

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A
VERIZON WIRELESS
Petitioner,

v.

BRIDGE AND POST, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-02046
Patent 7,657,594 B2

Before MIRIAM L. QUINN, BARBARA A. PARVIS, and
KEVIN C. TROCK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

TROCK, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review
37 C.F.R. § 42.108

I. INTRODUCTION

Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless (“Petitioner”) filed a request for *inter partes* review of claims 1–24 (the “challenged claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 7,657,594 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’594 patent”). Paper 1 (“Pet.”). Bridge and Post, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) filed a Preliminary Response. Paper 6 (“Prelim. Resp.”).

Under 35 U.S.C. § 314, an *inter partes* review must not be instituted “unless . . . the information presented in the petition . . . shows that there is a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition.” 35 U.S.C. § 314(a). Upon considering the Petition and Preliminary Response, we determine that Petitioner has not demonstrated a reasonable likelihood that it would prevail in showing the unpatentability of at least one of the challenged claims. Accordingly, we do not institute an *inter partes* review as to any claim of the ’594 patent.

A. *Related Proceedings*

Petitioner advises that the ’594 patent is the subject of a civil action, *Bridge and Post, Inc. v. Verizon Commc’ns, Inc.*, Case No. 3:17-cv-00094 (E.D. Va.). Pet. 1–2. Petitioner also advises that the ’594 patent was the subject of an IPR petition filed by Unified Patents, Inc., IPR2017-01423. Pet. 2. Patent Owner identified the same matters, as well as related patent applications. Paper 4, 2.

B. *The ’594 Patent*

The ’594 patent relates to determining directed media to provide to a user on a network, such as the Internet, based on user preferences. Ex. 1001, 1:20–22, 2:1–14. The directed media may include “advertisement, coupons,

video, music, or any other media which is tailored to the user preferences.” *Id.* at 2:41–43. The ’594 patent notes that traditionally, users have been identified on a network through personal accounts or through downloaded programs on the user’s network access device (e.g., “cookies”). *Id.* at 1:29–32. To avoid the problems associated with using cookies to track a user’s computing device, such as a user blocking or deleting cookies (*id.* at 1:52–59), the ’594 patent describes the use of user profiles associated with a persistent device identifier to identify a user’s network access device (*id.* at 2:67–3:4, 3:33–36). “The device identifier may comprise a media access control address (MAC address), an international mobile station identity (IMSI), an international media equipment identity (IMEI), or any anonymous device identifier.” *Id.* at 36–39.

A history module collects and maintains historic information about the network access device, including the number, date, and time of network accesses. *Id.* at 7:57–8:2. A profile engine generates user profiles based on the collected information and associates it with the persistent device identifier. *Id.* at 5:66–6:5, 6:64–7:1. The profile engine may incorporate into the profiles group characteristics, and include group identifiers indicating the associated group. *Id.* at 6:24–27. A media selection optimizer determines a directed media component based on the user profile. *Id.* at 2:15–29. The directed media is then provided to the user’s network access device. *Id.* at 8:54–64.

C. Challenged Claims

Petitioner challenges claims 1–24 of the ’594 patent. Claims 1, 15, and 24 are independent and are substantially similar– the principal difference being that claim 1 recites a method, claim 15 recites a system, and

claim 24 recites a machine-readable storage medium. *Id.* at 11:58–12:31, 13:7–50, 14:17–59. Claim 1 is illustrative.

1. A method for providing directed media to a user on a network, comprising:

receiving a request from the user to access a content provider web site over a network through a network access device operated by the user;

retrieving a persistent device identifier of the network access device;

determining a current network address of the network access device and one or more characteristics of the access device, wherein the current network address is assigned to the network access device by a network service provider for a present network access session;

retrieving historic information for the user, the historic information including patterns of usage for the network access device, and wherein the historic information comprises network access information including times and locations of network access and number of previous network accesses by the network access device;

retrieving location-centric information for a location from which the user is accessing the network;

generating a user profile based on the historic information for the user, the location-centric information, and the one or more characteristics of the access device;

storing the user profile as a record that identifies the user through the current network address and the persistent device identifier associated with the network access device;

incorporating into the user profile one or more group characteristics identifying a group with which the user is associated;

assigning a group identifier to the group based on the patterns of usage;

analyzing the retrieved device identifier, historic information, and location-centric information to determine a directed media component to be provided to the user or the group on the network access device, and

placing directed media referenced by the directed media component in the web site requested by the user request from the content provider, wherein the directed media comprises content that is customized to the user based on the user profile.

Id. at 11:58–12:31.

D. Applied Evidence

Petitioner relies upon the following references:

(1) U.S. Patent No. 6,487,538 B1, issued Nov. 26, 2002 (“Gupta I”) (Ex. 1004);

(2) U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0020242 A1, published Sep. 6, 2001 (“Gupta II”) (Ex. 1005);

(3) International Patent Application Publication No. PCT/US00/11803, published Nov. 9, 2000 (“Parekh”) (Ex. 1006);

(4) R. Droms, RFC 2131, Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol, March 1997 (“DHCP Protocol”) (Ex. 1008);

(5) U.S. Patent No. 7,366,523 B2, issued Nov. 12, 2002 (“Viikari”) (Ex. 1010);

(6) U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0172154 A1, published Aug. 4, 2005 (“Short”) (Ex. 1011);

Petitioner also relies on the Declaration of Stephen Gray. (“Gray Decl.”) (Ex. 1013).

E. Asserted Grounds of Unpatentability

Petitioner asserts the following grounds of unpatentability:

Ground 1: Claims 1–3, 5–10, 13–17, and 19–24 are unpatentable

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.