

No. 2014-1506, -1515

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT**

INTELLECTUAL VENTURES I LLC AND
INTELLECTUAL VENTURES II LLC,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

CAPITAL ONE, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION,
CAPITAL ONE BANK (USA), NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, AND
CAPITAL ONE FINANCIAL CORPORATION,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia
in civil action No. 1:13-cv-00740, Judge Anthony J. Trenga

**BRIEF FOR ASKELADDEN L.L.C. AS AMICUS CURIAE
IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES**

JAMES L. QUARLES III
GREGORY H. LANTIER
RICHARD A. CRUDO
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
1875 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 663-6000

October 21, 2014

CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST

Counsel for Amicus Askeladden L.L.C. certifies the following:

1. The full name of every party or amicus represented by me in this appeal is:

Askeladden L.L.C.

2. The names of the real parties in interest represented by me in this appeal are:

Askeladden L.L.C.

3. All parent corporations and any publicly held companies that own 10 percent or more of the stock of the party or amicus curiae represented by me are:

Askeladden L.L.C. is a wholly owned subsidiary of The Clearing House Payments Company L.L.C. No corporation or publicly held company owns 10 percent or more of The Clearing House Payments Company L.L.C.

4. The names of all law firms and the partners and associates that appeared in the lower tribunal or are expected to appear in this appeal on behalf of Amicus Askeladden L.L.C. are:

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP: James L. Quarles III, Gregory H. Lantier, Richard A. Crudo.

/s/ Gregory H. Lantier

Gregory H. Lantier

October 21, 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iv
STATEMENT OF INTEREST.....	1
ARGUMENT	3
I. THE PATENTS-IN-SUIT HAVE BEEN INDISCRIMINATELY ASSERTED.....	3
A. IV Has Asserted the Patents-in-Suit and Similar Patents Against Other Defendants.	3
B. The Patents-In-Suit Claim Concepts that Are Fundamental to Basic Internet Use and Personal Finance.....	5
II. PATENTS DIRECTED TOWARD COMPUTER-IMPLEMENTED, FUNDAMENTAL ECONOMIC PRACTICES, LIKE THE PATENTS-IN-SUIT, FALL OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF § 101.	8
A. Section 101 Has Long Applied to Prevent the Monopolization of Fundamental Ideas and Practices.	8
B. The Supreme Court’s <i>Alice Corp.</i> Decision Confirms that Patents Directed Toward Fundamental Financial Practices Are Invalid Under § 101.....	9
III. THE DISTRICT COURT PROPERLY GRANTED SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY UNDER § 101.....	12
A. The Patents Are Directed Toward Patent-Ineligible Ideas.....	12
1. The patent claims embody abstract ideas on their face.	13
2. The abstract nature of the patent claims is further evidenced by the manner in which the patents are asserted.....	14
B. The Other Limitations Do Not Transform the Nature of the Claims into Patent-Eligible Applications.	18

IV. THE TIMING OF DISTRICT COURTS' ADJUDICATION OF INVALIDITY UNDER
§ 101 IS CRITICALLY IMPORTANT.....20

CONCLUSION.....23

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Accenture Global Services, GmbH v. Guidewire Software, Inc.</i> , 728 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	11, 19
<i>Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank International</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Bancorp Services, LLC v. Sun Life Assurance Co. of Canada (U.S.)</i> , 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	11, 19–20
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 561 U.S. 593 (2010).....	8, 10, 14, 19
<i>Bonito Boats, Inc. v. Thunder Craft Boats, Inc.</i> , 489 U.S. 141 (1989).....	16
<i>buySAFE, Inc. v. Google, Inc.</i> , 765 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	11–12
<i>Clear with Computers, LLC v. Dick’s Sporting Goods, Inc.</i> , -- F. Supp. 2d --, 2014 WL 923280 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 21, 2014).....	18–19
<i>CLS Bank International v. Alice Corp.</i> , No. 2011-1301 (Fed. Cir. argued Feb. 8, 2013)	15
<i>Cyberfone Systems, LLC v. CNN Interactive Group, Inc.</i> , 558 F. App’x 988 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	22
<i>CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	11, 17
<i>Dealertrack, Inc. v. Huber</i> , 674 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	11
<i>DietGoal Innovations LLC v. Bravo Media LLC</i> , -- F. Supp. 2d --, 2014 WL 3582914 (S.D.N.Y. July 8, 2014).....	16
<i>Digitech Image Technologies, LLC v. Electronics for Imaging, Inc.</i> , 758 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	13

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.