

NOTE: This disposition is nonprecedential.

**United States Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit**

APPLE INC., GOOGLE LLC,
Appellants

v.

CONTENTGUARD HOLDINGS, INC.,
Cross-Appellant

v.

**ANDREI IANCU, UNDER SECRETARY OF
COMMERCE FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
AND DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE,**
Intervenor

2016-2548, 2016-2557, 2016-2559, 2016-2629

Appeals from the United States Patent and Trade-
mark Office, Patent Trial and Appeal Board in Nos.
CBM2015-00040, CBM2015-00160.

Decided: July 11, 2018

ROBERT UNIKEL, Paul Hastings LLP, Chicago, IL,
argued for all appellants. Appellant Google Inc. also

represented by ROBERT R. LAURENZI, Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP, New York, NY.

JEFFREY PAUL KUSHAN, Sidley Austin LLP, Washington, DC, for appellant Apple Inc. Also represented by THOMAS ANTHONY BROUGHAN, III, MICHAEL R. FRANZINGER; NATHANIEL C. LOVE, Chicago, IL.

TIMOTHY P. MALONEY, Fitch, Even, Tabin & Flannery, Chicago, IL, argued for cross-appellant. Also represented by PAUL HENKELMANN.

WILLIAM LAMARCA, Office of the Solicitor, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Alexandria, VA, argued for intervenor. Also represented by NATHAN K. KELLEY, THOMAS W. KRAUSE, FARHEENA YASMEEN RASHEED.

Before REYNA, BRYSON, and HUGHES, *Circuit Judges*.

HUGHES, *Circuit Judge*.

Apple Inc. and Google LLC appeal from the Patent Trial and Appeal Board's decision to grant ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.'s motion to amend in a covered business method review of U.S. Patent 7,774,280. Because the Board applied the wrong legal standard to determine whether the '280 patent qualified as a covered business method, we vacate and remand for further proceedings.

I

The '280 patent relates to digital rights management (DRM) systems. DRM systems allow content owners to control how their digital works are subsequently used. For example, a DRM system might prevent downstream users from making unauthorized copies of digital works or require users to pay a fee before the system grants access to the content.

According to the '280 patent, one drawback of prior DRM systems is that content owners cannot control how their digital works are distributed unless the content owner remains a party to a transaction. For example, a publisher might authorize a distributor to provide digital content to an online retailer, who in turn sells the content to end-users. '280 patent, col. 2, ll. 26–29. In prior art systems, once the publisher gives the content to the distributor, the publisher cannot control what rights the distributor grants to parties further downstream, such as the online retailer or the end-user. *Id.* col. 2, ll. 34–42.

The '280 patent purports to solve this problem by creating a DRM with “usage rights,” “meta-rights” and “state variables.” According to the '280 patent, “[u]sage rights define one or more manners of use of the associated document content.” *Id.* col. 2, ll. 14–16. Examples of usage rights include the right to view, use, or distribute a digital work. *Id.* col. 2, ll. 16–18. By contrast, “[m]eta-rights are the rights that one has to generate, manipulate, modify, dispose of or otherwise derive other rights. Meta-rights can be thought of as usage rights to usage rights (or other meta-rights).” *Id.* col. 5, ll. 47–49. Finally, “[s]tate variables” represent the status of rights, such as how many copies of a digital work have been distributed or viewed. *Id.* col. 7, l. 66–col. 8, l. 16.

Using the '280 patent’s DRM system, a publisher can grant meta-rights that specify what usage rights its distributor can grant to downstream parties like the online retailer or the end-user. *Id.* col. 6, ll. 36–60. For example, a publisher might specify that its distributor can allow the online retailer to sell only five copies of each digital work. *Id.* col. 6, ll. 47–60. Similarly, the publisher might also specify that the online retailer can only allow end-users to view the content or to print it once. *Id.* In the disclosed system, the online retailer can only grant rights to end users that have been “predetermined and

authorized” by upstream parties like the distributor or publisher. *Id.* col. 6, ll. 36–48.

Claim 1 of the ’280 patent recites:

1. A computer-implemented method for transferring rights adapted to be associated with items from a rights supplier to a rights consumer, the method comprising:

obtaining a set of rights associated with an item, the set of rights including a meta-right specifying a right that can be created when the meta-right is exercised, wherein the meta-right is provided in digital form and is enforceable by a repository;

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, wherein the created right includes at least one state variable based on the set of rights and used for determining a state of the created right.

Id. col. 15, ll. 7–22.

Petitioners Apple Inc. and Google LLC requested covered business method (CBM) review of the ’280 patent, which the Board instituted. In its institution decision, the Board determined that the ’280 patent qualified as a CBM patent. After institution, ContentGuard moved to amend the ’280 patent. In its final written decision, the Board cancelled original claims 1, 5, and 11 of the ’280 patent, but granted ContentGuard’s motion to amend by adding substitute independent claim 37. Petitioners appeal from the Board’s decision to grant ContentGuard’s motion to amend. ContentGuard cross-appealed and argued that

the '280 patent did not qualify as a CBM patent. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1295(a)(4)(A).

II

Our jurisdiction allows us to review whether the '280 patent qualifies as a CBM patent. *Versata Dev. Grp., Inc. v. SAP Am., Inc.*, 793 F.3d 1306, 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2015). Whether a patent qualifies as a CBM patent is a question of law that we review de novo. *Unwired Planet, LLC v. Google Inc.*, 841 F.3d 1376, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2016). The Board concluded that the '280 patent qualified as a CBM patent because it claimed an invention that is “incidental to” or “complementary to” financial activity. Since the Board’s decision, we expressly rejected this standard in *Unwired Planet*. *Id.* at 1382. Because the Board relied on an incorrect legal standard, we vacate the Board’s decision.¹

Unwired Planet held that “the Board’s reliance on whether the patent claims activities ‘incidental to’ or ‘complementary to’ a financial activity as the legal standard to determine whether a patent is a CBM patent was not in accordance with law.” *Id.* We explained that “it cannot be the case that a patent covering a method and corresponding apparatuses becomes a CBM patent because its practice could involve a potential sale of a good or service.” *Id.* Moreover “[i]t is not enough that a sale has occurred or may occur, or even that the specification

¹ In *Secure Access, LLC v. PNC Bank National Ass’n*, we held that “the statutory definition of a CBM patent requires that the patent have a claim that contains, however phrased, a financial activity element.” 848 F.3d 1370, 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2017). That decision, however, has since been vacated as moot by the Supreme Court. *PNC Bank Nat. Ass’n v. Secure Access, LLC*, 138 S. Ct. 1982 (2018).

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.