

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

Ocean Tomo, LLC,  
Petitioner

v.

Patent Ratings, LLC,  
Patent Owner

---

Patent No. 9,075,849

Filing Date: July 22, 2014

Issue Date: July 7, 2015

Title: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR PROBABILISTICALLY QUANTIFYING  
AND VISUALIZING RELEVANCE BETWEEN TWO OR MORE  
CITATIONALLY OR CONTEXTUALLY RELATED DATA OBJECTS

---

Case CBM: Unassigned

---

**Mail Stop *PATENT BOARD***  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S.P.T.O.  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT REVIEW OF  
U.S. PATENT NO. 9,075,849 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 321 AND § 18 OF THE  
LEAHY-SMITH AMERICA INVENTS ACT**

Covered Business Method Patent Review

U.S. Patent No. 9,075,849

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 321 and § 18 of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (“AIA”)<sup>1</sup> and pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.300 et seq., the undersigned hereby requests transitional covered business method post-grant review of claims 1–20 of U.S. Patent No. 9,075,849 (the “’849 Patent,” attached as Petition Exhibit 1001), which issued to Jonathan A. Barney on July 7, 2015 and is assigned to PatentRatings, LLC according to the records of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.<sup>2</sup>

Electronic payments in the amount of \$12,000 for the Covered Business Method Patent Review fee specified by 37 C.F.R. § 42.15(b)(1) and \$18,000 for the Covered Business Method Patent Review Post-Institution fee specified by 37 C.F.R. § 42.15(b)(2) are being paid at the time of the filing this petition (for a total payment of \$30,000). The Office is hereby authorized to charge any further fees required by this petition, or to credit any overpayments or refunds, to Deposit Account No. 22-0259.

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 18 of the AIA has not been codified, but it appears in 125 Stat. at 329–31.

<sup>2</sup> See assignment recorded at Reel/Frame No. 034043 / 0389.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
A. Background of the Petitioner and the Patent Owner .....	1
B. Recent Changes to the Law of Patent Eligibility .....	2
C. The '849 Patent.....	3
II. GROUNDS FOR STANDING .....	5
A. At Least One Challenged Claim Is Unpatentable .....	5
B. Claims 1–20 Are Directed to a Covered Business Method.....	5
C. Claims 1-20 Are Not a “Technological Invention” (37 C.F.R. § 42.301(b) (2012)) .....	8
D. Petitioner Has Standing under AIA 18(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.302.....	11
E. Real Party-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)) .....	17
F. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)) .....	18
G. Designation of Lead and Back-up Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)) .....	18
H. Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4)).....	18
III. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUEST FOR EACH CLAIM CHALLENGED.....	19
A. Claims for Which Review Is Requested.....	19
B. Statutory Grounds for Challenge.....	19
C. Claim Construction .....	19
IV. CLAIMS 1-20 ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101.....	21
A. The Legal Standard for Patent Eligibility under 35 U.S.C. § 101.....	21

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

(continued)

**Page**

B. The '849 Patent Claims Are Directed to Abstract Ideas .....27

V. CONCLUSION .....40

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### *Cases*

<i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank International</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....	passim
<i>Altvater v. Freeman</i> , 319 U.S. 359 (1943) .....	12
<i>American Express Co. v. Metasearch Sys., LLC</i> , Paper 70 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 13, 2015) .....	25, 26
<i>Ass’n for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc.</i> , 569 U.S. ___,133 S. Ct. 2107 (2013).....	2
<i>Bascom Research, LLC v. Facebook, Inc.</i> , No. 3-12-cv-06293, 2015 WL 149480 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 5, 2015, Order).....	23
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 561 U.S. 593 (2010) .....	passim
<i>BRCA1— &amp; BRCA2—Based Hereditary Cancer Test Patent Litig.</i> , 774 F.3d 755 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	23
<i>buySAFE, Inc. v. Google, Inc.</i> , 765 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	23, 24, 35
<i>CRS Advanced Techs., Inc. v. Frontline Techs., Inc.</i> , No. CBM2012-00005, Paper 66 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 21, 2014) .....	23
<i>Cummins, Inc. v. Tas Distributing Co., Inc.</i> , 700 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	12
<i>CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	28, 36
<i>Data Distribution Techs. v. Brer Affiliates</i> , Case No. 12-4878 (JBS/KMW), 2014 WL 4162765 (D.N.J. Aug. 19, 2014)....	36
<i>DDR Holdings LLC v. HotelsCom LP</i> , 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	10, 11
<i>Diamond v. Chakrabarty</i> , 447 U.S. 303 (1980) .....	21
<i>Diamond v. Diehr</i> , 450 U.S. 175 (1981) .....	21
<i>DietGoal Innovations LLC v. Bravo Media LLC</i> , 33 F. Supp. 3d 271 (S.D.N.Y. 2014).....	28, 36, 38
<i>Digitech Image Techs., LLC v. Elecs. for Imaging, Inc.</i> , 758 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	36
<i>Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 56 F. Supp. 3d 1167 (C.D. Cal. 2014).....	23

# 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.