

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE INC. and GOOGLE, Inc.,  
Petitioner,

v.

SMARTFLASH LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case CBM2015-00133<sup>1</sup>

Patent 8,336,772 B2

---

**PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR REHEARING**

---

<sup>1</sup> Google's challenge to claims 9 and 21 based on 35 U.S.C. § 101 in CBM2015-00132 was consolidated with this proceeding. Paper 10.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED .....	3
II.	BACKGROUND .....	3
III.	ARGUMENT .....	4
A.	The Challenged Claims Are Patent Eligible Because They Are Similar to the Claims in <i>DDR Holdings</i> , <i>Enfish</i> , and <i>BASCOM</i> .....	5
B.	The Challenged Claims Are Patent Eligible Because They Are Similar to the Claims in <i>McRO</i> and <i>Amdocs</i> .....	11
1.	The Challenged Claims Are Similar to the Claims in <i>McRO</i> ...	11
2.	The Challenged Claims Are Similar to the Claims in <i>Amdocs</i> .	13
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	15

Patent Owner Smartflash LLC files this Request for Rehearing pursuant to 37 CFR § 42.71. The Board’s final written decision (Paper 38) finding claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9, 11-13, 15-18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27-29, 31, and 33-36 (“the challenged claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 8,336,772 (“the ‘772 Patent”) to be unpatentable misapprehends and overlooks the Supreme Court’s and Federal Circuit’s guidance on patent eligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101, the Federal Circuit’s most recent decisions clarifying patent eligible subject matter, and Smartflash’s arguments as to the eligibility of the challenged claims.

The Federal Circuit has made clear that while “the analysis [for patent eligible subject matter] presumably would be based on a generally-accepted and understood *definition* of, or test for, what an ‘abstract idea’ encompasses,” “a search for a single test or definition in the decided cases concerning § 101 from [the Federal Circuit], and indeed from the Supreme Court, reveals that at present there is no such single, succinct, usable definition or test.” *Amdocs (Israel) Limited v. Openet Telecom, Inc.*, 2016 WL 6440387, at \*4 (Fed. Cir. November 1, 2016). In the absence of such a generally accepted definition or test, the Federal Circuit approach is to use the “classic common law methodology” of “examin[ing] earlier cases in which a similar or parallel descriptive nature can be seen—what prior cases were about, and which way they were decided.” *Id.* This is the approach taken by Smartflash – comparing the challenged claims to, among other

cases, *DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.*, 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (Paper 21 at 26-56); *Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.*, 822 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (Paper 33 at 1-3); and *BASCOM Global Internet Services, Inc. v. AT&T Mobility LLC*, 827 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (Paper 33 at 3-5).

The challenged claims are directed to a novel content delivery system for distributing digital content over the Internet solving the problem of Internet data piracy. The Board misapprehended how the challenged claims are subject matter eligible as: being “necessarily rooted in computer technology in order to overcome a problem specifically arising in the realm of computer networks” (*DDR Holdings*, 773 F.3d at 1257); teaching “an improvement to computer functionality itself.” (*Enfish*, 822 F.3d at 1336); and “representing a ‘software-based invention[ ] that improve[s] the performance of the computer system itself.’” *BASCOM*, 827 F.3d at 1351.

Moreover, the Board overlooked recent Federal Circuit decisions in *McRO, Inc. v. Bandai Namco Games America Inc.*, 837 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. September 13, 2016) and *Amdocs*, where the Federal Circuit found claims similar to the challenged claims to be patent eligible.

## I. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED

Patent Owner requests that the Board reverse its original decision (Paper 38, November 10, 2016) and hold that challenged claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9, 11-13, 15-18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27-29, 31, and 33-36 of the ‘772 Patent are patent eligible.

## II. BACKGROUND

Distribution of digital content over the Internet “introduces a problem that does not arise” with content distributed on physical media. *DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.*, 773 F.3d 1245, 1258 (Fed. Cir. 2014). By the late 1990s, improved data compression and increasing bandwidth for Internet access enabled content providers, for the first time, to offer content data for purchase over the Internet; at the same time, unprotected data files could be easily pirated and made available “essentially world-wide.” Ex. 1001, 1:32-52. Conventional operation of the Internet does not solve the problem of data piracy: on the contrary, the Internet facilitates the distribution of data without restriction or protection. *Id.* 1:52-58.

Content providers faced piracy before—a CD can be copied onto another CD and the pirated copy sold—but the problem presented by distribution of pirated content over the Internet was unprecedented. There had never before been a way to make free, identical, and flawless copies of physical media available to millions of people instantaneously at virtually no incremental cost. *See generally Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd.*, 545 U.S. 913, 929-30 (2005). The

# 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.