

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION**

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY,
Plaintiff,

v.

SERVICENOW, INC.,
Defendant.

Case No. 14-cv-00570-BLF

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT’S
MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY**

[Re: ECF 70]

Defendant ServiceNow moves for summary judgment of invalidity of claims asserted against it under four U.S. patents. For the reasons below, the motion is **GRANTED**.

I. BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Hewlett Packard (“HP”) brought this suit against Defendant ServiceNow, alleging infringement of eight patents. At issue in the present motion are claims 12, 32, and 35 of U.S. Patent 8,224,683; claims 8-10, 13, 15, and 17-20 of U.S. Patent 6,321,229; claims 1, 2, 3, 5, and 15 of U.S. Patent 7,890,802; and claims 1, 3, 4, 5, and 7 of U.S. Patent 7,610,512.¹ ServiceNow contends that these claims (collectively the “asserted claims”) are invalid under 35 U.S.C § 101 for failing to claim patentable subject matter. Specifically, ServiceNow contends that the asserted claims are directed to abstract ideas, which the Supreme Court has long held fall outside the scope of § 101, *Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank Int’l*, 134 S.Ct. 2347, 2354 (2014).

The court held a hearing on January 29, 2015. HP argued that the parties’ positions revealed underlying disputes as to the proper construction of critical claim terms and that construction of these claim terms would be necessary in order resolve the parties’ ultimate dispute regarding patent-eligibility. *See* Hearing Transcript at 40:5-14, ECF 87. However, HP did not provide explicit proposed constructions of the claim terms it believed precluded summary judgment of invalidity,

Exhibit 2001
ServiceNow v. HP
IPR2015-00523

1 explaining that it had understood the court's prior instructions to preclude claim construction prior
 2 to this summary judgment motion. The court, recognizing a misunderstanding, granted leave for
 3 HP to file proposed constructions; the court also granted ServiceNow leave to file additional
 4 briefing to address whether the patents at issue would be invalid under HP's proposed
 5 constructions. ECF 84. HP took the opportunity to file proposed constructions.² ECF 89.
 6 ServiceNow has accepted HP's proposed constructions for purposes of this motion and argued
 7 that the asserted claims are invalid even under the proposed constructions. ServiceNow's
 8 Supplemental Brief, ECF 91. The court will adopt HP's proposed constructions for purposes of
 9 this motion as well. *See Bascom Research, LLC v. LinkedIn, Inc.*, No. 12-cv-06293, 2015 WL 149480,
 10 at *12 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 5, 2015).

11 **A. U.S. PATENT 8,224,683**

12 The '683 patent is directed toward optimizing the efficiency of providing IT helpdesk services.
 13 According to the patent's specification, "many businesses choose to contract . . . information
 14 technology (IT) specialists to install and maintain appropriate computer and network hardware and
 15 software necessary for the business to achieve its business objectives. . . . Typically, the contract
 16 requires the IT provider to maintain a helpdesk to which the business'[s] employees may call to
 17 notify the IT provider of problems with the computer system, network, or software. ¶ The
 18 helpdesk agent assigns each reported problem a service ticket." '683 patent at 1:27-40. The claims
 19 of the '683 patent are directed to a "system for monitoring service tickets in order to provide
 20 reminders to a help desk user of impending times for actions." Claim 12 of the '683 patent, which is
 21 representative for § 101 purposes,³ recites:

22 A computer program product in a non-transitory computer readable media for
 23 use in a data processing system for monitoring service tickets for information
 24 technology service providers to ensure that levels of service required to be
 provided to a customer pursuant to a contractual agreement between the

25 ² The constructions submitted by HP are reproduced in Appendix B.

26 ³ Although HP has not stipulated that Claim 12 is representative for § 101 purposes, both parties
 27 argued the patent's validity in general terms, without identifying differences among the claims that
 28 would change the § 101 analysis. After reviewing the asserted claims, the court concludes that
 Claim 12 is representative for § 101 purposes "because all the claims are substantially similar and
 linked to the same abstract idea." *Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, Nat.*

customer and a service provider, are met, the computer program product comprising:

- first instructions for inspecting a service ticket in a database to determine a deadline for when a problem associated with the service ticket must be resolved, with the deadline based upon a contractually determined severity of the problem and a corresponding contractually required time for resolution of the problem;
- display instructions for displaying, on a display device at the help desk, a graphical display populated with representations of service tickets that have reached a predetermined percentage of the time before their due date;
- second instructions for determining an deadline approaching alert time at which a help desk user must be notified that the deadline for resolving the problem must be met; and
- third instructions for alerting the help desk user that the deadline for resolving the problem is approaching when the deadline approaching alert time is reached.

B. U.S. PATENT 6,321,229

The '229 patent is directed toward accessing information in an information repository, such as a computer database. Recognizing the utility of displaying information hierarchically, the '229 patent claims a method and apparatus for accessing a repository's information in a way that it may be displayed to a user in hierarchical form. Claim 8 of the '229 patent, representative for § 101 purposes,⁴ recites:

Apparatus for accessing an information repository, comprising:

- a. a number of computer readable media; and
- b. computer readable program code stored on said number of computer readable media, said computer readable program code comprising:
 - i. code for creating a hierarchy of derived containers, wherein a given derived container corresponds to:
 - (1) a container definition node of an information model, said information model comprising a hierarchy of container definition nodes; and
 - (2) a category of information stored in said information repository;
 - ii. code for displaying given ones of said derived containers to a computer user; and
 - iii. code for determining if a given one of said displayed derived containers has been selected by a computer user, and upon selection of said given one of said displayed derived containers, displaying contents of said given one of said displayed derived containers.

