

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COMPASS BANK, AMERICAN EXPRESS COMPANY, AMERICAN
EXPRESS TRAVEL RELATED SERVICES COMPANY, INC.,
DISCOVER FINANCIAL SERVICES, DISCOVER BANK, DISCOVER
PRODUCTS INC., AND STATE FARM MUTUAL AUTOMOBILE
INSURANCE COMPANY,
Petitioner,

v.

MAXIM INTEGRATED PRODUCTS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case CBM2015-00102
Patent 6,237,095 B1

Before TREVOR M. JEFFERSON, MITCHELL G. WEATHERLY, and
KERRY BEGLEY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

WEATHERLY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Institution of Covered Business Method Patent Review
37 C.F.R. § 42.208

I. INTRODUCTION

A. *Background*

Compass Bank, American Express Company, American Express Travel Related Services Company, Inc., Discover Financial Services, Discover Bank, Discover Products Inc., and State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company (collectively “Petitioner”)¹ filed a petition (Paper 1, “Pet.”) requesting a covered business method patent review (“CBM patent review”) of claims 1–8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,237,095 B1 (Ex. 1001, “the ’095 patent”) pursuant to section 18 of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (“AIA”). Patent Owner, Maxim Integrated Products, Inc., (“Patent Owner”) filed a Preliminary Response. Paper 13 (“Prelim. Resp.”). We authorized, and Petitioner filed, a Reply to Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response. Paper 14 (“Reply”).

With its Preliminary Response, Patent Owner provided evidence that it filed with the Office a statutory disclaimer of claim 7 of the ’095 patent, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(a). *See* Prelim. Resp. 2; Ex. 2003. Accordingly, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.207(e), no post grant review will be instituted based on disclaimed claim 7.

For remaining claims 1–6 and 8 (the “challenged claims”), we may not institute a CBM patent review “unless the Director² determines that the information presented in the petition . . . , if such information is not rebutted,

¹ The Petition also lists Navy Federal Credit Union (“NFCU”) as a petitioner. Pet. 1. NFCU and Patent Owner subsequently filed a joint motion to terminate NFCU’s participation in the case, and we granted the motion. Paper 10.

² “The Board institutes the trial on behalf of the Director.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.4(a).

would demonstrate that it is more likely than not that at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition is unpatentable.” 35 U.S.C. § 324(a); *see also* 37 C.F.R. § 42.208. Based on our review of the record, we conclude that Petitioner is more likely than not to prevail with respect to at least one of the challenged claims.

Petitioner contends that the challenged claims are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on the following grounds (Pet. 24–77):

References	Basis	Claim[s] challenged
Hawkes ³ alone or in combination with Chaum ⁴ and/or Ciarcia ⁵	§ 103	1, 2, 4–6, and 8
Hawkes alone or in combination with Brown ⁶ and/or Ingalls ⁷	§ 103	3

For the reasons described below, we institute a CBM review of claims 1–6 and 8.

B. Related Proceedings

Patent Owner has asserted the ’095 patent against all Petitioners except Discover Products Inc. (“DPI”) in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas. Pet. 1; *see* Paper 5, 2. In addition, Patent Owner

³ INTEGRATED CIRCUIT CARDS, TAGS AND TOKENS (Peter Hawkes, Donald Davies, W.L. Price, eds. 1990) (“Hawkes”) (Ex. 1003).

⁴ U.S. Patent No. 5,485,520 (Jan. 16, 1996) (“Chaum”) (Ex. 1004).

⁵ Steve Ciarcia, *Ciarcia’s Circuit Cellar: Build the BASIC-52 Computer/Controller*, BYTE, Aug. 1985, (“Ciarcia”) (Ex. 1005).

⁶ JOHN FORREST BROWN, EMBEDDED SYSTEMS PROGRAMMING IN C AND ASSEMBLY (1994) (“Brown”) (Ex. 1006).

⁷ Daniel Ingalls, *Design Principles Behind Smalltalk*, BYTE, Aug. 1981, (“Ingalls”) (Ex. 1007).

CBM2015-00102
Patent 6,237,095 B1

has asserted the '095 patent against numerous other defendants in more than thirty cases filed in various district courts. *See* Paper 5, 1–7; Pet. 1–3.

The '095 patent also has been involved in several proceedings before the Office. More specifically, the patent was the subject of two previous petitions for CBM patent review filed by different sets of petitioners. Paper 5, 3. First, in CBM2014-00041, the Board determined that 35 U.S.C. § 325(a)(1) precluded institution of review, because one of the petitioners had filed a civil action challenging the validity of claims of the '095 patent before filing the petition. *PNC Bank, N.A. v. Maxim Integrated Prods., Inc.*, Case CBM2014-00041 (PTAB June 3, 2014) (Paper 19). Second, in CBM2014-00177, the Board terminated the proceeding pursuant to settlement. *JP Morgan Chase & Co. v. Maxim Integrated Prods., Inc.*, Case CBM2014-00177 (PTAB Feb. 26, 2015) (Paper 14).

C. The '095 Patent

The '095 patent relates to an apparatus or “module” for transferring money or “digital cash” electronically. Ex. 1001, 1:24–29, 1:51–67, 7:65–12:34. The claims are directed to an “apparatus for receiving and transmitting encrypted data.” *Id.* at 32:59–34:19. Claim 1, which is the only independent claim in the '095 patent and thus illustrative, recites:

1. An apparatus for receiving and transmitting encrypted data, comprising:
 - an input/output interface for receiving a challenge number from an electronic device;
 - a microprocessor circuit connected to said input/output interface;
 - a coprocessor circuit, connected to said microprocessor circuit;

- a timing circuit connected to the microprocessor, the timing circuit for generating a time stamp;
- a first memory connected to said microprocessor circuit, said first memory for storing a first data object; and
- a second memory connected to said microprocessor circuit, said second memory including instructions readable by said microprocessor circuit to thereby cause said microprocessor circuit to:
 - initiate generation of a certificate, said certificate including said challenge number and a second data object; and
 - adjust said first data object according to said second data object responsive to a verification signal from said electronic device;
 - store a transaction script, the transaction script including at least a representation of the time stamp generated by the timing circuit.

Id. at 32:59–33:17.

We refer to the colorized version of Figure 1 from the '095 patent, reproduced below, in describing the claimed apparatus.

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.