

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

CORELOGIC, INC.  
Petitioner,

v.

BOUNDARY SOLUTIONS, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case CBM2016-00018  
Patent 8,065,352 B2

---

Before LYNNE E. PETTIGREW, PETER P. CHEN, and  
RICHARD H. MARSCHALL, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

MARSCHALL, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION

Denying Institution of Covered Business Method Patent Review  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.208*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner CoreLogic, Inc. (“CoreLogic”) filed a Petition (Paper 2, “Pet.”) to institute a covered business method (“CBM”) patent review of claims 1–23 of U.S. Patent No. 8,065,352 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’352 patent”), owned by Boundary Solutions, Inc. (“BSI”). BSI filed a Preliminary Response (Paper 7, “Prelim. Resp.”). We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 324. For the reasons that follow, the information presented in the Petition does not establish that the ’352 patent qualifies as a covered business method patent for purposes of § 18(d)(1) of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (“AIA”), Pub. L. No. 112–29, 125 Stat. 284, 331 (2011). Accordingly, we decline to institute a covered business method patent review of claims 1–23 of the ’352 patent. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 324(a).

## II. BACKGROUND

### A. *Related Proceedings*

The parties state that BSI has asserted the ’352 patent against CoreLogic in *Boundary Solutions, Inc. v. CoreLogic, Inc.*, No. 5:14-cv-00761 (N.D. Cal.) (filed Feb. 19, 2014). Pet. 67; Paper 5 (Patent Owner’s Mandatory Notices). BSI also has asserted related U.S. Patent No. 7,499,946 (“the ’946 patent”) and U.S. Patent No. 7,092,957 (“the ’957 patent”) in that proceeding. Pet. 67–68; Paper 5. The ’946 patent and the ’957 patent were the subject of *inter partes* reviews in Cases IPR2015-00226 and IPR2015-00228, respectively, based on petitions filed by

CoreLogic. We recently issued final decisions in Cases IPR2015-00226 and IPR2015-00228.

CoreLogic filed three petitions for *inter partes* review of the '352 patent. In Case IPR2015-00219, claims 12–15 and 17–21 of the '352 patent are subject to *inter partes* review based on one asserted ground of unpatentability. *CoreLogic, Inc. v. Boundary Solutions, Inc.*, Case IPR2015-00219 (PTAB May 21, 2015) (Paper 6). In Case IPR2015-00222, each of claims 1–23 of the '352 patent are subject to *inter partes* review based on two asserted grounds of unpatentability. *CoreLogic, Inc. v. Boundary Solutions, Inc.*, Case IPR2015-00222 (PTAB May 21, 2015) (Paper 7). We recently issued final decisions in each of these proceedings related to the '352 patent. In IPR2015-00222, we concluded that CoreLogic demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that claims 1–23 of the '352 patent are unpatentable. *CoreLogic, Inc. v. Boundary Solutions, Inc.*, Case IPR2015-00222 (PTAB May 19, 2016) (Paper 48). In Case IPR2015-00225, we did not institute an *inter partes* review because the information presented in the petition did not establish a reasonable likelihood that CoreLogic would prevail. *CoreLogic, Inc. v. Boundary Solutions, Inc.*, Case IPR2015-00225 (PTAB May 21, 2015) (Paper 7).

#### *B. The '352 Patent*

The '352 patent relates generally to Geographic Information Systems (“GIS”) and, in particular, to a National Online Parcel-Level Map Data Portal (“NPDP”) that provides online delivery of parcel-level map data. Ex. 1001, Abstract, 1:22–37. The '352 patent describes the NPDP as an electronic repository for parcel-level maps and linked attribute data acquired from public and private entities. *Id.* at 2:41–53. Databases from different

jurisdictions are assembled and stored in a standard format, with each jurisdictional database placed in an individual directory. *Id.* at 4:8–10, 7:22–30. The system normalizes information to a single universal spatial protocol. *Id.* at 3:16–19, 7:33–54. Parcel-level information includes parcel boundaries and geocodes linked using a parcel identifier to a non-graphic database containing property tax records. *Id.* at 1:60–64, 4:10–17, 8:14–25.

The '352 patent describes retrieving a parcel-level map based on the address of a parcel requested by an end user. *Id.* at 1:65–2:1, 4:52–56. The system searches a jurisdictional lookup table to identify the jurisdiction in which the requested parcel is located. *Id.* at 8:26–30. The system searches the non-graphic database for that jurisdiction for a record matching the address, and uses the parcel identifier for that record to access a graphic database containing the selected parcel. *Id.* at 3:56–63. The system can display the selected parcel and surrounding parcels, with the selected parcel shown as a highlighted polygon. *Id.* at 4:61–63. The system can also display the parcel's linked data (e.g., tax record). *Id.* at 4:63–64.

The '352 patent also describes a business revenue model that “begins with the establishment by the NPDP service provider of a publicized parcel-level map data web site with links to a tax record database.” *Id.* at 13:10–13. For example, the model contemplates generating revenue through various subscription agreements. *Id.* at 14:9–15:46. The '352 patent also describes providing access to the database for free. *See id.* at 2:67, 13:63–65, 14:28–29, 15:59–63.

*C. Illustrative Claim*

CoreLogic refers to independent claim 12 as “representative” in its Petition. Pet. 19. Claim 12 reads:

12. A method for retrieving and displaying geographic parcel boundary polygon maps comprising:

receiving, by a server, a request for a parcel boundary polygon map for a selected parcel;

searching, by the server, using a jurisdictional identifier[,] a multi-jurisdictional digital parcel map database for the selected parcel boundary polygon and the parcel boundary polygons of adjacent and surrounding parcels, the database having information about individual land parcels normalized to a common spatial data protocol, including polygon data used to describe the boundaries of a plurality of properties; and,

transmitting the parcel boundary polygon map data for the selected parcel along with the adjacent and surrounding parcels for display, wherein the parcel boundary polygon map includes the selected parcel polygon along with adjacent and surrounding parcel boundary polygons around the selected parcel.

Ex. 1001, 17:13–30.

*D. Asserted Grounds of Unpatentability*

CoreLogic asserts that claims 1–23 of the ’352 patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Pet. 30.

### III. DISCUSSION

A threshold question is whether the ’352 patent is a “covered business method patent,” as defined by the AIA. CoreLogic bears the burden of persuasion that the ’352 patent is a covered business method patent. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.304(a). For the reasons discussed below, we determine

# 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.