docket No. 20318-134631
Customer No: 22242

PRELIMINARY RESPONSE OF PATENT OWNER

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE BOARD MUST DISMISS THE PETITION BECAUSE THE ‘280 PATENT IS INELIGIBLE FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT REVIEW	4
A. Google fails to consider the claims as a whole	4
B. The ‘280 claims specify data access control technologies, not data processing or other operations “used in the practice, administration, or management of a financial product or service,” and are hence ineligible for CBM review	8
C. The ‘280 claims specify a “technological invention” and are ineligible for CBM review for this additional reason	16
III. THE BOARD SHOULD NOT INSTITUTE TRIAL BASED ON THE PETITION’S REDUNDANT PRIOR ART GROUNDS	21
IV. THE PETITION ADVANCES CERTAIN FLAWED CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS THAT SHOULD BE REJECTED	25
A. Overview of the ‘280 Patent	27
B. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	30
C. Response to Google’s Proposed Claim Constructions	30
1. Meta-right	30
2. Usage right.....	32
3. Right(s)	33
4. License	33
5. State variable.....	34
6. Repository	35
a. Physical integrity	36
b. Communications integrity	37

c.	Behavioral integrity	37
7.	Means-plus-function limitations	38
V.	THE CLAIMS OF THE ‘280 PATENT ARE DRAWN TO STATUTORY SUBJECT MATTER AND ARE NOT “ABSTRACT”	44
A.	Claims that are “necessarily rooted in computer technology” and that “overcome a problem specifically arising in the realm of computer networks” are patentable under <i>Alice</i> and post- <i>Alice</i> <i>DDR</i> decisions.....	44
B.	The ‘280 claims are drawn to a novel technological advancement over the prior art, necessarily rooted in computer technology in order to overcome a problem specifically arising in the realm of computer networks	51
C.	Google’s “abstractness” arguments ignore the law and are meritless.....	56
1.	Google’s “video store” analogy is badly flawed	56
2.	The claimed “repository” is not a general purpose computer and does not implement a prior known method and does not preempt the field of digital rights management.....	59
3.	The claim amendments during prosecution are irrelevant under <i>Alice</i> and <i>DDR</i>	61
VI.	TRIAL SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED ON THE MEANS-PLUS-FUNCTION CLAIMS 12 AND 22 BECAUSE THE PETITION FAILS TO PROVIDE A PROPER ANALYSIS OF THOSE CLAIMS	62
VII.	THE PETITION DOES NOT MEET GOOGLE’S BURDEN TO SHOW IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT TO PREVAIL ON ITS REMAINING GROUNDS OF INVALIDITY	63
A.	Legal Standards	63
B.	The Petition Fails to Demonstrate That the Challenged Claims Are Anticipated by <i>Stefik</i>	68
1.	<i>Stefik</i> Fails To Disclose: “a meta-right specifying a right that can be created when the meta-right is exercised”	70

2. Stefik Fails To Disclose: “determining, by a repository, whether the rights consumer is entitled to the right specified by the meta-right” and “exercising the meta-right to create the right specified by the meta-right if the rights consumer is entitled to the right specified by the meta-right” 73

C. The Petition Fails to Demonstrate That the Challenged Claims Are Obvious in View of Stefik and the Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art 76

VIII. CONCLUSION 79

Table of Authorities

Cases

<i>Accenture Global Servs. v. Guidewire Software, Inc.</i> , 728 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	58
<i>Activevideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc’ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	65
<i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014)	45, 46, 48
<i>Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr., In re</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	25
<i>Bancorp Services, L.L.C. v. Sun Life Assurance Co. of Canada</i> , 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	55
<i>Bass, In re</i> , 314 F.3d 575 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	25
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 130 S. Ct. 3218, 3221–27 (2010)	55
<i>Cal. Institute of Tech. v. Hughes Commcn’s Inc.</i> , 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 156763 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 3, 2014)	45, 56, 59
<i>Canon, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00535, Paper 9 (Sept. 24, 2014)	25
<i>Carella v. Starlight Archery & Pro Line Co.</i> , 804 F.2d 135 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	64
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (Aug. 29, 2014).....	65, 67
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC, In re</i> , No. 2014-1301, 2015 U.S. App. LEXIS 1699 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 4, 2015) ...	25
<i>CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	50
<i>Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig., In re</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	67
<i>DDR Holdings LLC v. Hotels.com, Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	44, 47, 48, 59
<i>Dell, Inc. v. Elecs & Telecommc’ns Res. Inst.</i> , IPR2014-00152, Paper 12 (May 16, 2014)	67
<i>Diamond v. Diehr</i> , 450 U.S. 175 (1981).....	46

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.