By: Reza Mollaaghababa, Reg. No. 43,810 George S. Haight IV, Reg. No. 54,146 Pepper Hamilton LLP 125 High Street 19th Floor High Street Tower Boston, MA 02110 (617) 204-5165 (telephone) (617) 204-5150 (facsimile)

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE INC., Petitioner v.

LOCATIONET SYSTEMS LTD
Patent Owner

Case No. CBM2016-00062 Patent 6,771,970

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.207(a) AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.300(a)



TABLE OF CONTENTS

			P	age(s)
Table	of Au	thoriti	es	iii
Table	of Ex	hibits.		vi
I.	INTR	ODU	CTION	1
II.	ALLEGED GROUNDS			2
	A.	Requi	irements for Covered Business Method Review	2
	B.	Alleg	ed Grounds of Invalidity	3
III.	TECH	HNICA	AL OVERVIEW OF THE '970 PATENT	4
IV.	LITIC	GATIC	ON AND PTAB HISTORY OF '970 PATENT	8
V.	LEVE	EL OF	ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	9
VI.	LEGA	AL ST	ANDARD	10
VII.			S NOT SUBJECT TO CONSIDERATION OF MEETING REQUIREMENTS	12
VIII.				13
	A.		Of The Alleged CBM Claims Is Directed To A Financial act Or Service	14
		1.	Claims 14-17 and 19 are completely devoid of any terms having any particular relation to a financial product or service	15
		2.	The Petition's analysis of claim 4, and its reliance on that analysis in connection with claims 14-17 and 19, is similarly flawed	28
	B.	The '970 Patent Falls Within The Technological Invention Exception		33
		1.	The Petition fails to establish that any claim is not directed to a technological feature that is novel and unobvious	34
		2.	The Petition fails to establish that any claim does not provide a technological solution to a technological problem	49



CBM2016-00062 U.S. Patent No. 6,771,970

	3.	The Petition fails to demonstrate that every claim of the		
		'970 Patent is <i>not</i> directed to a technological invention	56	
IX.	CONCLUS	ION	59	



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES	age(s)
Apple, Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc., CBM2015-00046, Paper 12 (PTAB Jun. 3, 2015)	36
AT&T Mobility LLC, v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC, CBM2015-00185, Paper 10 (PTAB May 4, 2016)p	oassim
Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc., 815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. Mar. 1, 2016)	20-22
CoreLogic Inc. v. Boundary Solutions, Inc., CBM2016-00016, Paper 9 (PTAB May 24, 2016)p	passim
Crandon v. United States, 494 U.S. 152 (1990)	57
Conn. Nat'l Bank v. Germain, 503 U.S. 249 (1992)	57
Duncan v. Walker, 533 U.S. 167 (2001)	57
E*Trade Fin. Corp. v. Droplets, Inc., CBM2014-00123, Paper 15 (PTAB Oct. 30, 2014)	12, 47
Emnos USA Corp. v. Dunnhumby Ltd, CBM2015-00116, Paper 8 (PTAB Nov. 10, 2015)	45, 49
Experian Marketing Solutions, Inc. v. Rpost Communications Ltd., CBM2014-00010, Paper 20 (PTAB Apr. 22, 2014)	48
FedEx Corp. v. Ronald A. Katz Tech. Licensing, L.P., CBM2015-00053, Paper 9 (PTAB Jun. 29, 2015)	26, 27
Google Inc. v. SimpleAir, Inc., CBM2015-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB May 19, 2015)	19, 24
Google Inc. v. Unwired Planet, LLC, CBM2014-00004, Paper 8 (PTAB Apr. 8, 2014)	20, 21
Great West Casualty Company v. Intellectual Ventures II, CBM2015-00171, Paper 10 (PTAB Feb. 9, 2016)	12



Guinn v. Kopf, 96 F.3d 1419 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	13
J.P. Morgan Chase v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC, CBM2014-00160, Paper 11 (PTAB Jan. 29, 2015)	11, 32
Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co., CBM2012-00004, Paper 10 (PTAB Jan. 29, 2015)	38
Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co., CBM2012-00002, Paper 66 (PTAB Jan. 23, 2014)	57, 58
Old Republic Gen. Ins. Group, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC, CBM2015-00184, Paper 7 (PTAB Apr. 7, 2016)	37
Par Pharm. Inc. et al. v. Jazz Pharm., Inc., CBM2014-00149, Paper 12 (PTAB Jan. 13, 2015)	19, 24
PNC Financial Services Group, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC, CBM2014-00032, Paper 13 (PTAB May 22, 2014)19, 24,	25, 27
PNC Bank, NA v. Parus Holdings, Inc., CBM2015-00110, Paper 10 (PTAB Nov. 9, 2015)	25, 26
PNC Bank, NA v. Parus Holdings, Inc., CBM2015-00150, Paper 10 (PTAB Nov. 9, 2015)	25, 26
Qualtrics, LLC v. OpinionLab, Inc., CBM2015-00164, Paper 8 (PTAB Feb. 3, 2016)	15, 25
Salesforce.com, Inc. v. Applications in Internet Time LLC, CBM2014-00162, Paper 11 (PTAB Feb. 2, 2015)	19, 24
ServiceNow, Inc. v. BMC Software, Inc., CBM2015-00107, Paper 12 (PTAB Sep. 11, 2015)	20
ServiceNow, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard, Co., CBM2015-00108, Paper 10 (PTAB Oct. 7, 2015)p	oassim
Sorenson v. Secretary of the Treasury, 475 U. S. 851 (1986)	58



DOCKET

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.

