IN THE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board

EBAY INC. and PAYPAL, INC.,

Petitioner,

 ν .

XPRT VENTURES, LLC

Patent Owner.

CBM2017-00028

Patent No. 7,599,881 B2

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO THE

PETITIONER'S PETITION

(37 C.F.R. Section 42.220)

Dated: November 1, 2017



TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABI	LE OF	AUTHORITIES	iv	
SUM	MARY	Y OF ARGUMENT	1	
ARG	UMEN	NT	5	
I.	PATENT OWNER'S CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE NOT CBM CLAIMS AND THEY RECITE PATENTABLE SUBJECT MATTER			
	A.	Challenged Claims Recite Patentable Subject Matter	5	
	B.	Challenged Claims Are Not CBM Claim	s9	
II.	THE ADH	ENTS ARE PRIVATE RIGHTS, AND PTAB INCORRECTLY ERED TO A "PUBLIC RIGHTS" ORY IN GRANTING THE PETITION	11	
	A.	The U.S. Supreme Court Has Historically Treated Patent Rights as Private Rights, Not "Public Rights"	13	
	B.	The PTAB'S "Public Rights" Theory Is Inconsistent With the Quid Pro Quo That Underlies the Patent System	21	
III.	ENA	IPR AND CBM PROCESSES AS CTED AND IMPLEMENTED CONSTITUTIONALLY INFIRM	23	



A.	Reco Artic	J.S. Supreme Court Has gnized Exceptions To le III Jurisdiction Only In ted Circumstances.	.24		
В.	IPR and CBM Proceedings Conducted By The PTAB Do Not Meet The Supreme Court's Criteria For Agency Adjudication of Private Rights				
	1.	The PTAB Operates More Broadly, And With Less Independence, Than the Tribunals Approved By The U.S. Supreme Court	.27		
	2.	The PTAB Has Failed To Adopt Fair Procedures To Secure Patent Rights	.32		
	3.	The Contrast With Other PTO Procedures For Reviewing IssuedPatents Shows That The IPR and CBM Processes Do Not Operate In A Fair Or Valid Manner	?		
ESPE APPI	ECIAL LIED T	ND CBM SYSTEMS ARE LY TROUBLING AS TO PATENTS ISSUED HE AIA	.41		
DEN: TO A	IES A JURY	CESS UNDERMINES OR PATENT OWNER'S RIGHT Y TRIAL UNDER THE	15		



IV.

V.

VI. CBM PROCESS IS UNFAIR TO A	
PATENT OWNER SINCE A PATENT	
INFRINGER CAN ASSERT GROUND	S
IT COULD HAVE REASONABLY	
ASSERTED IN THE DISTRICT	
COURT	46
CONCLUSION	47
WORD COUNT CERTIFICATION	49
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	50



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES:

Andrews v. Columbia Gas Transmission Corp., 544 F.3d 618 (6th Cir. 2008)	15
Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University v. Roche Molecular Systems, Inc., 131 S.Ct. 2188 (2011)	19
Cammeyer v. Newton, 94 U.S. (4 Otto) 225 (1876)	14
Cleveland v. United States, 531 U.S. 12 (2000)	13
Commodity Futures Trading Comm'n v. Schor, 478 U.S. 833 (1986)	passim
Consolidated Fruit-Jar Co. v. Wright, 94 U.S. (4 Otto) 92 (1876)	13
Crowell v. Benson, 285 U.S. 22 (1932)	passim
Crozier v. Fried, Krupp Aktiengesellschaft, 224 U.S. 290 (1912)	14
Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee, No. 15-446	32
Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corporation, (Fed. Cir. 2016)	5, 7
Evans v. Jordan, 8 Fed. Cas. 872 (C.C.D. Va. 1813)	17



DOCKET A L A R M

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.

