

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Broadsign International, LLC,

Petitioner

v.

T-Rex Property AB,

Patent Owner

U.S. Patent Number 6,430,603

Issue Date: August 6, 2002

Title: SYSTEM FOR DIRECT PLACEMENT OF COMMERCIAL
ADVERTISING, PUBLIC SERVICE ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND OTHER
CONTENT ON ELECTRONIC BILLBOARD DISPLAYS

Case Number: CBM2017-00008

PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD REVIEW

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 42.8(A)(1)..... 1

 A. Real Party-in-Interest Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)..... 1

 B. Related Matters Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)..... 1

 C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)..... 8

 D. Service Information 9

 E. Power of Attorney Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b)..... 9

III. PAYMENT OF FEES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.103 AND § 42.15(A)..... 9

IV. ELIGIBILITY FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD REVIEW 9

 A. Brief Summary of the Subject Matter of the '603 Patent..... 9

 1. Prosecution History of the '603 Patent..... 12

 2. Admitted Prior Art: U.S. Pat. No. 5,612,741 to Loban..... 13

 B. The '603 Patent Is Eligible For CBM..... 14

 C. The '603 Patent Claims Are Directed To A “Financial Activity” 16

 D. The '603 Patent Claims Are Not Directed To a “Technological
 Invention” 19

V. Petitioner Is Not Estopped From Challenging The '603 Patent
 and Has Standing 24

VI. LEVEL OF SKILL IN THE ART 29

VII. Claim Construction..... 29

VIII. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE..... 35

A. Ground 1: Claims 1, 11-13, 42-43, And 48-74 Are Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 As Being Directed To An Abstract Idea.....	36
1. The Law On Abstract Ideas.....	36
2. The Challenged Claims Are Directed To An Abstract Idea	38
3. The Challenged Claims Lack Any Inventive Concept.....	52
a. The Loban Reference Is A Prior-Art Admission And Evidence of No Inventive Concept	53
b. The Method Claims Lack An Inventive Concept	56
c. The System Claims Lack Any Inventive Concept.....	63
d. The Dependent Claims Lack Any Inventive Concept	73
B. Ground 2: Claims 1, 11, and 13 Are Unpatentable As Improper Means-Plus-Function Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 6 And Indefinite Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2.....	81
1. Claim 1 Is Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 2 As Indefinite Because The '603 Patent Specification Fails To Recite Any Corresponding Algorithms For The Computer-Implemented Functions	81
2. Claims 11 and 13 Are Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 2 As Indefinite Because The '603 Patent Specification Fails To Recite Any Corresponding Algorithms For The Computer-Implemented Functions	86
IX Conclusion	87

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit Number	Description of the Exhibit
1001	U.S. Patent Number 6,430,603
1002	Amended Complaint, Broadsign v. T-Rex Civil Action No. 1:16-cv-04586-LTS
1003	Schumer Letter re: CBM Review April 10, 2012
1004	Declaration by Jaime G. Carbonell, Ph.D.
1005	File History of U.S. App. No. 09/301,102
1006	U.S. Patent Number 5,612,741 to Loban
1007	Declaration by Burr R. Smith

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>3M Co. v. Avery Dennison Corp.</i> , 673 1372, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	25
<i>Accenture Global Servs., GmbH v. Guidewire Software, Inc.</i> , 728 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	51, 52, 68
<i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Apple Inc. v. Motorola, Inc.</i> , 757 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	33
<i>Apple Inc. v. SightSound Techs., LLC</i> , CBM2013-00021, 2013 WL 8538869 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 8, 2013).....	17
<i>Aristocrat Techs. Austl. Pty Ltd. v. Int’l Game Tech.</i> , 521 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	32, 81
<i>Ass’n for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc.</i> , 133 S. Ct. 2107 (2013).....	25
<i>Ass’n for Molecular Pathology v. USPTO</i> , 689 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	25
<i>Atmel Corp. v. Information Storage Devices, Inc.</i> , 198 F.3d 1374, 1381, 53 USPQ2d 1225, 1230 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	32
<i>B. Braun Med., Inc. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 124 F.3d 1419 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	31
<i>Bancorp Serv. v. Sun Life Assurance Co. of Can.</i> , 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	51, 68
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 561 U.S. 593 (2010).....	36, 37, 59, 61
<i>Biomedino, LLC v. Waters Techs. Corp.</i> , 490 F.3d 946 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	31, 32

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.