

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

LIVE NATION ENTERTAINMENT, INC.,

Petitioner

v.

SONGKICK.COM B.V.,

Patent Owner

---

Case PGR2017-00038

Patent 9,466,035

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

*37 C.F.R. § 42.207*

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	2
A.	Economic Context of Electronic Event-Ticket Sales .....	2
B.	Developments in Anti-Bot Technology.....	7
1.	Compaq Computer’s U.S. Patent No. 6,195,698, filed in 1998 .....	8
2.	Reshef et al. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0114705, first filed in 1997	9
C.	Recent Developments in Electronic Event-Ticket Sales .....	11
1.	McEwen U.S. Patent Publication No. 2016/0078370 .....	11
2.	Scarborough U.S. Patent Publ’n. No. 2015/0066546.....	15
3.	Shivakumar U.S. Patent Publ’n. No. 2015/0134371 .....	21
III.	THE PATENTED INVENTION .....	23
A.	Overview of the ’035 Patent .....	23
B.	Claims of the ’035 Patent.....	26
IV.	PROSECUTION HISTORY OF THE ’035 PATENT AND ’811 PATENT	27

A.	Allowance of '035 Patent .....	27
B.	Similarity between Claims of '035 Patent and '811 Patent.....	29
C.	Third-Party Submission during Prosecution of '811 Patent.....	31
D.	Examiner Interview during Prosecution of '811 Patent .....	32
E.	Examiner's Reasons for Allowing '811 Patent .....	33
V.	ALL GROUNDS SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER SECTION 325(d) 35	
A.	Section 325(d) Applies to Third-Party Submissions Previously Presented to the Office in Related Applications.....	36
B.	Section 101 Ground Based on <i>FairWarning</i> Was Previously Presented 37	
C.	Section 103 Ground Based on Scarborough Was Previously Presented 41	
VI.	PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER SECTION 324(a).....	43
A.	Claim Construction .....	43
1.	“receiver” .....	43
2.	“login” .....	43
3.	“tagging...” and “linking...” .....	44

4. “real-time” .....	44
5. “flag” .....	44
B. Ground 1: Patent Eligibility of Claims 1-19 under <i>FairWarning</i> ....	44
C. Ground 2: Obviousness of Claims 1, 4-9, 12-16, and 19 based on Scarborough and McEwen .....	47
1. Claims 1, 4-9, 12-16 Implicitly Require Two Partitions .....	47
2. Scarborough Does Not Teach the '035 Patent's Two Partitions....	48
3. McEwen Does Not Teach the '035 Patent's Two Partitions.....	52
4. A Combination of Scarborough and McEwen Does Not Teach the '035 Patent's Two Partitions.....	54
D. Ground 3: Obviousness of Claims 2, 3, 10, 11, 17, and 18 based on Scarborough, McEwen, and Shivakumar .....	55
VII. CONCLUSION.....	56

**EXHIBIT LIST**

<b>Ex. No.</b>	<b>Description</b>
2001	U.S. Patent No. 9,639,811 (the “’811 patent”)
2002	Prosecution History of U.S. Patent App. No. 15/099,750, which issued as the ’811 patent
2003	U.S. Patent No. 8,578,500 (“the ’500 patent”)
2004	Dean Budnick & Josh Baron, <i>Ticket Masters: The Rise of the Concert Industry and How the Public Got Scalped</i> (2011), p. 229.
2005	Federal Bureau of Investigation press release: Three Plead Guilty in “Wiseguys” Scheme to Purchase 1.5 Million Premium Tickets to Events Through Computer Hacking and Fraud (2012), <a href="https://archives.fbi.gov/archives/newark/press-releases/2010/nk111810.htm">https://archives.fbi.gov/archives/newark/press-releases/2010/nk111810.htm</a> (last visited October 17, 2017).
2006	<i>United States of America v. Kenneth Lowson, et al.</i> , 2:10-cr-00114-KSH, D.N.J, Indictment, filed February 23, 2010.
2007	Jason Koebler, <i>The Man Who Broke Ticketmaster</i> (Feb. 2017), Vice Magazine, available at <a href="https://motherboard.vice.com/en_us/article/mgxqb8/the-man-who-broke-ticketmaster">https://motherboard.vice.com/en_us/article/mgxqb8/the-man-who-broke-ticketmaster</a> (retrieved October 17, 2017).
2008	Kim Zetter, <i>Wiseguys Plead Guilty in Ticketmaster Captcha Case</i> (November 19, 2010), WIRED, <a href="https://www.wired.com/2010/11/wiseguys-plead-guilty/">https://www.wired.com/2010/11/wiseguys-plead-guilty/</a> (retrieved October 17, 2017).
2009	Hayley Tuskayama, <i>The Switch: The Surprising Tools Bots Use To Get Around Those Pesky Captchas</i> (June 9, 2016), The Washington Post, available at <a href="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-switch/wp/2016/06/09/the-surprising-tool-bots-use-to-get-around-those-pesky-captchas/?utm_term=.69e1ac980514">https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-switch/wp/2016/06/09/the-surprising-tool-bots-use-to-get-around-those-pesky-captchas/?utm_term=.69e1ac980514</a> (retrieved October 17, 2017)

# 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.