# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

\_\_\_\_\_

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC., Petitioner

v.

SMARTFLASH LLC, Patent Owner

Case CBM2015-00124 Patent 7,942,317

Before the Honorable JENNIFER S. BISK, RAMA G. ELLURU, JEREMY M. PLENZLER, and MATTHEW R. CLEMENTS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

### PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE



## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	INTF	RODU	CTIO]	N	1		
II.	THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE NOT § 101 PATENT ELIGIBLE						
	A.	Mayo Step 1: PO Fails To Rebut Apple's Showing That The Challenged Claims Are Directed To An Abstract Idea					
	B.	2: PO Fails To Rebut Apple's Showing That The Claims Have No Inventive Concept	6				
		1. PO Fails To Identify Any Inventive Concept					
		2.	The <i>DDR</i> Claims Are Not Analogous To The Challenged Claims				
			a)	The Challenged Claims Neither Address an Internet-Specific Problem Nor "Override" Routine and Conventional Computer Action	13		
			b)	The Challenged Claims Do Not "Parallel" the DDR Claims	15		
		3.		Challenged Claims Are Analogous To Those Held gible	16		
	C.	PO's	Preen	nption Arguments Are Misplaced	17		
III.	CLA	IM 19	IS IN	DEFINITE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2	19		
IV.	PO'S OTHER ARGUMENTS ARE IRRELEVANT TO THE MERITS						
	A.	Dr. Kelly's Unrebutted Expert Opinions Are Reliable And Entitled To Significant Weight					
	В.		_	ments Regarding The Board's Ability To Review nged Claims Are Unfounded	22		
		1.	Nor	her The Constitution, The '317 Patent's Prosecution, The AIA Prohibits The Board From Considering § Here	22		
		2.		-Final District Court § 101 Determinations Are evant	23		



\_1

# CBM2015-00124 Patent 7,942,317 B2

C.	The '317 Patent Is A Covered Business Method Patent				
	1.	The Federal Circuit Has Already Rejected PO's Proposed Interpretation Of Covered Business Method Patents	24		
	2.	The Board Correctly Determined That The '317 Patent Does Not Cover A Technological Invention	25		



## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

CASES	Page(s)
Accenture Global Servs., GmbH v. Guidewire Software, Inc., 728 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	passim
Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int'l, 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014)	
Ariosa Diagnostics, Inc. v. Sequenom, Inc., 788 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	18, 19, 21, 23
Arrhythmia Research Tech., Inc. v. Corazonix Corp., 958 F.2d 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	21, 24
Bancorp Servs., L.L.C. v. Sun Life Assurance Co. of Can., 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	passim
buySAFE, Inc. v. Google, Inc., 765 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	9, 17
Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, Nat 776 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	
CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc., 654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	3
DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P., 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	passim
Diamond v. Diehr, 450 U.S. 175 (1981)	19
Digitech Image Techs., LLC v. Elecs. for Imaging, Inc., 758 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	8
Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe, Inc., 424 F.3d 1276 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	22



# CBM2015-00124 Patent 7,942,317 B2

Ethicon, Inc. v. Quigg, 849 F.2d 1422 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	23, 24
Fresenius USA, Inc. v. Baxter Int'l, Inc., 721 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	23
Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63 (1972)	14
Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Capital One Bank (USA), 792 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	.3, 7, 8, 14
Internet Patents Corp. v. Active Network, Inc., 790 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	3, 8
Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc., 132 S. Ct. 1289 (2012)	passim
McCormick Harvesting Mach. Co. v. Aultman, 169 U.S. 606 (1898)	22
MCM Portfolio LLC v. Hewlett-Packard Co., No. 15-1091, 2015 WL 7755665 (Fed. Cir. Dec. 2, 2015)	2, 22
Mortgage Grader, Inc. v. First Choice Loan Servs. Inc., 811 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	17
OIP Techs., Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc., 788 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	passim
Research Corp. Techs., Inc. v. Microsoft Corp., 627 F.3d 859 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	
SightSound Techs., LLC v. Apple Inc., Nos. 15-1159, -1160, slip op. (Fed. Cir. Dec. 15, 2015)	24
SmartGene, Inc. v. Advanced Biological Labs., SA, 555 F. App'x 950 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	7
Suffolk Techs., LLC v. AOL Inc., 752 F 3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	22



# 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.

