Filed: <u>August 20, 2015</u>

Filed on behalf of Shoutpoint, Inc. and Victory Solutions, LLC

By: Michelle E. Armond

Brenton R. Babcock

Ted M. Cannon

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

2040 Main Street, 14th Floor

Irvine, CA 92614

Telephone: 949-760-0404 Facsimile: 949-760-9502

Email: BoxSHOUTVS@knobbe.com

#### UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

#### BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

\_\_\_\_\_

SHOUTPOINT, INC. and VICTORY SOLUTIONS, LLC Petitioners

v.

BROADNET TELESERVICES, LLC Patent Owner.

Case No. TBD U.S. Patent No. 9,081,485

PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD REVIEW



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

I.	INTE	RODU	DDUCTION 1					
II.	MANDATORY NOTICES PURSUANT TO C.F.R. § 42.8(A)(1)							
	A.	Real Party-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))						
	B.	Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2))						
	C.	Lead and Backup Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3))						
	D.	Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4))						
III.	PAY	MENT	TT OF FEES					
IV.	REQUIREMENTS FOR CBM REVIEW UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.304							
	A.	Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(a))						
		1.	Eligib	oility Requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 42.302	5			
		2.	Timin	ng Requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 42.303	5			
	B.	The '485 Patent is a Covered Business Method Patent						
		1.		485 Patent Is Directed To Financial Activities  Telecommunications Industry	6			
			a.	The '485 Patent Is Directed to Political Fundraising Activities	8			
			b.	The '485 Patent Claims Recite Screening Participants During a Telephone Meeting Based On Their Financial Contributions				
		2.		Challenged Claims Are Not Directed To A	17			



# TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)

Page No.

			a.	The Challenged Claims Do Not Recite a Technological Feature That is Novel and Nonobvious Over the Prior Art	18
			b.	The '485 Patent Does Not Solve a Technical Problem Using a Technical Solution	21
	C.			Statutory Grounds § 42.304(b)(1) & (b)(2))	23
	D.	Clain	n Cons	struction (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(3))	23
	Е.	_		vility of Construed Claims § 42.304(b)(4))	23
	F.	Supp	orting	Evidence (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(5))	23
V.	THA	T THE	E CHA	E THAN A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD LLENGED CLAIMS OF THE '485 PATENT FABLE	24
	A.	Over	view c	of the '485 Patent	25
		1.	Clair	n 1	26
	B.	Sumr	nary o	of the Prosecution History of the '485 Patent	27
	C.	Level	l of Oı	dinary Skill in the Art	28
	D.	Clain	n Cons	struction	29
		1.	"full-	-duplex"	30
		2.	"mul	ti-mode conference"	31
		3.	"voic	ce response units (VRUs)"	32



# TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)

Page No.

	E.	Ground 1: The '485 Patent Is Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 101			
		1.	Alice	Step One: The Claims Cover an Abstract Idea	36
			a.	The Claims of The '485 Patent Are Directed To The Abstract Idea of Screening Questions During A Telephone Meeting	38
			b.	The Abstract Idea of the '485 Patent Is Demonstrated By the Fact That It Can Be Performed By Human Beings	41
			c.	The '485 Patent Preempts Long-Practiced Ideas in the Telecommunications Industry	43
		2.		e Step Two: The '485 Patent Provides No itional Inventive Concept	47
			a.	There Are No Inventive Concepts In The '485 Patent	47
			b.	The '485 Patent Recites Only Conventional Computers and Telecommunications Equipment	49
		3.		Remaining Challenged Claims Are Not Patent-	54
VI.	CON	ICLUS	SION		68



## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page No(s).

Adams v. Frontier Broad. Co., 555 P.2d 556 (Wyo. 1976)
Adv. Fiber Techs. v. J & L Fiber Servs., 674 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2012)33
Agilysys, Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc., CBM2014-00014, 2014 WL 1440414 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 26, 2014)18, 21
Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int'l, 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014)passim
AmDocs (Israel) Ltd. v. Openet Telecom, Inc., 56 F. Supp. 3d 813 (E.D. Va. 2014)51
Apple, Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc., CBM2014-0013, 2015 WL 1324399 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 20, 2015)
Apple Inc. v. SightSound Techs., LLC, CBM2013-00020, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 8, 2013)6
Ass'n for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc., 133 S. Ct. 2107 (2013)35
Bilski v. Kappos, 561 U.S. 593 (2010)passim
Bloomberg Inc. v. Markets-Alert PTY Ltd., CBM2013-00005, Paper 18 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 29, 2013)
buySAFE, Inc. v. Google, Inc., 765 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2014)
Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, 776 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014)passim



# DOCKET A L A R M

# 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.

