

EXHIBIT B

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 6,628,314

Paper No. 1

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICROSOFT CORPORATION.

Petitioner,

v.

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, LLC,

Patent Owner

Patent No. 6,628,314

Issued: September 30, 2003

Filed: October 30, 2000

Inventor: Martin David Hoyle

Title: COMPUTER INTERFACE METHOD AND APPARATUS WITH
TARGETED ADVERTISING

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2014-0039

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 6,628,314

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR A PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW..... 4

 A. Certification the '314 Patent May Be Contested by Petitioner..... 4

 B. Fee for *Inter Partes* Review (§ 42.15(a))..... 4

 C. Mandatory Notices (37 CFR § 42.8(b)) 4

 1. Real Party in Interest (§ 42.8(b)(1))..... 4

 2. Other Proceedings (§ 42.8(b)(2))..... 5

 3. Designation of Lead and Backup Counsel..... 5

 4. Service Information (§ 42.8(b)(4)) 5

 D. Proof of Service (§§ 42.6(e) and 42.105(a)) 6

II. IDENTIFICATION OF CLAIMS BEING CHALLENGED (§ 42.104(B)) 6

III. RELEVANT INFORMATION CONCERNING THE CONTESTED PATENT 7

 A. Effective Filing Date and Prosecution History of the '314 Patent 7

 B. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art 7

 C. Construction of Terms Used in the Claims 8

IV. PRECISE REASONS FOR RELIEF REQUESTED 10

 A. Claims 11-14, 16-19 Are Anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,809,242 (Shaw) 10

 1. Shaw Anticipates Claim 11..... 11

 2. Shaw Anticipates Claim 12..... 17

 3. Shaw Anticipates Claim 13..... 17

 4. Shaw Anticipates Claim 14..... 18

 5. Shaw Anticipates Claim 16..... 18

 6. Shaw Anticipates Claim 17..... 18

 7. Shaw Anticipates Claim 18..... 19

 8. Shaw Anticipates Claim 19..... 19

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 6,628,314

B. Claim 15 Would Have Been Obvious Based on Shaw in view of Robinson..... 20

C. Claim 20 Would Have Been Obvious Based on Shaw in View of, *inter alia*, Ex. 1022 (RFC 1635) 21

D. Claim 21 Would Have Been Obvious Based on Ex. 1005 (Shaw) in View of, *inter alia*, Ex. 1022 (RFC 1635)..... 25

E. Claim 22 Would Have Been Obvious Based on Shaw in View of, *inter alia*, Ex. 1022 (RFC 1635) 26

F. Claims 11-14, 16-19 Are Anticipated By Guyot 27

 1. Guyot Anticipates Claim 11..... 27

 2. Guyot Anticipates Claim 12..... 32

 3. Guyot Anticipates Claim 13..... 33

 4. Guyot Anticipates Claim 14..... 33

 5. Guyot Anticipates Claim 16..... 33

 6. Guyot Anticipates Claim 17..... 34

 7. Guyot Anticipates Claim 18..... 34

 8. Guyot Anticipates Claim 19..... 35

 9. Guyot Anticipates Claim 20..... 35

G. Claim 15 Would Have Been Obvious Based on Ex. 1006 (Guyot) in View of Ex. 1007 (Robinson)..... 36

H. Claim 20 Would Have Been Obvious Based on Ex. 1006 (Guyot) in View of Ex. 1022 (RFC 1635) 37

I. Claim 21 Would Have Been Obvious Based on Ex. 1006 (Guyot) in View of Ex. 1022 (RFC 1635) 40

J. Claim 22 Would Have Been Obvious Based on Ex. 1006 (Guyot) in View of Ex. 1022 (RFC 1635) 41

K. Claims 11-19 Are Anticipated by Ex. 1007 (Robinson)..... 42

 1. Robinson Anticipates Claim 11 42

 2. Robinson Anticipates Claim 12 48

 3. Robinson Anticipates Claim 13 49

 4. Robinson Anticipates Claim 14 50

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 6,628,314

5.	Robinson Anticipates Claim 15	51
6.	Robinson Anticipates Claim 18	51
7.	Robinson Anticipates Claim 19	52
L.	Claim 11 Would Have Been Obvious Based on Ex. 1007 (<u>Robinson</u>)	52
M.	Claims 16 and 17 Would Have Been Obvious Based on Ex. 1007 (<u>Robinson</u>) in view of General Knowledge in the Field	53
1.	Claim 16 Would Have Been Obvious.....	53
2.	Claim 17 Would Have Been Obvious.....	55
N.	Claim 20 Would Have Been Obvious Based on Ex. 1007 (<u>Robinson</u>) in View of Ex. 1022 (RFC 1635).....	56
O.	Claim 21 Would Have Been Obvious Based on Ex. 1007 (<u>Robinson</u>) in View of Ex. 1022 (RFC 1635).....	58
P.	Claim 22 Would Have Been Obvious Based on Ex. 1007 (<u>Robinson</u>) in View of Ex. 1022 (RFC 1635).....	59
V.	CONCLUSION.....	60

Attachment A. Proof of Service of the Petition

Attachment B. List of Evidence and Exhibits Relied Upon in Petition

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.