⁴ Although HP has not stipulated that Claim 8 is representative for § 101 purposes, both parties argued the patent's validity in general terms, without identifying differences among the claims that would change the § 101 analysis. After reviewing the asserted claims, the court concludes that Claim 8 is representative for § 101 purposes "because all the claims are substantially similar and linked to the same abstract idea." *Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, Nat.*

1 **C. U.S. PATENTS 7,890,802 AND 7,610,512**

2 The '802 and '512 patents, which share a specification, are directed toward automating
3 workflows for resolving IT incidents. The '802 patent's claims focus on the creation of these
4 automated IT workflows, while the '512 patent's claims focus on running the automated IT
5 workflows. Claim 1 of the '802 patent, representative for § 101 purposes,⁵ recites:

6 A computer implemented method for facilitating a user in defining a repair
7 workflow for subsequent use in resolving information technology (IT)
8 incidents, comprising:

9 facilitating the user in defining a plurality of steps of the repair workflow
10 using a computing device, wherein facilitating the user in defining a
11 plurality of steps comprises facilitating the user in defining a plurality
12 of operations for the steps, and defining inputs and outputs of the
13 operations;

14 facilitating the user in defining a plurality of transitions between the
15 steps, based at least in part on the outputs of the steps, using a
16 computing device; and

17 checking the defined repair workflow for correctness before being used
18 to resolve an IT incident using a computing device, wherein
19 checking the defined repair workflow for correctness includes
20 verifying that each response of each step's operation has a transition
21 to another step.

22 Claim 1 of the '512 patent, representative for § 101 purposes,⁶ recites:

23 A computer implemented method for resolving an information technology
24 (IT) incident, comprising:

25 loading a repair workflow having a plurality of steps and transitions
26 between the steps, defined to repair the IT incident on a computing
27 device, each of the steps having one or more inputs, processing logic
28 for the input(s) and one or more outputs;

29 creating a repair frame for the loaded repair workflow on the computing
30 device;

31 creating a repair context for the repair frame on the computing device,
32 and populating the repair frame with configuration data;

33 binding one or more data values to the one or more inputs of one of the
34 steps within the repair context;

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

⁵ Although HP has not stipulated that Claim 1 is representative for § 101 purposes, both parties argued the patent's validity in general terms, without identifying differences among the claims that would change the § 101 analysis. After reviewing the asserted claims, the court concludes that Claim 1 is representative for § 101 purposes "because all the claims are substantially similar and linked to the same abstract idea." *Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, Nat. Ass'n*, 776 F.3d 1343, 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (internal citations omitted).

⁶ Although HP has not stipulated that Claim 1 is representative for § 101 purposes, both parties argued the patent's validity in general terms, without identifying differences among the claims that would change the § 101 analysis. After reviewing the asserted claims, the court concludes that Claim 1 is representative for § 101 purposes "because all the claims are substantially similar and linked to the same abstract idea." *Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, Nat.*

1 processing the bound data values of the one or more inputs of the step
 2 within the repair context;
 3 executing the step's operation;
 4 extracting the one or more outputs of step within the context; and
 5 selecting a transition to transition to another step within the context,
 6 based at least in part on the extracted one or more outputs.

7 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

8 **A. MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

9 Pursuant to Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a “court shall grant summary
 10 judgment if the movant shows that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the
 11 movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a).

12 The Supreme Court’s 1986 “trilogy” of *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317 (1986), *Anderson*
 13 *v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242 (1986), and *Matsushita Electric Industrial Co. v. Zenith Radio*
 14 *Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574 (1986), requires that a party seeking summary judgment show the absence of a
 15 genuine issue of material fact. Once the moving party has done so, the nonmoving party must “go
 16 beyond the pleadings and by [its] own affidavits, or by the depositions, answers to interrogatories,
 17 and admissions on file, designate specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue for trial.” *See*
 18 *Celotex*, 477 U.S. at 324. “When the moving party has carried its burden under Rule 56(c), its
 19 opponent must do more than simply show that there is some metaphysical doubt as to the material
 20 facts.” *Matsushita*, 475 U.S. at 586. “If the [opposing party’s] evidence is merely colorable, or is not
 21 significantly probative, summary judgment may be granted.” *Liberty Lobby*, 477 U.S. at 249-50.
 22 “[I]nferences to be drawn from the underlying facts,” however, “must be viewed in the light most
 23 favorable to the party opposing the motion.” *See Matsushita*, 475 U.S. at 587.

24 **B. PATENT-ELIGIBLE SUBJECT MATTER**

25 Section 101 of the Patent Act defines the classes of patentable subject matter: “Whoever
 26 invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter,
 27 or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions
 28 and requirements of this title.” 35 U.S.C. § 101.

29 Despite the apparent breadth of this language, § 101 has long contained “an important implicit
 30 exception: Laws of nature, natural phenomena, and abstract ideas are not patentable.” *Ass’n for*

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.