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Background
“Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.”

35 U.S.C. §101

Exceptions:
“… laws of nature, physical [natural] phenomena, and abstract ideas …” Bilski; citing Diamond v. Chakrabarty
The Test

Two-part test (in view of Mayo):

1) Is the claim directed to a patent-ineligible concept?

2) If yes, do the claim’s elements, both individually and in combination, transform the nature of the claims into a patent-eligible application of the abstract concept?

“… search for an “‘inventive concept’”— i.e., an element or combination of elements that is “sufficient to ensure that the patent in practice amounts to significantly more than a patent upon the [ineligible concept] itself.”” Alice, citing Mayo
“We have described the concern that drives this exclusionary principle as one of pre-emption” *Alice*, citing *Bilski* (upholding the patent “would pre-empt use of this approach in all fields, and would effectively grant a monopoly over an abstract idea”)

“… we tread carefully in construing this exclusionary principle lest it swallow all of patent law. … an invention is not rendered ineligible for patent simply because it involves an abstract concept. … [Applications] of such concepts ‘to a new and useful end,’ we have said, remain eligible for patent protection.”  
*Alice*, citing *Mayo, Diehr, Benson*

“In applying the §101 exception, this Court must distinguish patents that claim the ‘buildin[g] block[s]’ of human ingenuity, which are ineligible for patent protection, from those that integrate the building blocks into something more, … thereby ‘transform[ing]’ them into a patent-eligible invention” … “The latter pose no comparable risk of pre-emption, and therefore remain eligible for the monopoly granted under our patent laws.”  
*Alice*, citing *Mayo*
Cases and Contexts
# Cases Across Jurisdictions

## Federal Circuit
- Ultramercial (11.14.14)
- DDR (12.5.14)
- Internet Patents (6.23.15)

## District Courts
- Smartflash (E.D.Tex.) (1.21.15)
- Messaging Gateway Solutions (D.Del.) (4.15.15)
- Intellectual Ventures I (S.D.N.Y.) (4.28.15)
- Intellectual Ventures II (S.D.Md.) (5.12.15)
- Summit 6 (N.D.Tex.) (5.28.15)
- Frenny (E.D.Tex.) (5.29.15)
- PreSqriber (E.D.Tex.) (6.29.15)
- Stoneagle Services (M.D.Fla) (7.1.15)
- Chamberlain Group (7.7.15)
- ContentGuard (E.D.Tex.) (8.6.15)
- Klaustech (N.D.Cal.) (8.31.15)
- Canrig (S.D.Tex.) (9.17.15)
- eDekka (E.D.Tex.) (9.21.15)
- Maxus Strategic (8.18.15)

## Court of Federal Claims
- Thales Visionix (7.20.15)

## PTAB
- SimpleAir (1.22.15)
- JP Morgan Chase (2.20.15)
- Ex Parte Bush (2.27.15)
- Ex Parte Palmer (3.2.15)
- Ex Parte Scott (3.10.15)
- T. Rowe Price (6.22.15)
- ContentGuard (6.26.15)
- Ex Parte Wegman (9.18.15)
Software Contexts

Tangible
- Process affecting/affected by a real-world, tangible output/input
- System with real-world, tangible component(s)

Intangible – Technology as Necessity
- Process affects a virtual outcome
- Technological environment required to even exist

Intangible – Technology as Implementation
- Process affects a virtual outcome
- Claims technological environment as implementation for abstract idea
Cases in Context
Cases in Context

Tangible

- District Courts
  - Freeny
  - Chamberlain
  - Thales Visionix
  - Canrig

- PTAB
  - SimpleAir
  - JP Morgan Chase
  - Ex Parte Palmer

Diehr Model
Cases in Context

Intangible – Technology as Necessity

- **Federal Circuit**
  - DDR
- **District Courts**
  - Smartflash
  - Messaging Gateway Solutions
  - Intellectual Ventures I
  - Intellectual Ventures II
  - Summit 6
  - ContentGuard
  - Klaustech
  - Maxus Strategic
- **PTAB**
  - Ex Parte Bush
  - Ex Parte Scott
  - T. Rowe Price
  - ContentGuard

DDR Model
Intangible – Technology as Implementation

- **Federal Circuit**
  - Ultramercial
  - Internet Patents

- **District Courts**
  - PreSqriber
  - Stoneeagle
  - Prism Tech

- **PTAB**
  - Ex Parte Wegman

**Ultramercial Model**
Tangible
Diehr Model


Eligible under section 101.

Method for operating a rubber-molding press.

- Claim explicitly recites the “Arrhenius equation”
- Mathematical formulas in the abstract are not eligible for patent protection.
- But, physical application is eligible.
- “opening the press automatically when a said comparison indicates equivalence.”

