

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

GOOGLE INC.,

Petitioner

v.

AT HOME BONDHOLDERS' LIQUIDATING TRUST,

Patent Owner.

---

Case CBM2016-00036

U.S. Patent No. 6,286,045

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

**PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b)**

## Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	The 045 Patent .....	4
III.	The 045 Patent is not eligible for review under Section 18 of the AIA.....	9
A.	The 045 Patent is not a Covered Business Method Patent.....	10
1.	The claims of the 045 Patent are not directed to “the practice, administration, or management of a financial product or service” .....	10
2.	The disclosed applications to the advertising industry in the specification do not make the claims subject to CBMR .....	16
3.	Even if the claims were limited to advertising, advertising is not a financial product or service .....	22
B.	The 045 Patent is directed to a “technological invention”.....	22
1.	Considered as a whole, the 045 Patent claims recite novel and unobvious technological features.....	23
2.	The 045 Patent solves a technical problem using a technical solution .....	28
IV.	The claims of the 045 Patent are patent-eligible under Section 101 .....	31
A.	The 045 Patent is not directed to an “abstract idea” .....	33
B.	The claims of the 045 Patent recite an inventive concept that ensures the claims are more than an abstract idea itself .....	41
V.	The claims of the 045 Patent are not invalid under Section 112.....	43

A.	The PTAB already considered indefiniteness when it largely rejected Google’s <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Petition on this same patent last year.....	43
B.	The “intended to” language in the claims is not “impermissibly subjective” .....	45
1.	Courts and the Patent Office have found “intended to” and similar phrases to be valid and not indefinite .....	45
2.	Google’s own expert has used “intended to prevent caching” in a technical proposal to the Internet Engineering Task Force .....	48
3.	The “intended to” language describes, with reasonable certainty, the scope of the invention .....	49
4.	The examiner approved the “intended to” language during the prosecution of the 045 Patent .....	50
C.	The “best suited” language is not “impermissibly subjective” .....	52
VI.	Conclusion .....	55

**Table of Exhibits**

<b>AHBLT-(Exhibit #)</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>2001</b>	Declaration of Kevin C. Almeroth
<b>2002</b>	<i>Curriculum Vitae</i> of Professor Kevin C. Almeroth

**Table of Authorities**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Federal Cases</b>	
<i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int'l</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Ass'n for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc.</i> , 133 S. Ct. 2107 (2013).....	32
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 561 U.S. 593 (2010).....	32, 34
<i>BioSig Instruments, Inc. v. Nautilus, Inc.</i> , 783 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	46, 49
<i>BMC Software, Inc. v. ServiceNow, Inc.</i> , No. 14-903, 2015 WL 4776970 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 13, 2015) .....	54
<i>Caron v. QuicKutz, Inc.</i> , No. 09-02600, 2012 WL 5053232 (D. Ariz. Oct. 16, 2012) .....	47
<i>DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.</i> , 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Diamond v. Diehr</i> , 450 U.S. 175 (1981).....	34
<i>Enfish LLC v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , No. 2015-1244, slip op. (Fed. Cir. May 12, 2016).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	23
<i>Mayo Collaborative. Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.</i> , 132 S. Ct. 1289 (2012).....	32
<i>Mowry v. Whitney</i> , 81 U.S. 620 (1871).....	46, 54

# 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.