

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Twilio Inc.
Petitioner

v.

TeleSign Corporation
Patent Owner

Patent No. 9,300,792
(filed April 3, 2015, issued March 29, 2016)

Title: REGISTRATION, VERIFICATION AND NOTIFICATION SYSTEM

Covered Business Method Review No. 2016-00099

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Table of Contents

1.	Argument Summary.....	1
2.	Background.....	2
3.	Matters Involving Related Patents.....	3
4.	The '792 patent.	4
	4(A). Background and context.....	4
	4(B). Technical Problems Addressed.	5
	4(C). Technical Solutions Provided.....	7
5.	Claim Construction.....	9
	5(A). “notification event”	9
	5(B). “verifying the telephone number”	9
6.	Identification of the Disclaimed Claims and the “Remaining Claims.”	10
7.	Legal Authority regarding the Finance-Related Requirement.	11
	7(A). The Board’s decision should not be based on disclaimed claims.....	11
	7(B). Petitioner bears the burden of demonstrating that a patent is a CBM patent, and whether that burden was carried can be the Board’s sole focus.	12
	7(C). Determining whether a patent is a CBM patent turns on analyzing the “claims” in view of AIA § 18(d)(1).....	13
	7(D). CBM review is not available for patents that claim generally useful technologies, and the Board may not rely on a standard to determine whether a patent is CBM patent based on claimed activity being merely “incidental to” or “complementary to” a financial activity.....	14
	7(D)(1). The lack of explicit or inherent finance-related terminology or limitations favors denying institution.	15
	7(D)(2). Denying institution is proper where the claim limitations alone are not finance-related.....	15

7(D)(3). CBM review should not be instituted on patents applicable in both commercial and non-commercial contexts.	16
7(E). A “financial product or service” involves an agreement stipulating the movement of money or the way money is handled.	17
7(F). Conferring a financial benefit is not sufficient to render patents eligible for CBM review.	17
7(G). Non-limiting examples in the specification are not sufficient to convert claims of general applicability into finance-related claims.....	18
7(H). Proposing claim constructions that are not financial in nature weighs against finding that the claims are eligible for CBM review.	20
7(I). The Board may not base its institution decision on arguments or evidence not raised by Petitioner or not properly in the Petition.....	21
8. Petitioner has not carried its burden to show that the claimed subject matter is sufficiently finance-related to be eligible for CBM review.....	22
8(A). Petitioner has failed to carry its burden because its analysis is based on a standard rejected by the Federal Circuit.....	22
8(B). Petitioner has not shown that the claims are sufficiently finance related.	24
8(C). Disclaimed claims 5 & 14 and 7 & 16 may not serve as a proper basis for CBM review.	27
8(C)(1). Not even disclaimed claims 5 & 14 would have rendered the ’792 patent eligible for CBM review.....	27
8(C)(2). Not even disclaimed claims 7 and 16 would have rendered the ’792 patent eligible for CBM review.....	28
8(D). The recited terms “service” and “notification event” are not finance-related.	29
8(D)(1). Petitioner has not shown that “service” is restricted to financial services; rather, it is general in nature.	30

8(D)(2). Petitioner has not shown that “notification event” is restricted to financial services and not general in nature.....	31
9. Affirmative argument: the non-disclaimed claims are not sufficiently finance-related for the ’792 patent to be eligible for CBM review.....	34
9(A). The Board should not consider disclaimed claims when deciding whether to institute CBM review.	35
9(B). The non-disclaimed claims are of general utility, making the ’792 patent ineligible for CBM review.	35
9(C). The lack of explicit or inherent finance-related terminology or limitations favors denying institution.....	37
9(D). The fact that the claims alone are not finance-related favors denying institution.....	38
9(E). Because the invention is not limited to a financial context, institution should be denied.....	39
9(F). The non-disclaimed claims do not sufficiently relate to a “financial product or service” and are not directed to the movement or handling of money, indicating that the ’792 patent is not a CBM patent.....	40
9(G). The specification confirms that any financial applicability mentioned is in the context of non-limiting examples, insufficient to qualify the ’792 patent for CBM review.....	41
9(H). Petitioner’s own assertions and proposed construction(s) undermine its insinuation that a “service” or “notification event” is inherently financially related.	43
9(I). Petitioner does not contend that the accused products and services are finance-related.	45
10. Legal Authority on the “Technological Invention” requirement.	45
10(A). Patents directed to technological inventions are not eligible for CBM review.	45
10(B). Petitioner bears the burden of showing that the ’792	

patent is not directed to a technological invention.....	45
10(C). A Petition’s failure to analyze express claim elements indicates that Petitioner did not sufficiently show that the claimed subject matter “as a whole” recites a technological feature.....	46
10(D). The Petition must adequately demonstrate the claimed subject matter does not solve a technical problem using a technical solution.....	47
10(E).A petition’s arguments from its obviousness case are insufficient to carry the petitioner’s burden on the technological-invention inquiry.	47
11. Petitioner has not met its burden to show that the non-disclaimed claims are not directed to a technological invention.....	48
11(A). The Petition’s first-prong deficiency: CBM review should be denied because the Petition does not sufficiently analyze the claims “as a whole” as required.	49
11(B). The Petition’s second-prong deficiency: Petitioner does not sufficiently show that the Remaining Claims are not directed to solving a technical problem.	53
12. Affirmative argument: the non-disclaimed claims are directed to a “technological invention,” and thus, ineligible for CMB review.....	55
12(A). In the ’792 patent, the claimed subject matter as a whole recites a technological feature that is novel and unobvious over the prior art.	56
12(B). In the ’792 patent, the claimed subject matter as a whole solves a technical problem using a technical solution.	59
12(B)(1). Problem.....	59
12(B)(2). Solution.....	60
13. Twilio has failed to carry its burden to show that the claims are directed to patent-ineligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101.	65
13(A). Background	65

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.