

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

THE JEWELRY CHANNEL, INC. USA d/b/a Liquidation Channel,

Petitioner

v.

AMERICA'S COLLECTIBLES NETWORK, INC.

Patent Owner

Patent No. 8,370,211  
Filing Date: August 21, 2006  
Issue Date: February 5, 2013  
Title: COMPUTER SYSTEM

---

**PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD REVIEW  
UNDER § 18 OF THE AMERICA INVENTS ACT  
AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.300 *ET SEQ.***

Case No. CBM2014-00119

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8) .....	1
A.	Real Party-in-Interest .....	1
B.	Related Matters.....	1
C.	Lead and Backup Counsel.....	2
D.	Service Information.....	2
E.	Power of Attorney .....	3
II.	PAYMENT OF FEES – 37 C.F.R. § 42.103.....	3
III.	GROUND FOR STANDING (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.301, 302, 304(a)).....	3
A.	Petitioner Meets the Eligibility Requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 42.302 .....	3
B.	Claims 1–39 of the ’211 Patent Describe Covered Business Methods as Defined by 37 C.F.R. § 42.301 .....	3
1.	The ’211 patent claims a financial product or service .....	4
2.	The ’211 patent does not claim a technological invention .....	7
IV.	IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.304(b) (1)–(3)) AND RELIEF REQUESTED (37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)(1)) .....	12
A.	The ’211 Patent .....	13
B.	Prosecution History of the ’211 Patent .....	18
C.	Identified Claims and Specific Statutory Grounds for Challenge (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(1)–(2)) .....	23
D.	Claim Construction (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(3)).....	23
V.	HOW THE CONSTRUED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(4)–(5)) .....	26

A.	Claims 1–39 Are Not Directed to Patent-Eligible Subject Matter Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 .....	26
1.	The claims of the '211 patent are directed to an abstract idea.....	28
2.	Claim 1 and dependent claims 2–34 of the '211 patent add no meaningful limitations to the claimed abstract idea .....	37
3.	The remaining independent claims, and the claims that depend therefrom, are also directed to unpatentable subject matter.....	41
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	44

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Accenture Global Servs., GmbH v. Guidewire Software, Inc.</i> , 728 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	38, 41, 42, 43
<i>Agilysys, Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc.</i> , Case No. CBM2014-00016, Decision to Institute (Paper 19) (P.T.A.B. Mar. 26, 2014) .....	9
<i>Apple, Inc. v. SightSound Techs., LLC</i> , Case No. CBM2013-00019, Decision to Institute (Paper 17) (P.T.A.B. Oct. 8, 2013).....	5, 12
<i>Bancorp Serv. v. Sun Life Assurance Co. of Can.</i> , 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	39, 42
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 130 S. Ct. 3218 (2010) .....	26
<i>CLS Bank Int’l v. Alice Corp.</i> , 717 F.3d 1269 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	41
<i>Cyberfone Sys., LLC v. CNN Interactive Group, Inc.</i> , Case No. 2012-1673, -1674, 2014 WL 718153 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 26, 2014).....	27, 37
<i>CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	27, 37, 43
<i>Diamond v. Chakrabarty</i> , 447 U.S. 303 (1980).....	26
<i>Fort Props., Inc. v. Am. Master Lease LLC</i> , 671 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	43
<i>Gottschalk v. Benson</i> , 409 U.S. 63 (1972) .....	26
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i> , 383 U.S. 1, 12 (1966).....	12

...

<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 517 U.S. 370 (1996).....	25
<i>Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.</i> , 132 S. Ct. 1289 (2012).....	12, 26, 27, 38
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	24
<i>Regions Fin. Corp. v. Ret. Capital Access Mgmt. Co.</i> , Case No. CBM2014-00012, Decision to Institute (Paper 16) (P.T.A.B. Mar. 25, 2014).....	12, 13
<i>SAP Am. v. Versata Dev. Grp., Inc.</i> , Case No. CBM2012-00001, Decision to Institute (Paper 36) (P.T.A.B. Jan. 9, 2013) .....	5, 12, 27, 38
<i>Volusion, Inc. v. Versata Software, Inc.</i> , Case No. CBM2013-00017, Decision to Institute (Paper No. 8) (P.T.A.B. Oct. 24, 2013).....	4

## Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 101.....	passim
35 U.S.C. § 103.....	19
35 U.S.C. § 282(b).....	12
35 U.S.C. § 282(b)(2).....	12
35 U.S.C. § 321(b).....	12

## Other Authorities

157 Cong. Rec. S5432 (daily ed. Sept. 8, 2011) (statement of Sen. Schumer).....	4
AIA § 18(a)(1) .....	12
AIA § 18(d).....	3, 4, 6

# 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.