

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HTC CORPORATION and HTC AMERICA, INC.,
Petitioners,

v.

ANCORA TECHNOLOGIES INC.,
Patent Owner.

U.S. Patent No. 6,411,941

Case No.: CBM2017-00054

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.207(a)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities	ii
List of Exhibits.....	iv
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Overview of the ‘941 Patent.....	1
III. The ‘941 Patent is not eligible for CBM review under Section 18 of the AIA	5
A. By statute, CBM review is available only for a narrow range of plainly business-related patents.....	5
B. The claims of the ‘941 Patent are not financial in nature because they recite or require no financial activity element.....	8
1. The ‘941 Patent describes a method to control access to software, which is a technique of general utility and not a financial activity.....	9
2. The claims of the ‘941 Patent do not recite or require the exchange of money	12
3. Whether the ‘941 Patent may be used to solve a piracy problem is “incidental” and thus irrelevant to CBM review eligibility	16
C. The ‘941 Patent recites a technological invention	17
1. The ‘941 Patent solves a technical problem using a technical solution	17
2. The ‘941 Patent recites a technological feature that is novel and unobvious	22
IV. Conclusion	27
Certificate of Service	28
Certificate of Compliance Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.24	30

Table of Authorities

Cases

<i>Ancora Techs. v. Apple, Inc.</i> , No. 11-cv-06357, 2012 WL 6738761 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 31, 2012), <i>aff'd</i> , 744 F.3d 732 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	3, 21
<i>Apple Inc. v. SightSound Techs., LLC</i> , CBM2013-00020, Paper No. 14 (PTAB Oct. 8, 2013)	15, 16
<i>Apple, Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.</i> , CBM2015-00046, Paper No. 12 (PTAB June 3, 2015).....	26
<i>Bloomberg L.P. v. Quest Licensing Corp.</i> , CBM2014-00205, Paper No. 16 (PTAB Apr. 7, 2015).....	6, 18, 25
<i>emnos USA Corp. v. dunnhumby Ltd.</i> , CBM2015-00116, Paper No. 8 (PTAB Nov. 10, 2015).....	21, 26
<i>Google Inc. v. At Home Bondholders' Liquidating Trust</i> , CBM2016-00036, Paper No. 12 (PTAB Aug. 22, 2016).....	19-20
<i>Google Inc. v. Content Guard Holdings, Inc.</i> , CBM2015-00040, Paper No. 34 (PTAB June 21, 2016).....	11
<i>Hewlett Packard Co. v. YYZ LLC</i> , CBM2015-00049, Paper No. 9 (PTAB June 30, 2015).....	20
<i>Indeed, Inc. v. Career Destination Dev., LLC</i> , CBM2014-00069, Paper No. 12 (PTAB Aug. 20, 2014).....	16
<i>Informatica Corp. v. Protegrity Corp.</i> , CBM2015-00021, Paper No. 38 (PTAB May 31, 2016).....	16, 17
<i>Motorola Mobility, LLC v. Intellectual Ventures I, LLC</i> , CBM2015-00004, Paper No. 9 (PTAB Mar. 27, 2015).....	21

<i>Old Republic Gen. Ins. Grp., Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC</i> , CBM2015-00184, Paper No. 7 (PTAB Apr. 15, 2016).....	26
<i>Par Pharm., Inc. v. Jazz Pharm., Inc.</i> , CBM2014-00149, Paper No. 12 (PTAB Jan. 13, 2015).....	15
<i>PNC Bank NA v. Parus Holdings, Inc.</i> , CBM2015-00109, Paper No. 10 (PTAB Nov. 9, 2015).....	10
<i>Qualtrics LLC v. OpinionLab, Inc.</i> , CBM2016-00003, Paper No. 9 (PTAB Apr. 13, 2016).....	10
<i>Sally Beauty Holdings, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC</i> , CBM2016-00030, Paper No. 8 (PTAB Aug. 2, 2016).....	25-26
<i>Samsung Elec. Am., Inc. v. Smartflash LLC</i> , CBM2014-00190, 2015 WL 1535809 (PTAB Apr. 2, 2015)	11
<i>Secure Access, LLC v. PNC Bank Nat. Ass'n</i> , 848 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	6, 7, 8, 12, 16
<i>SEGA of Am., Inc. v. Uniloc USA, Inc.</i> , CBM2014-00183, Paper No. 11 (PTAB Mar. 10, 2015) ...	7-10, 12, 14-15, 17
<i>ServiceNow, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard, Co.</i> , CBM2015-00108, Paper No. 10 (PTAB Oct. 7, 2015)	10, 14
<i>Unwired Planet, LLC v. Google Inc.</i> , 841 F.3d 1376, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	6, 7, 11, 14-17
Statutes	
AIA §18.....	5, 6, 8, 17
Other Authorities	
PTO Final Review Rules, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,680, 48,709 (Aug. 14, 2012)	6
Rules	
37 C.F.R. §42.301	5, 6, 17, 22, 24

List of Exhibits

Exhibit No.	Description	Date	Identifier
2001	February 5, 2002 Response to Office Action	2/5/2002	2/5/2002 Response
2002	February 20, 2002 Notice of Allowance	2/20/2002	2/20/2002 Notice of Allowance
2003	March 9, 2010 Notice of Intent to Issue an <i>Ex Parte</i> Reexamination Certificate	3/9/2010	3/9/2010 Notice of Intent

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.