

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

T-MOBILE US, INC.
Petitioner

v.

INTELLECTUAL VENTURES II LLC
Patent Owner

Case CBM2016-00083
Patent 6,115,737

**PATENT OWNER INTELLECTUAL VENTURES II LLC'S
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION**

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Table of Contents

I. Introduction 1

II. Technology Overview of the '737 Patent..... 2

 A. The problem: existing self-service customer care and account management services lacked flexibility..... 2

 B. The '737 patent provides an important solution. 3

 C. The extensive prosecution history attests to the novelty of the claimed inventions. 6

 D. State of the art. 9

III. Claim Construction..... 13

 A. Patent Owner’s definition of “CCSN/IG” follows the accepted rules of claim construction. 13

 1. Patent Owner’s construction is based on the claim language, the specification, and the file history. 14

 2. The Board should reject Petitioner’s construction as too narrow: an integrated service control point is not limited to part of a telephone network switch. 18

 3. The CCSN/IG and the CCSN are not a conventional. 24

 B. Available through telecom service providers’ web server..... 27

IV. The Board Should Deny Institution Because Petitioner Did Not Meet Its Burden that the '737 Patent is Eligible for CBM Review..... 27

 A. The '737 patent does not meet the financial prong of CBM eligibility..... 28

 1. None of the claims of the '737 patent recite a financial product or service..... 30

 2. The embodiments in the specification are insufficient to make the challenged claims eligible for CBM review. 35

 3. Conclusion..... 44

 B. Because the '352 patent is for a technological invention, Petitioner cannot satisfy the second prong of the CBM test. 45

V. Petitioner has failed to show that claims 7–9 and 14 are directed to patent ineligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. 49

 A. Legal framework. 51

 1. The challenged claims are not directed to an abstract idea..... 52

2. The claims recite a novel and non-obvious technical application.61
3. The challenged claims satisfy the machine-or-transformation test.68
VI. Conclusion.70

Table of Authorities

Cases:

Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank International,
134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....*passim*

Apple Inc. v. SightSound Techs., LLC,
CBM2013-00019, Paper 17 (PTAB Oct. 8, 2013)30, 62

Apple Inc. v. SightSound Tech., LLC,
CBM2013-00020, Paper 14 (PTAB Oct. 8, 2013)41

Apple Inc. v. SightSound Tech., LLC,
CBM2013-00023, Paper 12 (PTAB Oct. 8, 2013)41

AT&T Mobility LLC v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC,
CBM2015-00185, Paper 10 (PTAB May 4, 2016).....43

Bancorp Servs., L.L.C. v. Sun Life Assurance Co. of Can.,
687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....69

Bascom Glob. Internet Servs., Inc. v. AT&T Mobility LLC,
No. 2015-1763, 2016 WL 3514158 (Fed. Cir. June 27, 2016).....52, 62, 64, 66

Bilski v. Kappos,
561 U.S. 593 (2010).....68, 69

Blue Calypso LLC v. Groupon, Inc.,
No. 2015-1391, 2016 WL 791107 (Fed Cir. March 1, 2016).....30

buySAFE, Inc. v. Google, Inc.,
765 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....58, 59

Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank,
76 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....58

DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.,
773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....51–52

<i>Diamond v. Diehr</i> , 450 U.S. 175 (1981).....	67
<i>Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 822 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	51, 52, 57, 60
<i>FFF Enterprises, Inc. v. AmerisourceBergen Specialty Group, Inc.</i> , CBM2014-00154, Paper 14 (PTAB Jan. 29, 2015).....	30
<i>Google Inc. v. Network-1 Technologies, Inc.</i> , CBM2015-00113, Paper 7 (PTAB. Oct. 19, 2015)	61
<i>Intermix Media, LLC v. Bally Gaming, Inc.</i> , CBM2015-00154, Paper 10 (PTAB. Jan. 20, 2016).....	61
<i>Internet Patents Corp. v. Active Network, Inc.</i> , 790 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	57
<i>J.P. Morgan Chase & Co. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC</i> , CBM2014-00160, Paper 11 (PTAB Jan. 29, 2015).....	33
<i>NRT Technology Corp. v. Everi Payments, Inc.</i> , CBM2015-00167, Paper 14 (PTAB. Jan. 22, 2016).....	61
<i>Par Pharm., Inc. v. Jazz Pharms., Inc.</i> , CBM2014-00149, Paper 12 (PTAB Jan. 13, 2015).....	31
<i>PNC Fin. Servs. Group, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC</i> , CBM2014-00032, Paper 13 (PTAB May 22, 2014).....	33
<i>Salesforce.com, Inc. v. Applications in Internet Time LLC</i> , CBM2014-00162, Paper 11 (PTAB Feb. 2, 2015)	33
<i>Sega of Am., Inc. v. Uniloc USA, Inc.</i> , CBM2014-00183, Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 10, 2015)	32
<i>ServiceNow, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard, Co.</i> , CBM2015-00108, Paper 10 (PTAB Oct. 7, 2015)	29, 30, 36, 43
<i>Sightsound Tech., LLC v. Apple Inc.</i> , 809 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	41

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.