Abstract BUT real-world, tangible outcome = Eligible
Eligible under section 101 in view of *Alice*.

Multiple patents with claims directed to movable barrier (e.g., garage door, gate, etc.) monitoring and alarm systems.

12. A method for checking the status of a movable barrier comprising the steps of:
   receiving from a network client over a network, a status request for a movable barrier;
   determining a status of the movable barrier;
   sending a status of the movable barrier over the network to the network client in response to the status request and;
   wherein the movable barrier comprises a barrier movement operator for controlling the movement of the barrier and the method comprises receiving a status change request from the network client and controlling movement of the barrier in response to the status change request.
11. A method for use by an intrusion detection alarm system for communicating with a garage door opener controlling movement of a garage door, the method comprising:
receiving from the garage door opener, via a secure encrypted communication link, information regarding at least one of operational status and received operational commands as corresponds to the garage door opener;
effecting at least one intrusion detection alarm system action in response to the information received from the garage door opener.

- Monitoring “claims have a clear concrete and tangible form in that they are directed to monitoring and opening and closing a movable barrier—a particular tangible form”

- “… claimed alarm system is more than an abstract idea as the patents disclose the monitoring of process variables and the means of setting off an alarm or adjusting an alarm system.”
Ineligible under section 101 in view of Alice.

Directed to using inertial trackers to track motion relative to a moving platform instead of relative to the earth.

HMDS projects tactical information onto the interior of the visor of the pilot’s helmet (the pilot does not need to look straight ahead at a fixed point to receive the displayed information), and allows the pilot to target enemies and fire weapons in all directions.

1. A system for tracking the motion of an object relative to a moving reference frame, comprising:

   [1] a first inertial sensor mounted on the tracked object;

   [2] a second inertial sensor mounted on the moving reference frame; and

   [3] an element adapted to receive signals from said first and second inertial sensors and configured to determine an orientation of the object relative to the moving reference frame based on the signals received from the first and second inertial sensors.
Diehr Model

Thales Visionix (continued)

- Claims “directed to mathematical equations for determining the relative position of a moving object to a moving reference frame,” although “a complex mathematical concept, and a solution to the problem of tracking two moving objects in relation to each other,” ... “the solution lies in the mathematical formulae, not the generic devices listed in the system claim.”

- “... claim fails to transform the method claim into a patent-eligible invention,” describing “generic, fungible inertial sensors that admittedly have already gained “widespread acceptance” in the field of motion tracking.

- “Like the computer elements in Alice, these inertial trackers, when considered as an ordered combination in the claimed system, add nothing transformative to the patent.”

“... we tread carefully in construing this exclusionary principle lest it swallow all of patent law.” - Alice
Diehr Model

Canrig Drilling Technology LTD. V. Trinidad Drilling, L.P.  
(S.D.Tex., September 17, 2015)

Eligible under section 101 in view of Alice.

Directed to “directional drilling [which] presents two significant challenges: (1) accurately steering the drilling path of the well and (2) overcoming friction inherent in the directional drilling process.

[4. A drilling method comprising: monitoring the rotation of a drill string with a sensor at the surface; transmitting said rotational information to a computer; controlling a motor that rotates said drill string with said computer; and rotating said drill string to a predetermined angle.]
“The claims in Canrig’s patents address specific challenges in directional drilling through a concrete process for controlling the rotation of the long drill strings to and between predetermined angles.”

“Such tangible, industrial processes have long been considered eligible to receive patent protection. See Diehr, 450 U.S. at 184.”

“Although rotation in isolation is an abstract concept, Canrig’s patented process uses controlled rotation within predetermined angles to orient and oscillate a drill string. …. See, e.g., Diehr, 450 U.S. at 187”
Eligible under section 101 in view of Alice.

Directed to a card game that incorporates rules and scoring to simulate the play of a sporting event.

1. A method for playing a card game combining elements of poker and elements of a sporting event, the game method of play comprising the steps of:

   (a) providing a deck of fifty-six cards comprising the standard fifty-two rank and suit cards with the addition of four cards of rank “1” in each of the standard suits, the deck of cards suitable for playing the game of poker, a plurality of the cards each comprising indicia representing a non-zero numerical score in the sporting event, and each of the remaining cards comprising indicia representing a zero numerical score in the sporting event;

   (b) carrying out the play of at least one hand of the game of poker with the deck of cards and determining a poker winner based on the rules of poker; and

   (c) concurrent with the play of the at least one hand of the game of poker, for every poker hand having at least a rank pair, totaling a sum of the sporting event numerical score indicia present on the cards in that hand and determining a sporting event winner based on the sporting event numerical score totals.
Abstract Idea – “We view a method of playing a card game as being akin to ‘a method of organizing human activity’ at issue in Alice.”

