

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent of: Robert M. Cezar  
U.S. Pat. No.: 6,128,651 C1 Atty Docket No.: 19473-0342CP1  
Issue Date: Oct. 3, 2000  
App. Serial No.: 09/291,785  
Filing Date: April 14, 1999  
Title: INTERNET ADVERTISING WITH CONTROLLED AND  
TIMED DISPLAY OF AD CONTENT FROM  
CENTRALIZED SYSTEM CONTROLLER

**Mail Stop Patent Board**

Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD REVIEW**  
**OF UNITED STATES PATENT NO. 6,128,651**  
**PURSUANT TO 35 USC § 321, AIA § 18, AND 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.300 – 42.304**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**I. INTRODUCTION .....1**

**II. MANDATORY NOTICES AND FEES .....2**

A. Real Parties-In-Interest Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1).....2

B. Related Matters Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2) .....2

C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3) .....4

D. Service Information.....4

E. Payment Of Fees Under 37 C.F.R. §42.103.....4

**III. SUMMARY OF THE '651 PATENT .....4**

A. Brief Description .....4

B. Summary of the Prosecution History .....5

1. Original Prosecution .....5

2. *Ex Parte* Reexamination History .....6

**IV. REQUIREMENTS FOR CBM UNDER 37 C.F.R § 42.104.....7**

A. Statement Of The Precise Relief Requested For Each Claim Challenged.....7

B. The '651 Patent Is A Covered Business Method Patent Because Claims 20 And 25 Are Directed to “Performing Data Processing or Other Operations Used in the Practice, Administration, or Management of a Financial Product or Service” .....9

C. Claims 20 and 25 Are Not Directed to a Technological Invention .....18

1. Claims 20 and 25 are directed to solving *business* problems, rather than *technical* problems.....19

2. The '651 patent background asserts that a search engine indexing problem exists and then identifies which

essential element is “important” to solving this alleged problem, but Patent Owner now admits in court that the “important” element is not required by claims 20 and 25. ....23

3. Claims 20 and 25 recite traditional hardware/components that were known before the time of the ’651 patent. ....28

D. Petitioner Has Been Sued For Infringement Of The ’651 Patent And Is Not Estopped .....34

V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS .....34

A. “non-scrolling ad display” (claims 20-21, 23-26, and 28-29) .....35

VI. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....36

VII. IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT AT LEAST ONE CLAIM OF THE ’651 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE .....36

A. [GROUND 1] – Claims 20-21, 23-26, and 28-29 Fail to Recite a Statutory Claim Category Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 .....36

1. A “non-scrolling ad display” is not a “process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter” as required by 35 U.S.C. § 101. ....36

B. [GROUND 2] – Claims 20-21, 23-26, and 28-29 Recite an Improper Hybrid of Claim Categories Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 .....41

1. Even If the Claimed “Non-Scrolling Ad Display” did fit Within a Statutory Category Under 35 U.S.C. § 101, Claims 20-21, 23-26, and 28-29 Are Indefinite Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2 For Being Directed To An Improper “Hybrid” of Mixed Apparatus/Method Elements .....42

C. [GROUND 3] – Claims 20-21, 23-26, and 28-29 Are Directed to Patent-Ineligible Subject Matter Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and *Alice* .....45

1. Claims 20-21, 23-26, and 28-29 are directed to an abstract idea under the first prong of *Alice*’s two-part test. ....46

2. Claims 20-21, 23-26, and 28-29 do not amount to

significantly more than the abstract idea under the second prong of *Alice*'s two-part test.....48

3. Patent Owner changed its position regarding the technical nature/solution for claims 20 and 25 after the district court made a preliminary ruling on the pleadings.....53

D. [GROUND 4] – Claims 20-21, 23-26, and 28-29 Are Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 For Reciting The “Non-Scrolling Ad Frame” In A Way That Is Never Contemplated In the Specification and That Contradicts The “Important” Requirements Of The Specification .....57

1. Claims 20-21, 23-26, and 28-29 improperly omit an essential step for providing the “non-scrolling ad frame” and therefore fails the written description requirement. ....59

2. The specification fails to provide written description support for any embodiment in which the “non-scrolling ad frame” is provided together with a page transmitted from the website, as claims 20-21, 23-26, and 28-29 permit. ....72

E. [GROUND 5] – Claims 20-21, 23-26, and 28-29 Are Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 For Reciting The “Non-Scrolling Ad Frame” In A Way That Is Not Enabled By The Specification.....74

1. The specification fails to describe how the “non-scrolling ad frame” is provided together with a page transmitted from the website, as claims 20-21, 23-26, and 28-29 permit, “in such full clear, concise, and exact terms” that would enable a POSITA to make and use the claimed subject matter. ....74

F. [GROUND 6] - Claims 20-21, 23-26, and 28-29 Are Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 For Failing To Claim What Applicant Regards As His Invention. ....77

G. [GROUND 7] - Claims 20-21, 23-26, and 28-29 Are Indefinite Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2. ....79

1. The Term ‘Timer Timeout Report’ Recited in Claims 20 and 25 Lacks Antecedent Basis and Prevents Clarity. ....79
2. The Multiple Recitations of ‘a Website’ and ‘a Browser’ in Claims 20 and 25 are Ambiguous and Unclear. ....81
3. The Multiple Recitations of ‘an Internet Address’ in Claims 23 and 28 are Ambiguous and Unclear. ....82

**VIII. CONCLUSION.....83**

# 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.