

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

FACEBOOK, INC. and INSTAGRAM, LLC,

Petitioner,

v.

SKKY, LLC,

Patent Owner.

---

Case CBM2017-00002  
Patent 9,203,870 B2

---

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.207*

## Table of Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| I. Summary of Preliminary Response .....  | 1  |
| II. Factual Background of the '870 Patent .....   | 1  |
| III. This Board should reject the Petition on its face because the '870 patent is not a CBM patent .....  | 5  |
| a. This Board should only consider remaining claims 8 and 10-14 in the '870 patent for CBM review.....  | 5  |
| b. Claim 8 is not subject to CBM review because it is not directed to a financial product or service .....  | 6  |
| i. Claim 8 is not directed to a financial product or service because it does not specifically disclose how money is used or handled .....           | 6  |
| ii. Claim 8's copyright limitation does not render the claim CBM eligible because copyright ownership is not specific to the financial sector. .... | 8  |
| c. Claims 10 and 11 are not subject to CBM review because the "tracking" limitation is not limited to determining royalty payments. ....            | 15 |
| d. Claim 14 is not subject to CBM review because it is not directed to a financial product or service .....   | 17 |
| e. Claims 8 and 10-14 are not subject to CBM review because they claim technological inventions .....   | 18 |
| IV. Claim Construction.....   | 25 |
| V. Petitioners Have Not Proven That One Or More Claims Of The '870 Patent Are More Likely Than Not Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 101.....          | 26 |
| a. An inventive concept or transformation of building blocks of human ingenuity is patent eligible under Section 101. ....                          | 26 |
| b. A solution to a problem necessarily rooted in computer technology constitutes an inventive concept under Section 101.....                        | 27 |
| c. The '870 patent is patent eligible because it is a solution to a problem necessarily rooted in computer technology. ....                         | 28 |
| VI. Petitioners Have Not Proven That One Or More Claims Of The '870 Patent Are More Likely Than Not Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 112.....         | 36 |
| a. The '870 patent complies with the "regards as" clause .....  | 37 |
| b. The '870 patent complies with the written description requirement.....   | 43 |

VII. Conclusion.....49

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

|   | <b>Page(s)</b> |
|---|----------------|
| <b>Cases</b>  |                |
| <i>Alcon Research Ltd. v. Barr Labs., Inc.</i> ,<br>745 F.3d 1180 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....                        | 44             |
| <i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l</i> ,<br>134 S. Ct. 2347, 2354 (2014).....                           | 27             |
| <i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l</i> ,<br>134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....                                 | 27, 31, 34, 36 |
| <i>Allen Eng’g Corp. v. Bartell Indus., Inc.</i> ,<br>299 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....                      | 39, 40         |
| <i>Ancora Techs. v. Apple, Inc.</i> ,<br>744 F.3d 732 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....                                    | 38, 39, 40, 41 |
| <i>Apple, Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.</i> ,<br>CBM2015-00046, Paper 12 (PTAB June 3, 2015).....         | 24             |
| <i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i> ,<br>598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....                     | 44             |
| <i>Ass’n for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc.</i> ,<br>133 S. Ct. 2107 (2012).....                  | 26             |
| <i>Bamberg v. Dalvey</i> ,<br>815 F.3d 793 (Fed. Cir 2016) .....  | 48             |
| <i>BASCOM Global Internet Servs. v. AT&amp;T Mobility LLC</i> ,<br>827 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. June 27, 2016)..... | 32, 33, 34, 35 |
| <i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> ,<br>561 U.S. 593 (2010).....   | 32             |
| <i>Boston Sci. Corp. v. Johnson &amp; Johnson</i> ,<br>647 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....                     | 44             |
| <i>Community for Creative Non-Violence v. Reid</i> ,<br>490 U.S. 730 (1989).....                                | 9, 15          |

|  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
| <i>CoreLogic</i> ,<br>CBM2016-00018, Paper 9 .....   | 12                   |
| <i>CoreLogic, Inc. v. Boundary Solutions, Inc.</i> ,<br>CBM2016-00018 (PTAB May 24, 2016).....                     | 12                   |
| <i>DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.</i> ,<br>773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....                             | 28                   |
| <i>Diamond v. Diehr</i> ,<br>450 U.S. 175 (1981).....  | 27, 29               |
| <i>Emnos USA Corp. v. Dunnhumby Ltd.</i> ,<br>CBM2015-00116, Paper 8 (PTAB Nov. 10, 2015).....                     | 24                   |
| <i>Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.</i> ,<br>822 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....                                    | 28, 29, 30           |
| <i>Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe Inc.</i> ,<br>323 F.3d 956 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....                               | 45                   |
| <i>Experian Mktg. Sols., Inc. v. RPost Commc'ns Ltd.</i> ,<br>CBM2014-00010, Paper 20 (PTAB Apr. 22, 2014).....    | 24                   |
| <i>Facebook, Inc. v. Skky, LLC</i> ,<br>CBM2016-00091, Paper 7 (PTAB Nov. 23, 2016).....                           | 5, 6, 11, 14         |
| <i>Google Inc. v. At Home Bondholders' Liquidating Trust</i> ,<br>CBM2016-0036, Paper 12 (PTAB Aug. 22, 2016)..... | 19, 20, 24           |
| <i>Google Inc. v. SimpleAir, Inc.</i> ,<br>CBM2015-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB May 19, 2014).....                        | 5                    |
| <i>Great West Cas. Co. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC</i> ,<br>CBM2015-00171, Paper 10 (PTAB Feb. 9, 2016).....   | 5, 9, 11, 14, 16, 18 |
| <i>ICU Med., Inc. v. Alaris Med. Sys.</i> ,<br>558 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....                                | 46, 47               |
| <i>In re Conley</i> ,<br>490 F.2d 972 (CCPA 1974) .....  | 38                   |

# 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.