“The claims at issue recite a deck of cards with a high degree of particularity. … [T]he claims specify a particular make-up of the deck, including the number of cards contained in the deck and unique card markings. Thus, we determine that the claimed deck of cards is a particular article or apparatus in the context of the machine-or-transformation test.”
Intangible – Technology as Necessity
Eligible under section 101 in view of Alice.

Method for providing a hybrid web page.

- Abstract idea? Good question.
- “Although the claims address a business challenge (retaining website visitors), it is a challenge particular to the Internet ..., the claimed solution is necessarily rooted in computer technology in order to overcome a problem specifically arising in the realm of computer networks.”
- Anyway, there is no preemption because they “recite a specific way to automate the creation of a composite web page by an ‘outsource provider’ that incorporates elements from multiple sources in order to solve a problem faced by websites on the Internet.”

Cannot be Divorced from Technical Environment = Eligible
Eligible under section 101 in view of Alice.

Method for facilitating two-way communication between mobile device and Internet server.

Claim 20 of the ’183 patent reads:

A method of using a computer system to facilitate two-way communication between a mobile device and an Internet server, comprising:

- the computer system receiving a text message via a first communication path;
- the computer system inserting at least a message body of the text message into an Internet Protocol (IP) message; and
- the computer system transmitting the IP message to the Internet server, via a second communication path,

wherein the text message originates from the mobile device as a short message service (SMS) text message, and wherein the SMS text message contains a multi-digit address that is fewer than seven digits and that is associated with a URL of the internet server.
Abstract Idea → translation: “The claim is a method that enables a device that ordinarily cannot send a message to a different device to do so. That is essentially the same as a translator assisting two people who speak different languages to communicate with each other ...”

Claim “‘is necessarily rooted in computer technology in order to overcome a problem specifically arising in the realm of computer networks.’ See [DDR Holdings] at 1257.

Claim 20 is directed to a problem unique to text-message telecommunication between a mobile device and a computer. The solution it provides is tethered to the technology that created the problem.”
**DDR Model**

*Intellectual Ventures v. JPMorgan Chase (S.D.N.Y., April 28, 2015)*

"*Intellectual Ventures I*

Ineligible under section 101 in view of Alice.

- Detecting and preventing entry of a packet containing malware.
- Control access to, and use of, digital property after primary distribution to an authorized user.

A method for filtering a packet, including the steps of: (a) receiving packet having at least one header parameter and a payload; (b) selecting an access rule based upon the contents of the payload of the packet received in step a; (c) implementing the access rule for a packet, wherein the access rule is selected based upon a combination of the contents of the packet received in step (a) and the contents of at least one other packet.

A method of distributing data, the method comprising: (a) protecting portions of the data; and (b) openly distributing the protected portions of the data, whereby (c) each and every access to an unprotected form of the protected portions of the data is limited in accordance with rules defining access rights to the data as enforced by an access mechanism, (d) so that unauthorized access to the protected portions of the data is not to the unprotected form of the protected portions of the data.
Intellectual Ventures I (continued)

- “the claim of the patent amounts to a mental process” (’694)
- “There is nothing concrete to make the patent eligible for protection. … a computer does not convert a mental process into something concrete.”
- “… the claim is broad enough to raise concerns of preemption.”
  - “… covers all network filtering by any firewall on any computer network where an access rule is chosen based upon the data of multiple packets”
  - BUT, decision already discusses alternative ways to filter packets?
- Court addresses preemption as part of Step 1, when it is Step 2 of the Mayo/Alice test.
- Distinguishes: DDR recites “a specific way to automate the creation of a composite web page”
  - Claims here recite a specific way to filter based on content of multiple packets.
- “a patent's recitation of a computer amounts to a mere instruction to implement an abstract idea on a computer, that addition cannot impart patent eligibility.”
Klaustech, Inc. v. Admob, Inc. (N.D. Cal., August 31, 2015)

Eligible under section 101 in view of Alice.

Internet advertising with controlled and timed display of ad content from centralized system controller.

