

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., and  
STATE FARM MUTUAL AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE COMPANY,  
Petitioners,

v.

MAXIM INTEGRATED PRODUCTS, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case CBM2015-00098  
Patent 5,940,510

---

**PATENT OWNER'S  
REQUEST FOR REHEARING OF DECISION INSTITUTING  
COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT REVIEW  
(CORRECTED)**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE DECISION MISAPPREHENDED AIA § 18’S REQUIREMENT THAT A CBM PATENT IS “A PATENT THAT <i>CLAIMS</i> A METHOD OR CORRESPONDING APPARATUS <i>FOR</i> PERFORMING . . . OPERATIONS USED IN THE PRACTICE, ADMINISTRATION, OR MANAGEMENT OF A FINANCIAL PRODUCT OR SERVICE” .....	3
A. The Board Relied On The Specification, Rather Than The Claims. ....	4
B. The Statute Requires That The Patent Claim An Invention “ <i>For</i> ” Operations “Used In . . . Financial Products Or Services,” Not Merely “ <i>Encompassing</i> ” Such Operations.....	6
C. The Board Improperly Rejected The “Technological Invention” Exception To Institution Based On Extrinsic Trial Evidence. ....	12
1. The “technological” exception is a threshold determination. ....	13
2. The exception cannot be decided based on trial testimony. ....	13
CONCLUSION.....	15

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases**

*Achates Reference Publ., Inc. v. Apple Inc.*, --- F.3d ----, 2015 U.S. App.  
LEXIS 17183 (Fed. Cir. Sep. 30, 2015) .....2

*Pall Corp. v. Hemasure, Inc.*, 181 F.3d 1305 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....11

*Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc) .....14

*Versata Dev. Group, Inc. v. SAP Am., Inc.*, 793 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....2

*Wilson Sporting Goods Co. v. Hillerich & Bradsby Co.*, 442 F.3d 1322  
(Fed. Cir. 2006) .....11

**Administrative Determinations**

*Fairchild Semiconductor Corp. v. In-Depth Test LLC*, CBM2015-00060,  
Paper 11 (PTAB Aug. 3, 2015).....11

*Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.*, CBM2012-00003,  
Paper 15 (PTAB Feb. 12, 2013).....14

*Motorola Mobility LLC v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC*, CBM2014-00083,  
Paper 17 (PTAB Aug. 6, 2014).....15

*Sony Corp. of Am. v. Network-1 Techs.*, CBM2015-00078, Paper 7  
(PTAB Jul. 1, 2015) ..... 8, 11

**Statutes**

Leahy-Smith America Invents Act of 2011, Pub. L. No. 112-29,  
125 Stat. 284, 327, § 14 .....8, 9

Leahy-Smith America Invents Act of 2011, Pub. L. No. 112-29,  
125 Stat. 284, 327, § 14(a) ..... 8, 10

Leahy-Smith America Invents Act of 2011, Pub. L. No. 112-29,  
125 Stat. 284, 330, § 18 ..... 2, 8, 13

Leahy-Smith America Invents Act of 2011, Pub. L. No. 112-29,  
125 Stat. 284, 330, § 18(a)(1)(E) .....13

Leahy-Smith America Invents Act of 2011, Pub. L. No. 112-29,  
125 Stat. 284, 331, § 18(d)(1) ..... passim

**Regulations and Rulemaking**

37 C.F.R. § 42.207(c).....14

USPTO Guidance Document, “Tax Strategies Training Examples,”  
www.uspto.gov “Patents Examination Area”  
([http://www.uspto.gov/sites/default/files/aia\\_implementation/tax-strategies-training-examples.pdf](http://www.uspto.gov/sites/default/files/aia_implementation/tax-strategies-training-examples.pdf)) (last visited Oct. 6, 2015) .....9

USPTO Patent And Trademark Appeal Board, Standard Operating  
Procedure No. 1 (rev. 14).....2, 3

USPTO, Amendments to the Rules of Practice; Proposed Rules, 80 Fed. Reg.  
50,719 *et seq.* (Aug. 20, 2015).....2

USPTO, Manual of Patent Examining Procedure  
(9th Ed. Mar. 2014) § 2124.01 .....9

**Legislative History**

157 Cong. Rec. H4421 (June 22, 2011) (Statement of Rep. Smith) .....10

157 Cong. Rec. S1053, 1053 (Mar. 1, 2011) (Statement of Sen. Schumer).....10

157 Cong. Rec. S1363 (daily ed. Mar. 8, 2011) (Statement of Sen. Schumer).....15

EXHIBIT LIST	
Exhibit 2001	Order of Dismissal With Prejudice, <i>Maxim Integrated Prods., Inc. v. Navy Fed. Credit Union</i> , Civil Action No. 5:14-cv 01032-XR (W.D. Tex. May. 18, 2015)
Exhibit 2002	Confidential Settlement Agreement between Maxim Integrated Products and Navy Federal Credit Union
Exhibit 2003	Disclaimer in Patent Under 37 CFR 1.321(a), U.S. Pat. No. 5,940,510, cl. 2 (08/594,975 Jun. 19, 2015)
Exhibit 2004	U.S. Patent No. 5,805,702 to Curry et al.

# 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.