

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CORELOGIC, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

BOUNDARY SOLUTIONS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-00219
Patent 8,065,352 B2

Before LYNNE E. PETTIGREW, PETER P. CHEN, and
RICHARD H. MARSCHALL, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

PETTIGREW, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

FINAL WRITTEN DECISION
35 U.S.C. § 318(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.73

I. INTRODUCTION

In this *inter partes* review, instituted pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 314, CoreLogic, Inc. (“CoreLogic”) challenges the patentability of several claims of U.S. Patent No. 8,065,352 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’352 patent”), owned by Boundary Solutions, Inc. (“BSI”). We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C.

IPR2015-00219
Patent 8,065,352 B2

§ 6(c). This Final Written Decision is entered pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 318(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.73. For the reasons discussed below, CoreLogic has not shown by a preponderance of the evidence that claims 12–15 and 17–21 of the '352 patent are unpatentable.

A. Procedural History

CoreLogic filed a Petition for *inter partes* review of claims 1–23 of the '352 patent. Paper 1 (“Pet.”). BSI filed a Preliminary Response. Paper 5 (“Prelim. Resp.”). On May 21, 2015, we instituted an *inter partes* review of claims 12–15 and 17–21 of the '352 patent based on the asserted ground of anticipation by Oosterom.¹ Paper 6 (“Dec.”).

After institution, BSI filed a Patent Owner Response, Paper 22 (“PO Resp.”), and CoreLogic filed a Reply to the Patent Owner Response, Paper 35 (“Reply”). CoreLogic filed a Motion to Exclude Evidence, Paper 37 (“Mot. Excl.”), BSI filed an Opposition to the Motion to Exclude, Paper 41, and CoreLogic filed a Reply in support of its Motion to Exclude, Paper 42.

An oral hearing was held on February 11, 2016.² A transcript of the hearing has been entered into the record. Paper 47 (“Tr.”).

B. Related Matters

The parties state that BSI has asserted the '352 patent against CoreLogic in *Boundary Solutions, Inc. v. CoreLogic, Inc.*, No. 3:14-cv-

¹ P.J.M. van Oosterom et al., *Spatial data management on a very large cadastral database*, 25 COMPUTERS, ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN SYSTEMS 509 (2001) (Ex. 1010, “Oosterom”).

² A consolidated oral hearing was held for this proceeding and Cases IPR2015-00222, IPR2015-00226, and IPR2015-00228. *See* Paper 40.

IPR2015-00219
Patent 8,065,352 B2

00761 (N.D. Cal.) (filed Feb. 19, 2014). Pet. 59; Paper 4 (Patent Owner’s Mandatory Notices). BSI also has asserted related U.S. Patent No. 7,499,946 (“the ’946 patent”) and U.S. Patent No. 7,092,957 (“the ’957 patent”) in that proceeding. Pet. 59; Paper 4. The ’946 patent and the ’957 patent are the subject of *inter partes* reviews in Cases IPR2015-00226 and IPR2015-00228, respectively, based on petitions filed by CoreLogic.

CoreLogic filed two additional petitions for *inter partes* review of the ’352 patent. In Case IPR2015-00222, each of claims 1–23 of the ’352 patent is the subject of an *inter partes* review based on two asserted grounds of unpatentability. *CoreLogic, Inc. v. Boundary Solutions, Inc.*, Case IPR2015-00222 (PTAB May 21, 2015) (Paper 7). In Case IPR2015-00225, we did not institute an *inter partes* review because the information presented in the petition did not establish a reasonable likelihood CoreLogic would prevail. *CoreLogic, Inc. v. Boundary Solutions, Inc.*, Case IPR2015-00225 (PTAB May 21, 2015) (Paper 7).

CoreLogic also has filed petitions for covered business method patent review of the ’957 patent, ’946 patent, and ’352 patent, which are pending in Cases CBM2015-00016, CBM2015-00017, and CBM2015-00018, respectively.

C. The ’352 Patent

The ’352 patent relates generally to Geographic Information Systems (“GIS”) and, in particular, to a National Online Parcel-Level Map Data Portal (“NPDP”) that provides online delivery of parcel-level map data. Ex. 1001, Abstract, 1:22–37. The ’352 patent describes the NPDP as an electronic repository for parcel-level maps and linked attribute data acquired from public and private entities. *Id.* at 2:41–53. Databases from different

jurisdictions are assembled and stored in a standard format, with each jurisdictional database placed in an individual directory. *Id.* at 4:8–10, 7:22–30. Information is normalized to a single universal spatial protocol. *Id.* at 3:16–19, 7:33–54. Parcel-level information includes parcel boundaries and geocodes, which are linked using a parcel identifier to a non-graphic database containing property tax records. *Id.* at 1:60–64, 4:10–17, 8:14–25.

The '352 patent describes retrieving a parcel-level map based on the address of a parcel requested by an end user. *Id.* at 1:65–2:1, 4:52–56. A jurisdictional lookup table is searched to identify, for example, the jurisdiction in which the requested parcel is located. *Id.* at 8:26–30. The non-graphic database for that jurisdiction is searched for a record matching the address, and the parcel identifier for that record is used to access a graphic database containing the selected parcel. *Id.* at 3:56–63. The selected parcel and surrounding parcels may be displayed, with the selected parcel shown as a highlighted polygon. *Id.* at 4:61–63. The parcel's linked data (e.g., tax record) also may be displayed. *Id.* at 4:63–64.

D. Illustrative Claim

Among the claims at issue in this proceeding, only claim 12 is independent. Claim 12 reads:

12. A method for retrieving and displaying geographic parcel boundary polygon maps comprising:

receiving, by a server, a request for a parcel boundary polygon map for a selected parcel;

searching, by the server, using a jurisdictional identifier[,] a multi-jurisdictional digital parcel map database for the selected parcel boundary polygon and the parcel boundary polygons of adjacent and surrounding parcels, the database having information about individual land parcels normalized to a

common spatial data protocol, including polygon data used to describe the boundaries of a plurality of properties; and,

transmitting the parcel boundary polygon map data for the selected parcel along with the adjacent and surrounding parcels for display, wherein the parcel boundary polygon map includes the selected parcel polygon along with adjacent and surrounding parcel boundary polygons around the selected parcel.

Ex. 1001, 17:13–30.

II. DISCUSSION

A. *Claim Construction*

In an *inter partes* review, we construe claim terms in an unexpired patent according to their broadest reasonable construction in light of the specification of the patent in which they appear. 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b); *In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC*, 793 F.3d 1268, 1278 (Fed. Cir. 2015), *cert. granted sub nom. Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC v. Lee*, 136 S. Ct. 890 (mem.) (2016). Consistent with the broadest reasonable construction, claim terms generally are given their ordinary and customary meaning as understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art in the context of the entire patent disclosure. *In re Translogic Tech., Inc.*, 504 F.3d 1249, 1257 (Fed. Cir. 2007). An inventor may provide a meaning for a term that is different from its ordinary meaning by defining the term in the specification with reasonable clarity, deliberateness, and precision. *In re Paulsen*, 30 F.3d 1475, 1480 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

In the Institution Decision, we construed “jurisdictional identifier” to mean “a number or other name, code, or description that identifies a jurisdiction.” Dec. 6. We based our construction on the only appearance of

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.