

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE INC. and APPLE INC.,
Petitioners

v.

CONTENTGUARD HOLDINGS, INC.
Patent Owner

Case CBM 2015-00040¹

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. 20318-134361

Customer No: 22242

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

¹ Case CBM2015-00160 has been joined with this proceeding.

Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	OVERVIEW OF THE ‘280 PATENT	4
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	14
	A. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	15
	B. Response to the Board’s Claim Construction	16
	1. Rights	16
	2. License	16
	3. Repository	16
	4. State Variable.....	18
	5. Meta-right	18
IV.	THE ‘280 PATENT IS NOT ELIGIBLE FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT REVIEW	27
	A. The ‘280 Patent Does Not Claim A Financial Activity And Is Context Neutral	28
	1. The Decision Focused On Optional Financial Uses Of The Technology Disclosed In The Specification, Rather Than The Required Steps Of The Claims	29
	2. Google Relied On An Incorrect Standard For CBM Review	33
	3. The Decision Misapprehends CG’s Preliminary Arguments.....	39
	B. The ‘280 Claims As A Whole Specify A “Technological Invention” And Are Not Eligible For CBM Review For This Additional Reason.....	40
V.	GOOGLE HAS NOT PROVEN THAT THE ‘280 CLAIMS ARE ANTICIPATED BY STEFIK	47
	A. Stefik’s DRM Approach Manages Only Usage Rights	48
	B. Stefik Lacks Several Limitations Of The ‘280 Claims.....	50

1.	Stefik Does Not Disclose: “a meta-right specifying a right that can be created when the meta-right is exercised”	50
2.	Stefik Does Not Disclose: “determining, by a repository, whether the rights consumer is entitled to the right specified by the meta-right”	56
3.	Stefik Does Not Disclose: “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”	61
VI.	GOOGLE HAS NOT PROVEN THAT THE ‘280 CLAIMS ARE OBVIOUS BASED ON STEFIK AND THE KNOWLEDGE OF A PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	63
VII.	CONCLUSION	71

Table of Authorities

Cases

<i>Abbott Diabetes Care, Inc., In re</i> , 696 F.3d 1142 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	15, 24
<i>Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr., In re</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	15
<i>ATD Corp. v. Lydall, Inc.</i> , 159 F.3d 534 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	63
<i>Bass, In re</i> , 314 F.3d 575 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	15
<i>Bicon, Inc. v. Strauman Co.</i> , 441 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	29
<i>Carella v. Starlight Archery & Pro Line Co.</i> , 804 F.2d 135 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	47
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC, In re</i> , No. 2014-1301, 2015 U.S. App. LEXIS 1699 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 4, 2015) ...	15
<i>Dow Chem. Co., In re</i> , 837 F.2d 469 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	65
<i>E*Trade Financial Corp. v. Droplets</i> , CBM2014-00124, Paper 15 (PTAB October 30, 2014).....	44, 46
<i>E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.</i> , 849 F.2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	19, 20
<i>Epsilon Data Management, LLC</i> , CBM2014-00017, Paper 21 (PTAB April 22, 2014)	46
<i>Fairchild Semiconductor Corp. v. In-Depth Test LLC</i> , CBM2015-00060, Paper 11 (PTAB August 3, 2015).....	36
<i>FedEx Corp. v. Katz Technology Licensing</i> , CBM2015-00053, Paper 9 (PTAB June 29, 2015)	28, 34, 35, 37
<i>Google Inc. v. Simplair, Inc.</i> , CBM2015-00020, Paper 11 (PTAB May 19, 2015)	36
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	63, 64
<i>Grain Processing Corp. v. Am. Maize-Prods. Co.</i> , 840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	65
<i>Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	64
<i>J.P. Morgan Chase & Co. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC</i> , CBM2014-00160, Paper 11 (PTAB Jan. 29, 2015)	35

<i>Kahn, In re,</i> 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	64, 65
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.,</i> 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	64
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,</i> 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	63, 64, 65
<i>Lear Siegler, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.,</i> 733 F.2d 881 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....	24
<i>MEHL/Biophile Int’l Corp. v. Milgram,</i> 192 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	48
<i>Merck & Co., Inc., In re,</i> 800 F.2d 1091 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	65
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Secure Web Conference Corp.,</i> IPR2014-00745, Paper 12 (PTAB Sept. 29, 2014).....	70
<i>Minnesota Min. & Mfg. Co. v. Johnson & Johnson Orthopaedics Inc.,</i> 976 F.2d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1992).....	47
<i>Motorola Mobility, LLC, v. Intellectual Ventures I, LLC,</i> CBM2014-00084, Paper 18 (PTAB August 6, 2014).....	46
<i>Orthopedic Equip. Co. v. United States,</i> 702 F.2d 1005 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....	65
<i>Par Pharmaceutical,</i> CBM 2014-00149, Paper 11 (Jan. 13, 2015)	29
<i>Par Pharmaceutical, Inc. v. Jazz Pharmaceuticals, Inc.,</i> CBM 2014-00149, Paper 12 (Jan. 13, 2015)	29, 40
<i>Paulsen, In re,</i> 30 F.3d 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	21
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.,</i> 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)(en banc).....	15, 26
<i>PNC Fin. Servs. Group, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC,</i> CBM2014-00032, Paper 13 (PTAB May 22, 2014)	36
<i>Renishaw PLC v. Marposs Societa’ per Azioni,</i> 158 F.3d 1243 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	19, 20, 21, 22
<i>Salesforce.com, Inc. v. Applications in Internet Time LLC,</i> CBM2014-00162, Paper 11 (PTAB Feb. 2, 2015).....	35
<i>Sega of Am., Inc. v. Uniloc USA, Inc.,</i> CBM2014-00183, Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 10, 2015).....	35
<i>Sony Corp. of America v. Network-1 Security Solutions, Inc.,</i> IPR2013-00092, Paper 21 (May 24, 2013)	48
<i>Sony Corp. of America v. Network-1 Techs., Inc.,</i> CBM2015-00078, Paper 7 (PTAB July 1, 2015).....	34

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.