

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AMAZON.COM, INC., AMAZON DIGITAL SERVICES, INC., AMAZON
FULFILLMENT SERVICES, INC., HULU, LLC, and NETFLIX, INC.,
Petitioners,

v.

UNILOC LUXEMBOURG, S.A.,
Patent Owner.

CASE: IPR2017-00948
Patent No. 8,566,960

Before DAVID C. MCKONE, BARBARA A. PARVIS, and MICHELLE N.
WORMMEESTER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

**PETITIONERS' OPPOSITION TO
PATENT OWNER'S CONTINGENT MOTION TO AMEND**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. THE SUBSTITUTE CLAIMS ARE INELIGIBLE UNDER § 101	1
A. Uniloc's Motion to Amend Did Not Address § 101, Despite a Prior Adverse Judgment on That Issue	1
B. The Proposed Substitute Claims Recite Patent-Ineligible Subject Matter Under § 101	2
1. The Substitute Claims Are Directed to an Abstract Idea.....	3
2. The Substitute Claims Lack an Inventive Concept Capable of Imparting Patent Eligibility	9
II. THE SUBSTITUTE CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER § 103	11
A. Claim 26 Would Have Been Obvious Over DeMello and Hu.....	13
B. Claim 27 Would Have Been Obvious Over DeMello and Hu.....	18
C. Claim 28 Would Have Been Obvious Over DeMello and Hu.....	19
D. The Dependent Claims Would Remain Unpatentable Over the Prior Art.....	20
III. THE SUBSTITUTE CLAIMS SHOULD BE REJECTED AS VIOLATING THE STATUTORY PROHIBITION AGAINST ENLARGING CLAIM SCOPE.....	21
IV. THE SUBSTITUTE CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE DUE TO INDEFINITENESS	24
V. CONCLUSION.....	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES	PAGE(S)
<i>Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank Int'l,</i> 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....	3, 4, 5, 9
<i>Amazon.com, Inc. v. Personalized Media Commc'ns, LLC,</i> IPR2014-01530, Paper 55 (PTAB Mar. 24, 2016).....	1
<i>Aqua Products, Inc. v. Matal,</i> 872 F.3d 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	2
<i>Ariosa Diagnostics v. Isis Innovation Ltd.,</i> IPR2012-00022, Paper 166 (PTAB Sept. 2, 2014)	1, 2
<i>Bancorp Servs., L.L.C. v. Sun Life Assurance Co. of Can. (U.S.),</i> 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	3
<i>Bilski v. Kappos,</i> 561 U.S. 593 (2010).....	5
<i>buySAFE, Inc. v. Google, Inc.,</i> 765 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	5
<i>Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.,</i> 776 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	5
<i>CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc.,</i> 654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	6
<i>Elec. Power Grp., LLC v. Alstom S.A.,</i> 830 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	7
<i>Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.,</i> 822 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	8
<i>Euro-Pro Operating LLC v. Acorne Enters., LLC,</i> IPR2014-00351, Paper 38 (PTAB July 9, 2015).....	24
<i>FairWarning IP, LLC v. Iatric Sys., Inc.,</i> 839 F.3d 1089 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
 (continued)

	Page(s)
<i>In re Bennett,</i> 766 F.2d 524 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (en banc)	22
<i>In re Freeman,</i> 30 F.3d 1459 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	22
<i>In re Packard,</i> 751 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	24
<i>In re TLI Commc 'ns LLC,</i> 823 F.3d 607 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	8, 9
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Capital One Fin. Corp.,</i> 850 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	5, 8, 9
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,</i> 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	16
<i>Mortgage Grader, Inc. v. First Choice Loan Servs., Inc.,</i> 811 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	5, 6
<i>Nippon Suisan Kaisha Ltd. v. Pronova Biopharma Norge, AS,</i> PGR2017-00033, Paper 7 (PTAB Jan. 17, 2018).....	24
<i>OIP Techs., Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.,</i> 788 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	5
<i>Pannu v. Storz Instruments, Inc.,</i> 258 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	23
<i>Smart Sys. Innovations, LLC v. Chicago Transit Auth.,</i> 873 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	9
<i>Synopsys, Inc. v. Mentor Graphics Corp.,</i> 839 F.3d 1138 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	5
<i>Thermalloy, Inc. v. Aavid Eng'g, Inc.,</i> 121 F.3d 691 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page(s)
<i>Two-Way Media Ltd. v. Comcast Cable Commc'ns, LLC,</i> 874 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	7
<i>Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.,</i> 243 F. Supp. 3d 797 (E.D. Tex. 2017).....	1, 3, 4, 9
<i>U.S. Dept. of Homeland Sec. v. Golden,</i> IPR2014-00714, Paper 35 (PTAB Oct. 1, 2015).....	22
<i>Versata Dev. Grp., Inc. v. SAP Am., Inc.,</i> 793 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	5
STATUTES	
35 U.S.C. § 101	1, 2, 3, 11
35 U.S.C. §§ 102(a), (b), and (e)	12
35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2	24
35 U.S.C. § 251	22
35 U.S.C. § 305	22
35 U.S.C. § 316(d)(3).....	21, 22
OTHER AUTHORITIES	
37 C.F.R. § 42.11	2
37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a)(2)(ii)	21, 24

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.