

Paper No. \_\_\_\_\_

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE (USPS)  
AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
AS REPRESENTED BY THE POSTMASTER GENERAL  
Petitioner,

v.

RETURN MAIL, INC.  
Patent Owner.

---

Case CBM2014-00116  
Patent 6,826,548

---

**PATENT OWNER RETURN MAIL, INC.'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	v
LIST OF EXHIBITS.....	x
I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT.....	1
II. BACKGROUND.....	3
A. The ‘548 Patent.....	3
B. Prosecution History.....	3
III. PETITIONER LACKS STANDING TO SEEK CBM REVIEW.....	6
A. Eminent domain litigation brought under 28 U.S.C. § 1498 is not a proper ground for standing for CBM review.....	6
B. The ‘548 patent is not a CBM patent under the AIA.....	10
IV. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED.....	14
A. It is not “more likely than not” that any of Claims 39-44 will be found unpatentable.....	14
B. “Impermissible Broadening” is not a proper basis for CBM review.....	14
C. Claim Construction.....	16
1. “decode,” “decoding,” “decoded information,” and “decoded data”.....	17
2. “encode,” “encoding,” “encoded information,” and “encoded data”.....	18
3. “returned mail items” and “mail items returned”.....	19
4. “return mail service provider”.....	20

5.	“detector,” “processor,” and “network”	21
6.	“posting”	22
V.	CLAIMS 39-44 OF THE ‘548 PATENT RECITE PATENT-ELIGIBLE SUBJECT MATTER	22
A.	Petitioner has the burden of proof	25
B.	Claim 39 is patent-eligible	25
C.	Claim 40 is patent-eligible	28
D.	Claim 41 is patent-eligible	30
E.	Claim 42 is patent-eligible	32
F.	Claims 43 and 44 are patent-eligible	35
VI.	CLAIMS 39-44 ARE PATENTABLE UNDER § 102 AND § 103	36
A.	<i>Krause</i> is not prior art under § 102(a)	36
B.	Patent Owner disputes Petitioner’s prior art allegations and its representations as to the features of Claims 39-44	37
C.	<i>Park</i> does not anticipate Claims 39-44	38
1.	Claim 39 is not anticipated by <i>Park</i>	39
2.	Claim 40 is not anticipated by <i>Park</i>	41
3.	Claim 41 is not anticipated by <i>Park</i>	43
4.	Claim 42 is not anticipated by <i>Park</i>	44
5.	Claim 43 is not anticipated by <i>Park</i>	48
6.	Claim 44 is not anticipated by <i>Park</i>	48
D.	<i>1997 ACS</i> does not anticipate Claims 39-44	49

1.	Claim 39 is not anticipated by <i>1997 ACS</i> .....	50
2.	Claim 40 is not anticipated by <i>1997 ACS</i> .....	51
3.	Claim 41 is not anticipated by <i>1997 ACS</i> .....	53
4.	Claim 42 is not anticipated by <i>1997 ACS</i> .....	55
5.	Claim 43 is not anticipated by <i>1997 ACS</i> .....	58
6.	Claim 44 is not anticipated by <i>1997 ACS</i> .....	59
E.	<i>Uhl</i> does not anticipate nor render obvious Claims 39-41.....	59
1.	Claim 39 is not anticipated by <i>Uhl</i> .....	60
2.	Claim 39 is not obvious over <i>Uhl</i> in view of <i>Krause</i> .....	62
3.	Claim 39 is not obvious over <i>Uhl</i> in view of <i>1997 ACS</i> .....	62
4.	Claim 40 is not anticipated by <i>Uhl</i> .....	62
5.	Claim 40 is not obvious over <i>Uhl</i> in view of <i>Krause</i> .....	64
6.	Claim 40 is not obvious over <i>Uhl</i> in view of <i>1997 ACS</i> .....	65
7.	Claim 41 is not anticipated by <i>Uhl</i> .....	65
8.	Claim 42 is not obvious over <i>Uhl</i> in view of <i>Jatkowski</i> .....	66
9.	Claim 42 is not obvious over <i>Uhl</i> in view of <i>Jatkowski</i> and further in view of <i>1997 ACS</i> .....	70
10.	Claim 43 is not obvious over <i>Uhl</i> in view of <i>Jatkowski</i> .....	70
11.	Claim 43 is not obvious over <i>Uhl</i> in view of <i>Jatkowski</i> and further in view of <i>1997 ACS</i> .....	71
12.	Claim 44 is not obvious over <i>Uhl</i> in view of <i>Jatkowski</i> .....	72

...

13.	Claim 44 is not obvious over <i>Uhl</i> in view of <i>Jatkowski</i> and further in view of <i>1997 ACS</i> .....	73
VI.	CLAIMS 39-44 ARE WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE ORIGINAL CLAIMS.....	73
A.	Claim 39 is within the scope of the original claims.....	74
B.	Claim 40 is within the scope of the original claims.....	75
C.	Claim 41 is within the scope of the original claims.....	76
D.	Claim 42 is within the scope of the original claims.....	77
E.	Claims 43 and 44 are within the scope of the original claims.....	78
VII.	GROUND NOT ADDRESSED IN PRELIMINARY RESPONSE.....	78
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	79

# 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.