

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

DELTA AIR LINES, FRONTIER AIRLINES, INC., UNITED AIRLINES, INC.,
US AIRWAYS, INC., AND AMERICAN AIRLINES, INC.
Petitioner

v.

LOYALTY CONVERSION SYSTEMS CORPORATION
Patent Owner

Case CBM2014-00096
Patent 8,511,550

Before GRACE MEDLEY, *Administrative Patent Judge*

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page(s)
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
LIST OF EXHIBITS	v
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED	5
III. BACKGROUND	6
IV. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE THAT IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT AT LEAST ONE CLAIM OF THE ‘550 PATENT IS INVALID ..	9
A. Patent Owner’s Proposed Claim Construction	9
B. Petitioner Has Not Established that the Claims of the ‘550 Patent are More Likely Than Not Invalid on the Asserted Grounds Based on 35 USC §112(a) (Proposed Ground 4)	18
C. Petitioner Has Not Established that the Claims of the ‘550 Patent are More Likely Than Not Invalid on the Asserted Grounds Based on 35 USC §102(b) as Being Anticipated by MacLean et al (Proposed Ground 2)	20
D. Proposed Ground 3 is Redundant and Malformed	41
E. Petitioner Has Not Established that the Claims of the ‘550 Patent are More Likely Than Not Invalid on the Asserted Grounds Based on 35 USC § 103 as Being Obvious Over Antonucci in View of MacLean (Proposed Ground 3)	46
F. Attempted Combinations of Antonucci and MacLean Are Not Obvious	48
G. Material Claimed Limitations Are Not Disclosed by Antonucci in View of MacLean	50
H. Response to Petition Arguments	61
I. Petitioner Has Not Established that the Claims of the ‘550 Patent are More Likely Than Not Invalid on the Asserted Grounds Based on 35 USC § 101 (Proposed Ground 1)	63
J. The Petition Fails to Conform to PTAB Rules	76
V. CONCLUSION	79

..

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES	Page(s)
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc)	19
<i>In re Gardner</i> , 480 F.2d 879, 879 (C.C.P.A. 1973)	19
<i>In re Wertheim</i> , 541 F.2d 257, 263, 191 USPQ 90, 97 (CCPA 1976)	19
<i>In re Koller</i> , 613 F.2d 819, 204 USPQ 702 (CCPA 1980)	19
<i>In re Napier</i> , 55 F.3d 610, 613, 34 USPQ2d 1782, 1784 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	21
<i>In re Robertson</i> , 169 F.3d USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	21
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966)	42
<i>Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.</i> , CBM2012-00003	42
<i>Diamond v. Diehr</i> , 450 U.S. 175 (1981)	66
<i>CLS Bank Int’l v. Alice Corp.</i> , 717 F.3d 1269 (Fed. Cir. 2013) (en banc), affirmed by 573, U.S., (2014)(slip opinion)	67, 70
<i>CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1366, 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	73

...

<i>SiRF Tech., Inc. v. ITC</i> , 601 F.3d 1319, 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	73
<i>Research Corp. Tech., Inc., v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 627 F.3d 859, 867 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	75

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. §101	5, 65
35 U.S.C. §102	5, 20
35 U.S.C. §103	5, 41, 46
35 U.S.C. §112	5,18
35 U.S.C. §312(a)	76, 77
35 U.S.C. §316(e)	67
37 C.F.R §42.20(c)	42, 61, 65, 76
37 C.F.R §42.6(a)(2)(iii)	43
37 C.F.R §42.8(a)(1) and (b)(3)	76
37 C.F.R §42.104(b)(4)	77
37 C.F.R §42.204(b)(4)	77
37 C.F.R §42.207(a)	1
37 C.F.R §42.208(c)	9

LISTS OF EXHIBITS

Petitioner's Exhibits

Exhibit	Description
1001	U.S. Patent No. 8,511,550
1002	U.S. Patent No. 3,083,906
1003	U.S. Patent No. 3,795,795
1004	U.S. Pat. Appl. Pub. No. 2003/0200144 to Antonucci et al.
1005	U.S. Pat. Appl. Pub. No. 2002/0143614 to Maclean et al.
1006	U.S. Patent No. 8,297,502
1007	U.S. Patent No. 7,703,673
1008	Patent File History for U.S. Patent No. 7,703,673
1009	Declaration of Sandeep Chatterjee
1010	Patent File History for U.S. Patent No. 8,511,550
1011	Transitional Program for Covered Business Method Patents – Definitions of Covered Business Method Patent and Technological Invention, 77 Fed. Reg 157 (August 14, 2012)
1012	<i>Loyalty Conversion Systems Corp. v. US Airways</i> , 2:13-cv-00666, Complaint
1013	Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed Reg. 157 (August 14, 2012)
1014	<i>Loyalty Conversion Systems Corp. v. Delta Air Lines</i> , 2:13-cv-00659, Complaint
1015	<i>Loyalty Conversion Systems Corp. v. United Airlines</i> , 2:13-cv-00665, Complaint

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.