

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Sally Beauty Holdings, Inc., and Sally Beauty Supply LLC,

Petitioners

v.

Intellectual Ventures I LLC,

Patent Owner

Case CBM2016-_____

Reissued Patent RE43,715

PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD REVIEW

Petitioners Sally Beauty Holdings, Inc., and Sally Beauty Supply LLC submit this Petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(2)(iii) for covered business method review of U.S. Reissue Patent No. RE43,715.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
II.	PETITIONERS’ STANDING TO SEEK CBM REVIEW	2
III.	MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(A)(1))	2
	A. Real Parties-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))	2
	B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	3
	C. Designation of Lead and Backup Counsel and Service Information (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.8(b)(3)-(4))	3
	D. Proof of Service (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.6(e) and 42.105(a)).....	3
	E. Fee for Covered Business Method Review (37 C.F.R. § 42.103)	3
	F. Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(a))	4
IV.	THE ’715 PATENT IS A COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT	4
	A. The ’715 Patent Is Directed to a “Financial Product or Service”	4
	B. The ’715 Patent Is Not Directed to a “Technological Invention”	8
	1. Claim 14 Does Not Recite a Novel or Non-Obvious Technological Feature.....	9
	2. Claim 14 Does Not Solve a Technical Problem with a Technical Solution	11
V.	PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	12
VI.	OVERVIEW OF THE ’715 PATENT	14
VII.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION FOR PURPOSES OF CBM REVIEW	15
	A. “Public Data”	16
	A. “Private Data”	16

B.	“Private Data Store”	17
C.	“Publicly Available Data Store”	17
D.	“Public Data Is Determined By Private Data”	18
E.	“Integrated Data”	18
VIII.	DETAILED EXPLANATION OF GROUNDS FOR INSTITUTION	19
A.	Claims 1-50 Recite Patent-Ineligible Subject Matter	19
1.	Legal Standard	19
2.	The ’715 Patent Claims Recite an Abstract Idea	20
B.	The Claims Do Not Pass the Machine or Transformation Test	27
IX.	CLAIMS 1-50 ARE OBVIOUS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103	28
A.	Claims 1-6, 8-10, 20, 25, 27-32, 35-42, 44, and 47-49 are obvious under 35. U.S.C. § 103(a) over Farber in view of CompuServe	28
B.	Claims 7, 9, 18, 22-24, 26, 34, 39, 46, and 50 are obvious over Farber in view of CompuServe and Nazem	55
C.	Claims 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, and 33 are obvious over Farber in view of CompuServe and Dedrick	62
D.	Claim 13 is obvious over Farber in view of CompuServe, Dedrick, and Griffin	70
E.	Claim 16 is obvious over Farber in view of CompuServe, Nazem, Dedrick, and Williams	71
F.	Claim 19 is obvious over Farber in view of CompuServe, Dedrick, and Cragun	73
G.	Claims 21 and 43 are obvious over Farber in view of CompuServe and Oracle SQL	75
H.	Claim 45 is obvious over Farber in view of CompuServe and Bauer.....	78

X. CLAIMS 10 AND 19 ARE INDEFINITE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 11279
A. Claim 10 is Indefinite Under 35 U.S.C. § 112(b)79
B. Claim 19 is Indefinite Under 35 U.S.C. § 112(a)80
XI. CONCLUSION.....80

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....	19, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27
<i>Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336, 94 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc).....	80
<i>Ass’n for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc.</i> , 133 S. Ct. 2107 (2013).....	19
<i>Bancorp Servs., L.L.C. v. Sun Life Assur. Co. of Can. (U.S.)</i> , 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	1
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 130 S. Ct. 3218 (2010).....	27, 28
<i>buySAFE, Inc. v. Google, Inc.</i> , 765 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	27
<i>Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, Nat. Ass’n</i> , 776 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	25
<i>Cybersource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	20
<i>Google Inc. v. SimpleAir Inc.</i> , CBM2014-00170, Paper 13 at 6 (PTAB Jan. 22, 2015).....	5
<i>Gottschalk v. Benson</i> , 409 U.S. 63 (1972).....	26
<i>Informatica Corp. v. Protegrity Corp.</i> , CBM2015-0010, Paper 13, 11-12 (PTAB May 11, 2015)	8
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Capital One Bank (USA)</i> , 792 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	20, 24
<i>Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.</i> , CBM2012-00003, Paper No. 78, 7 (PTAB, Feb. 11, 2014)	4

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.