

Patent No. 6,918,082
Petition For Covered Business Method Patent Review

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Intralinks, Inc.
Petitioner

v.

Lone Star Document Management, LLC
Patent Owner

Patent No. 6,918,082
Issue Date: July 12, 2005
Title: ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT PROOFING SYSTEM

Covered Business Method Review No. _____

**PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD REVIEW
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 321 AND § 18 OF THE LEAHY-SMITH
AMERICA INVENTS ACT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. NOTICES AND STATEMENTS	2
III. SUMMARY OF THE '082 PATENT.....	6
IV. GROUNDS FOR STANDING AND CBM ELIGIBILITY	9
A. Intralinks Has Standing To File This CBM Petition.....	9
B. The '082 Patent Is Eligible for CBM Review.....	12
1. Claim 10 is incidental and complementary to a financial activity.....	13
2. Claim 10 does not recite a technological invention.....	16
a. Claim 10 does not recite a technological invention that is novel and non-obvious.....	17
b. Claim 10 does not solve a technical problem using a technical solution	24
V. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE.....	26
A. Claims 1-21 Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 101	26
1. The Supreme Court has set forth a two-step test for determining whether or not a patent claim is directed to statutory subject matter	26
2. The claims of the '082 patent are directed to non-statutory subject matter because they recite 1) abstract ideas, with 2) a generic computer implementation.....	30
a. Representative independent claim 10 is invalid.....	31
b. Independent claims 1, 17, and 21 are invalid	33
c. Dependent claims 2-9, 11-16 and 18-20 are invalid	34
VI. CONCLUSION	35

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Alice Corporation Pty, Ltd. v. CLS Bank International</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....	27, 29
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 561 U.S. 593 (2010).....	25, 26
<i>Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.</i> , 776 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	27, 29
<i>Fidelity Nat’l Info. Servs., Inc., v. Checkfree Corp.</i> , No. CBM2013-00030, Paper 51 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 22, 2014).....	24
<i>Google Inc. v. Better Food Choices LLC</i> , No. CBM2015-00071, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 20, 2015)	13
<i>Hawaiian Telecom, Inc. v. Broadband iTV, Inc.</i> , No. CBM2014-00189, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 1, 2015).....	13
<i>Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Acceleron, LLC</i> , 587 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	10
<i>Indeed, Inc. v. Career Destination Dev., LLC</i> , No. CBM2014-00068, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 20, 2014)	13
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Capital One Bank (USA)</i> , 792 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	27
<i>Internet Patents Corp. v. Active Network, Inc.</i> , 790 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	28
<i>Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.</i> , No. CBM2012-00002, Paper 66 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 23, 2014).....	11
<i>Mayo Collaborative Services v. Prometheus Laboratories, Inc.</i> , 132 S. Ct. 1289 (2012).....	26, 27

Medimmune, Inc., v Genentech, Inc., et al.,
549 U.S. 118 (2007).....10

Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc. v. Smartflash LLC.
No. CBM2014-00197, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 31, 2015)17

Sandisk Corp. v. STMicroelectronics, Inc.
480 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2007)10

SAP Am., Inc. v. Versata Software Inc.,
No. CBM 2012-00001, Paper 70 (P.T.A.B. June 11, 2013).....30

SAP Am., Inc. v. VersataDev. Grp., Inc.,
No. CBM2012-00001, Paper 36 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 9, 2013).....11, 12

Ultramercial, LLC v. Hulu, LLC,
772 F.3d 709 (Fed. Cir. 2014), *cert. denied*,
sub nom, WildTangent, Inc. v. Ultramercial, LLC,
135 S. Ct. 2907 (2015).....28

Versata Dev. Grp., Inc. v. SAP Am., Inc.,
793 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2015)28, 29

OTHER AUTHORITIES

37 C.F.R. § 42.30111

37 C.F.R. § 42.301(b)16

37 C.F.R. § 42.302(a).....8, 9, 11

AIA § 18(d)(2)15

Inter Partes, Post Grant, and Covered Business Method Review Final Rules,
77 Fed. Reg. 48,680 (Aug. 14, 2012)11

Office Patent Trial Practice Guide,
77 Fed. Reg. 48,756 (Aug. 14, 2012)16

Transitional Program for Covered Business Method
Patents—Definitions of Covered Business Method
Patent and Technological Invention,
77 Fed. Reg. 48,734 (Aug. 14, 2012).....12

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.