

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AMERICAN EXPRESS COMPANY, AMERICAN EXPRESS TRAVEL
RELATED SERVICES COMPANY, INC., COMPASS BANK, DISCOVER
FINANCIAL SERVICES, DISCOVER BANK, DISCOVER PRODUCTS INC.,
NAVY FEDERAL CREDIT UNION, AND STATE FARM MUTUAL
AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE COMPANY,
Petitioners

v.

MAXIM INTEGRATED PRODUCTS, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case CBM2015-00098
Patent 5,940,510

**PATENT OWNER MAXIM INTEGRATED PRODUCTS, INC.'S
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS
METHOD PATENT REVIEW OF UNITED STATES PATENT NO.
5,940,510 PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 323, 37 C.F.R. § 42.304**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	2
II. THE '510 PATENT HAS NOT BEEN SHOWN TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT REVIEW.	3
A. Petitioners Fail To Meet Their Burden To Demonstrate That The '510 Patent Is A Covered Business Method Patent.	4
1. Whether the '510 Patent is a covered business method patent depends on what the Patent claims.	5
2. Claim 2 is disclaimed and cannot be a basis for standing.	7
3. Petitioners' arguments based on claim 2 cannot support standing.	8
4. Petitioners' citations to the specification in reference to what the Patent claims do not support standing.	12
5. Assertion of the Patent against providers of financial products or services does not support standing.	14
6. The Board's institution decision in an earlier case before claim 2 was disclaimed does not support standing.	16
B. Even If Petitioners Had Not Forfeited Other Standing Arguments, They Could Not Have Shown The Patent Is Directed To Financial Activities. ..	18
1. Standing must be based on what the patent claims, not what it discloses but does not claim.	19
2. The Patent's remaining claims are undisputedly not directed to financial activities.	19
3. The Office and a Court have both previously found that the Patent is not directed towards financial activities.	22

4. The Board has found that claims with similar subject matter are not directed to financial activities.....	25
C. Review Must Also Be Denied Because The Patent Is For A Technological Invention.	27
1. Petitioners’ attempts to show that the Patent does not claim a novel and unobvious technological feature instead confirm the opposite.	30
2. Petitioners do not show that the Patent does not solve a technical problem with a technical solution, and the Patent in fact uses both hardware and software to solve a technical communication problem.	36
III. EVEN IF THE PATENT HAD BEEN DEMONSTRATED TO BE A COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT, THE PETITION WOULD STILL NOT SATISFY THE 35 U.S.C. § 324 THRESHOLD.....	41
A. Petitioners’ Unpatentability Arguments Cannot Be Fully Addressed At The Institution Stage.	41
B. The “Broadest Reasonable Interpretation” Claim Construction Standard Should Not Apply In This Case.	42
1. The Patent will expire before any final written decision.	43
2. No claims will be added or amended.	44
3. The same construction standard should apply at institution as at trial.	44
IV. PETITIONERS PROPOSE REDUNDANT GROUNDS OF REVIEW....	48
A. The Board Routinely Rejects Redundant Or Duplicative Grounds.....	48
B. Proposed Grounds I And II, Which Are Both Based On The Same Art, Are Redundant.	50
V. CONCLUSION	51

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Facebook, Inc. v. Pragmatus AV, LLC</i> , 582 Fed. Appx. 864 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (nonprecedential)	47
<i>Genetics Inst., LLC v. Novartis Vaccines & Diagnostics, Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	8
<i>Guinn v. Kopf</i> , 96 F.3d 1419 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	7
<i>Maxim Integrated Products, Inc.. In re</i> , MDL No 2354 (W.D. Pa. Dec. 17, 2013) (Claim Construction Opinion)	23, 24
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)	42, 43, 45, 46, 47
<i>Vectra Fitness, Inc. v. TWNK Corp.</i> , 162 F.3d 1379 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	7

Administrative Determinations

<i>Agilysys, Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc.</i> , CBM2014-00014, Paper 19 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 26, 2014) (per Rice, APJ)	9
<i>Bloomberg L.P. v. Quest Licensing Corp.</i> , CBM2014-00205, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 7, 2015) (per Giannetti, APJ)	32, 40
<i>Canon Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures I, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00535 to-00537, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Sep. 24, 2014) (per Boucher, APJ)	48, 50
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. AIP Acquisition, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00247, Paper 17 (P.T.A.B. Jun. 26, 2014) (per Lee, APJ)	43
<i>Dell Inc. v. Disposition Servs. LLC</i> , CBM2013-00040, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 5, 2014) (per. Clements, APJ)	12

<i>E*Trade Fin. Corp. v. Droplets, Inc.</i> , CBM2014-00123, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 30, 2014) (per Gaudette, APJ)	29, 32, 39
<i>Experian Mktg. Sols., Inc. v. RPost Commc'ns, Ltd.</i> , CBM2014-00010, Paper 20 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 22, 2014) (per Turner, APJ)	14, 33, 37
<i>Fujitsu Semiconductor Ltd. v. Zond, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00863, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 23, 2014) (per Turner, APJ)	49
<i>Google, Inc. v. SimpleAir, Inc.</i> , CBM2015-00019, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. May 19, 2014) (per Arbes, APJ)	3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 17, 19
<i>GSI Commerce Solutions, Inc. v. Arunachalam</i> , CBM2014-00101, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 7, 2014) (per McNamara, APJ)	39
<i>HTC Corp. v. E-Watch, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00987, Paper 6 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 9, 2014) (per Clements, APJ)	49
<i>HTC Corp. v. E-Watch, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00987, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 7, 2015) (per Clements, APJ)	49
<i>Informatica Corp. v. Protegrity Corp.</i> , CBM2015-00010, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. May 11, 2015) (per Petravick, APJ)	13
<i>Innolux Corp. v. Semiconductor Energy Lab. Co. Ltd.</i> , IPR2013-00065, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 30, 2013) (per Turner, APJ)	49
<i>Interthinx, Inc. v. Corelogic Solutions, LLC</i> , CBM2012-00007, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 31, 2013) (per McNamara, APJ)	11, 43, 44
<i>J.P. Morgan Chase & Co. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC</i> , CBM2014-00160, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 29, 2015) (per Busch, APJ)	5, 21, 22, 25
<i>JP Morgan Chase & Co. v. Maxim Integrated Products, Inc.</i> , CBM2014-00179, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 20, 2015) (per Begley, APJ)	16, 17, 29, 33, 38
<i>LG Elecs., Inc. v. Straight Path IP Group, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00196, Paper 20 (P.T.A.B. May 15, 2015) (per Deshpande, ALJ)	45
<i>Motorola Mobility LLC v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC</i> , CBM2015-00005, Paper 10 (Mar. 27, 2015) (per Kokoski, APJ)	13

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.