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 CBM2015-00101 Patent 6,105,013

PATENT OWNER'S
REQUEST FOR REHEARING OF DECISION INSTITUTING
COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT REVIEW



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ΤΉ	ED	ECISION MISAPPREHENDED AIA § 18'S REQUIREMENT		
TH	AT	A CBM PATENT IS "A PATENT THAT <i>CLAIMS</i> A METHOD		
OR	\mathbf{CC}	ORRESPONDING APPARATUS <i>FOR</i> PERFORMING		
OP	ERA	ATIONS USED IN THE PRACTICE, ADMINISTRATION, OR		
MA	ANA	GEMENT OF A FINANCIAL PRODUCT OR SERVICE"	3	
A.	Th	e Board Relied On The Specification, Rather Than The Claims	5	
B.	The Statute Requires That The Patent Claim An Invention			
	" F	or" Operations "Used In Financial Products Or Services," Not		
	Μe	erely "Encompassing" Such Operations	7	
C.	Th	e Board Improperly Rejected The "Technological Invention"		
	Ex	ception 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	
CC	NC	LUSION	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)
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), reh'g & reh'g en banc denied (Fed. Cir. Oct. 15, 2015)
Wilson Sporting Goods Co. v. Hillerich & Bradsby Co., 442 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2006)
Administrative Determinations
Fairchild Semiconductor Corp. v. In-Depth Test LLC, CBM2015-00060, Paper 11 (PTAB Aug. 3, 2015)
Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co., CBM2012-00003, Paper 15 (PTAB Feb. 12, 2013)
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)
Statutes
Leahy-Smith America Invents Act of 2011, Pub. L. No. 112-29, 125 Stat. 284, 327, § 14
Leahy-Smith America Invents Act of 2011, Pub. L. No. 112-29, 125 Stat. 284, 327, § 14(a)



Leahy-Smith America Invents Act of 2011, Pub. L. No. 112-29, 125 Stat. 284, 330, § 18
Leahy-Smith America Invents Act of 2011, Pub. L. No. 112-29, 125 Stat. 284, 330, § 18(a)(1)(E)
Leahy-Smith America Invents Act of 2011, Pub. L. No. 112-29, 125 Stat. 284, 331, § 18(d)(1)
Regulations and Rulemaking
37 C.F.R. § 42.207(c)
USPTO Guidance Document, "Tax Strategies Training Examples," www.uspto.gov "Patents Examination Area" (last visited Sep. 28, 2015)10
USPTO Patent And Trademark Appeal Board, Standard Operating Procedure No. 1 (rev. 14)
USPTO, Amendments to the Rules of Practice; Proposed Rules, 80 Fed. Reg. 50,719 et seq. (Aug. 20, 2015)
USPTO, Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (9th Ed. Mar. 2014) § 2124.019
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 \$1363 (daily ed Mar & 2011) (Statement of Sen Schumer) 15



EXHIBIT LIST			
Exhibit 2001	Order of Dismissal With Prejudice, <i>Maxim Integrated Prods.</i> , <i>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. 6,105,013, cls. 7, 14, 16 (09/041,190 Jul. 6, 2015)		
Exhibit 2004	U.S. Patent No. 5,805,702 to Curry et al.		
Exhibit 2005	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 2006	Restriction Requirement, U.S. Patent No. 5,805,702 (08/595,014 Jul. 21, 1997)		
Exhibit 2007	Originally-filed claims, U.S. Patent No. 5,805,702 (08/595,014 Jan. 31, 1996)		
Exhibit 2008	Hearing Transcript, In re Maxim Integrated Products, Inc., Misc. No. 12-244 (MDL No. 2354) (W.D. Pa. Mar. 20, 2013) (excerpt)		
Exhibit 2009	Declaration of Nathan Lowenstein in support of Patent Owner Maxim Integrated Products, Inc.'s Motion For Pro Hac Vice Admission Of Nathan Lowenstein Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c)		



DOCKET

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.

