

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

SMARTFLASH LLC,

Patent Owner.

Case CBM2015-00129

Patent 7,942,317 B2

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS5

III. THE TYGAR DECLARATION SHOULD BE GIVEN LITTLE OR NO WEIGHT5

 A. Dr. Tygar Admits that His Opinions Are Not Legal Opinions5

 B. No Evidentiary Standard Is Disclosed in the Tygar Declaration6

 C. There Is No Assurance That Dr. Tygar’s Methodology Is Reliable7

IV. OVERVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,942,31711

 A. Overview of the Technology of the Patent11

 B. Claim Construction14

V. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OF THE ‘317 PATENT ARE NOT DIRECTED TO A FINANCIAL PRODUCT OR SERVICE15

VI. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OF THE ‘317 PATENT ARE TECHNOLOGICAL INVENTIONS EXEMPT FROM CBM REVIEW20

VII. CLAIMS 7 AND 12 OF THE ‘317 PATENT ARE NOT DIRECTED TO AN ABSTRACT IDEA22

VIII. EVEN IF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OF THE ‘317 PATENT WERE DIRECTED TO AN ABSTRACT IDEA, THE CLAIMS ARE DIRECTED TO STATUTORY SUBJECT MATTER.....26

 A. The Two-Part Test for Statutory Subject Matter26

 B. Petitioner Cannot Meet Its Burden Of Proving That Claims 7 And 12 Do Not Amount To Significantly More Than A Patent Upon The Abstract Idea Itself27

C.	The Claims Are Statutory Under <i>Mayo</i> and <i>Alice</i>	29
D.	Claims 7 and 12 In Practice Amount To Significantly More Than A Patent Upon The Abstract Idea Itself	38
1.	Evidence Shows That Claims 7 and 12 Do Not Amount To A Patent On The Abstract Idea Of Controlling Access To Something Based On One Or More Conditions (Such As Payment)	38
2.	The Existence Of Alternative Technologies That Control Access Based On Payment Outside The Scope Of Claims 7 and 12 Show The Claims Do Not Amount To A Patent On The Abstract Idea Of Controlling Access Based On One Or More Conditions (Such As Payment)	42
E.	Claims 7 and 12 Do Not Result In Inappropriate Preemption	43
IX.	A FEDERAL COURT HAS ALREADY FOUND RELATED CLAIMS OF THE ‘317 PATENT TO BE STATUTORY UNDER § 101	46
X.	THE USPTO IS ESTOPPED FROM REVISITING THE ISSUE OF WHETHER THE CLAIMS ARE DIRECTED TO STATUTORY SUBJECT MATTER	47
XI.	INVALIDATING PATENT CLAIMS VIA CBM REVIEW IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL	48
XII.	SECTION 101 IS NOT A GROUND THAT MAY BE RAISED IN COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT REVIEW	50
XIII.	CONCLUSION	53

PATENT OWNER'S LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit Number	Exhibit Description
2001	Congressional Record - House, June 23, 2011, H4480-4505
2002	Congressional Record - Senate, Sep. 8, 2011, S5402-5443
2003-2048	Reserved
2049	Report and Recommendation (on Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment of Invalidity Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 101), from <i>Smartflash LLC et al. v. Apple, Inc., et al.</i> , Case No. 6:13-CV-447 (E.D. Tex.) and <i>Smartflash LLC et al. v. Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd, et al.</i> , Case No. 6:13-CV-448 (E.D. Tex.), dated Jan. 21, 2015
2050	Order adopting Report and Recommendation (on Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment of Invalidity Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 101), from <i>Smartflash LLC et al. v. Apple, Inc., et al.</i> , Case No. 6:13-CV-447 (E.D. Tex.) and <i>Smartflash LLC et al. v. Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd, et al.</i> , Case No. 6:13-CV-448 (E.D. Tex.), dated Feb. 13, 2015
2051-2067	Reserved
2068	Deposition Transcript of Anthony J. Wechselberger dated May 28, 2015 taken in CBM2015-00015, -00016, -00017 and -00018
2069-2074	Reserved

Exhibit Number	Exhibit Description
2075	Order (on Defendants' Renewed Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law on the Issue of § 101 under Rule 50(b)); Dkt. # 585; from <i>Smartflash LLC, et al. v. Apple Inc., et al.</i> , Case No. 6:13-CV-447 (E.D. Tex.) dated July 8, 2015.
2076	Deposition Transcript of Anthony J. Wechselberger dated July 22, 2015 taken in CBM2015-00028, -00029, -00031, -00032 and -00033
2077-2091	Reserved
2092	Declaration of Emily E. Toohey in Support of Patent Owner's Preliminary Response
2093-2104	Reserved
2105	Transcript of Deposition of Justin Douglas Tygar, Ph.D. dated January 19, 2016 taken in CBM2015-00126 and -00129
2106	Reserved
2107	Declaration of Emily E. Toohey in Support of Patent Owner's Response

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.