

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

GOOGLE INC.  
Petitioner

v.

HBAC MATCHMAKER MEDIA, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case CBM: Unassigned

---

**PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT REVIEW OF  
U.S. PATENT NO. 6,002,393 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 321 AND § 18 OF THE  
LEAHY-SMITH AMERICA INVENTS ACT**

**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

	<b>Page</b>
I. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED (37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)).....	1
II. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT .....	1
III. MANDATORY NOTICES INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED (37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)) .....	3
A. Real Party-In-Interest .....	3
B. Related Matters.....	3
C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel and Service Information .....	6
IV. OVERVIEW OF THE '393 PATENT AND ITS PROSECUTION HISTORY .....	7
A. Independent Claims .....	7
B. Dependent Claims .....	13
C. Specification.....	13
D. Prosecution History .....	15
V. GROUNDS FOR STANDING.....	17
A. Petitioner Has Been Sued For Infringement Of The '393 Patent And Is Not Estopped .....	17
B. The '393 Patent Is A Covered Business Method Patent .....	17
1. At least independent claims 1 and 56 are directed to “performing data processing or other operations used in the practice, administration, or management of a financial product or service.” .....	18
C. At Least Claims 1 And 56 Are Not Directed To A “Technological Invention” .....	21
1. At least claims 1 and 56 do not recite a technological feature that is novel and unobvious .....	21
a) The claims recite known, prior art hardware.....	23
b) The claims recite known, prior art software.....	28
2. At least claims 1 and 56 do not solve a technical problem using a technical solution.....	30

3.	For the same reasons as addressed for claims 1 and 56, independent claims 10, 19, 28, 37, 46, 55, 69, and 70 are also related to a financial product and service, and do not recite a technological feature or solve technical problem .....	32
VI.	IDENTIFICATION OF THE CHALLENGE TO THE CLAIMS OF THE '393 PATENT .....	33
A.	Claims For Which Review Is Requested .....	33
B.	Statutory Grounds Of Challenge .....	34
C.	Person Having Ordinary Skill In The Art .....	34
D.	Claim Construction .....	35
1.	Standards for claim construction .....	35
2.	“Head end system” .....	35
3.	“Downloading the [instruction/command signal] . . . to command the control device[s] to select [an/the] advertisement from the head end system” .....	35
VII.	CLAIMS 1–70 OF THE '393 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE.....	36
A.	Ground No. 1: Claims 1–70 Are Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 101.....	36
1.	The challenged claims are directed to an abstract idea.....	38
2.	The independent claims do not contain an inventive concept .....	44
a)	The “head end system,” “control” components,” and one or more “data bases” .....	44
b)	The “display site” and “viewing site” limitations .....	53
c)	Instructions to apply the abstract concept .....	55
d)	The ordered combination of elements .....	55
3.	Elements recited in the dependent claims do not alter the analysis.....	59
B.	Ground No. 2: Claims 1–70 Are Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 112.....	69
1.	The Claims of the '393 Patent are Invalid for Lack of Written Description.....	69
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	82

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Abbvie Deutschland GmbH &amp; Co. v. Janssen Biotech, Inc.</i> , 759 F.3d 1285 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	76
<i>Accenture Glob. Servs., GMBH v. Guideware Software, Inc.</i> , 728 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	69
<i>Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC v. DirecTV LLC</i> , 109 F. Supp. 3d 916 (W.D. Tex. 2015) .....	31, 40
<i>Agilent Techs., Inc. v. Affymetrix, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	76
<i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc.</i> , 314 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	76
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Bancorp Servs., L.L.C. v. Sun Life Assur. Co. of Canada</i> , 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	46, 55, 60
<i>Bascom Glob. Internet Servs., Inc. v AT&amp;T Mobility</i> , 2016 WL 3514158 (Fed. Cir. June 27, 2016) .....	57
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 561 U.S. 593 (2010).....	37
<i>Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	19
<i>Broadband iTV, Inc., v. Hawaiian Telcom, Inc.</i> , 136 F. Supp. 3d 1228 (D. Haw. 2015).....	22, 23, 53

<i>Centocor Ortho Biotech, Inc. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 636 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	73
<i>CLS Bank Int’l v. Alice Corp.</i> , 717 F.3d 1269 (Fed. Cir. 2013) (en banc) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Crown Packaging Tech., Inc. v. Ball Metal Bev. Container Corp.</i> , 635 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	80
<i>CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	50, 61, 63, 67
<i>DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.</i> , 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	47
<i>Dealertrack, Inc. v. Huber</i> , 674 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	46, 50
<i>Diamond v. Diehr</i> , 450 U.S. 175 (1981).....	37
<i>Driessen v. Sony Music Entm’t</i> , 2016 WL 520263 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 10, 2016) .....	72
<i>Elec. Power Grp., LLC v. Alstom S.A.</i> , 2016 WL 4073318 (Fed. Cir. Aug. 1, 2016) .....	43, 58
<i>Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 822 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	42
<i>Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co.</i> , 535 U.S. 722 (2002).....	71
<i>Fiers v. Revel</i> , 984 F.2d 1164 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	77
<i>HBAC Matchmaker Media, Inc. v. Google Inc.</i> , 2016 WL 3059238 (Fed. Cir. May 31, 2016) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>ICU Med., Inc. v. Alaris Med. Sys., Inc.</i> , 558 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	80, 82

# 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.