

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

RFCYBER CORP.,
Patent Owner

PGR2021-00028
U.S. Patent No. 10,600,046

PETITION FOR POST-GRANT REVIEW

(§ 112 and § 101)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	MANDATORY NOTICES	2
	A. Real Party-in-Interest.....	2
	B. Related Matters.....	2
	C. Lead and Back-up Counsel and Service Information	3
III.	GROUND FOR STANDING.....	4
IV.	THE '046 PATENT	5
	A. Overview of the '046 Patent.....	5
	B. Prosecution History	8
V.	THE '046 PATENT IS ELIGIBLE FOR POST-GRANT REVIEW.....	13
	A. The '046 Patent's broken priority chain creates PGR eligibility.....	14
	1. The “displaying a denial” step in claim 1 lacks written description support in the pre-AIA applications.....	17
	2. The “account and bank information of the registered merchant” limitation in claims 6 and 15 lacks written description support in the pre-AIA applications.....	21
	B. The '046 Patent's lack of written description for subject matter added by amendment creates PGR eligibility.	25
VI.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	25
VII.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	26

VIII. RELIEF REQUESTED AND THE REASONS FOR THE REQUESTED RELIEF27

IX. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGES27

X. THE BOARD SHOULD INSTITUTE POST-GRANT REVIEW.....28

 A. The challenges presented in this petition are not cumulative to prosecution of the '046 Patent..... 28

 B. The *Fintiv* factors favor institution..... 28

 1. Factor 1 is neutral (possibility of a stay)..... 28

 2. Factor 2 favors institution (proximity of trial date to final written decision)..... 29

 3. Factor 3 favors institution (investment in parallel proceeding)..... 30

 4. Factor 4 favors institution (overlap in issues)..... 31

 5. Factor 5 is neutral (overlap in parties). 31

 6. Factor 6 favors institution (other circumstances)..... 32

XI. IDENTIFICATION OF HOW THE CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE.....32

 A. Challenge #1: Claims 1-17 are invalid for failing to satisfy the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C § 112. 32

 1. Independent Claim 1 33

 a. The specification does not describe sending a payment request to a payment gateway only when an e-purse balance is sufficient.....34

b.	The specification does not describe “displaying a confirmation in the mobile device that the balance in the e-purse has been reduced by the total amount.”	47
2.	Independent Claim 12	51
a.	The specification does not describe sending a payment request to a payment gateway only if an e-purse balance is sufficient.	52
b.	The specification does not describe a payment gateway configured to cause the balance in the e-purse to be reduced.	53
3.	Dependent Claims 2-17.....	57
B.	Challenge #2: Claims 1-17 are invalid under 35 U.S.C § 101.....	58
1.	<i>Guidance</i> Step 1: Statutory Category.....	61
2.	<i>Guidance</i> Step 2A, Prong 1: The ’046 Patent claims recite the abstract idea of presenting and settling an invoice, a fundamental economic practice.....	61
a.	Presenting and settling an invoice is a fundamental economic practice and, thus, an abstract idea under the <i>Guidance</i>	62
b.	The Supreme Court and Federal Circuit have determined that presenting and settling an invoice is a fundamental economic practice and, thus, is an abstract idea.....	64
3.	<i>Guidance</i> Step 2A, Prong 2: The ’046 Patent claims do not integrate the abstract idea into a practical application.....	65

a.	The claims do not aim to improve the functioning of a computer or other technology.	67
b.	The claims employ standard e-commerce components to implement an abstract idea.	70
4.	<i>Guidance</i> Step 2B: The '046 Patent claims do not provide an “inventive concept.”	76
a.	The additional claim elements simply append well-understood, routine, and conventional e-commerce activities to the abstract idea.	77
b.	The ordered combination of elements does not add “significantly more” to the abstract idea of presenting and settling an invoice.	91
5.	Independent claim 12 is substantially similar to representative claim 1 and is thus not patent eligible.	93
6.	The dependent claims of the '046 Patent are directed to the same abstract idea and add only trivial and conventional elements.	94
a.	Claims 2, 5, and 13	95
b.	Claims 3, 7, 9, 10, 14, and 17	97
c.	Claims 4 and 8	101
d.	Claims 6 and 15	104
e.	Claims 11 and 16	106

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.