1. A non-scrolling ad display from a website for causing a browser hitting the website to undertake centrally controlled and recorded ad display for guaranteed minimum timed intervals comprising the steps of:

   - providing a website at a webserver for transmitting at least one page with a non-scrolling ad frame to a browser;
   - providing ad content for the non-scrolling ad frame, each ad content having ad identity and an individual timer for timing out commencing with display at the browser and an Internet address for fetching by the browser;
   - providing a central controller interrogating for browser identity and maintaining records associated with the browser identity indicating ad identity displayed, and timer timeout;
   - placing the ad content in the non-scrolling ad frame of the browser to display the ad content and start the individual timer;
   - timing out the individual timer of the ad content at the non-scrolling frame at the browser;
   - reporting from the browser to the central controller the timer timeout of the ad content; and,
   - retaining in the central controller a record of the browser identity, the ad identity, and the timer timeout of the ad content at the browser.
Motion to dismiss should be limited to those cases where “the basic character of the claimed subject matter is readily ascertainable from the face of the patent.”

“The claimed system provides real time communication between the central controller and the browser to allow advertisements to be displayed for a set minimum amount of time and to enable the browser to track and control the display.”

“The patent attempts to address the prevailing problem of advertising on the Internet to control advertising to each web page viewing browser and to monitor accurately the timing of the display, with proof of the advertisement display to the paying advertiser.”

The claimed solution “employs a new approach . . . to solve technical problems that do not exist in the conventional advertising realm.”
Eligible under section 101 in view of Alice.

Computer-based communication and notification scheme interconnecting computers.

1. A computer-based method performed by one or more computers programmed to identify common accounts, the method comprising:

assigning by one of the one or more computers a first user identifier to a first account, the first account being associated with a first node, the first node including a first computing device;

assigning by one of the one or more computers a second user identifier to a second account, the second account being associated with a second node, the second node including a second computing device;

receiving a request from the second node that includes the first user identifier;

determining whether the first account is already associated with the second node; and

upon determining that the first account is not already associated to the second node, determining whether the first and second accounts represent the same account; and

when it is determined that the first and second accounts represent the same account, combining by one of the one or more computers the first and second accounts into a single account.

- “… inextricable[y] tied with a computer based communication and notification scheme interconnecting computers … to combine … accounts into a single account using computer associated nodes, … more than the mere nominal recitation of a computer to obtain patent eligibility.”
Eligible under section 101 in view of Alice.

Digital rights management → managing transfer of rights associated with digital works using shared state variables.

1. A method for sharing rights adapted to be associated with an item, the method comprising:

   specifying, in a first license, using a processor, at least one usage right and at least one meta-right for the item, wherein the usage right and the meta-right include at least one right that is shared among one or more users or devices;

   defining, via the at least one usage right, using a processor, a manner of use selected from a plurality of permitted manners of use for the item;

   defining, via the at least one meta-right, using a processor, a manner of rights creation for the item, wherein said at least one meta-right is enforceable by a repository and allows said one or more users or devices to create new rights;

   associating, using a processor, at least one state variable with the at least one right in the first license, wherein the at least one state variable identifies a location where a state of rights is tracked;

   *4 generating, in a second license, using a processor, one or more rights based on the meta-right in the first license, wherein the one or more rights in the second license includes at least one right that is shared among one or more users or devices; and

   associating at least one state variable with the at least one right that is shared in the second license,

   wherein the at least one state variable that is associated with the second license is based on the at least one state variable that is associated with the first license.
"We agree with ContentGuard that the invention … is similar to the invention determined to be a patent-eligible application in DDR Holdings. … The Federal Circuit held that ‘the claimed solution is necessarily rooted in computer technology in order to overcome a problem specifically arising in the realm of computer networks.’”

“… are directed to a particular way of creating and enforcing rights associated with digital works that is ‘necessarily rooted in computer technology’ and ‘specifically arises in the realm of computer networks.’”

“… implementation of digital rights management required by the challenged claims, particularly through the use of the claimed ‘repository,’ is specific enough such that it does not preempt all other ways of ensuring that an owner of a digital work can enforce the rights associated therewith.”
Intangible – Technology as Implementation
Ineligible under section 101 in view of *Alice*.

11-step method for Internet distribution of copyrighted media - users receive the content for free if they agree to view an advertisement.

- Abstract idea = watch an ad to watch copyrighted media
- “… the majority of the limitations describes only the abstract idea of showing an advertisement before delivering free content.”
- “That some of the eleven steps were not previously employed in this art is not enough—standing alone—to confer patent eligibility upon the claims at issue.”

New and Non-Obvious Abstract Idea ≠ Eligible
Eligible under section 101 in view of Alice.

- Health care provider reimbursement system, by which a payor, such as an insurance company, makes “a virtual payment to a medical provider by transmitting a stored-value card account payment of the authorized benefit amount, together with an EOB.

2. A method of facilitating payment of adjudicated health care benefits to a health care provider comprising:

   identifying the health care provider that renders medical services in anticipation of payment;

   identifying a payer that has agreed to pay the health care provider on behalf of a patient subject to preselected conditions;

   identifying an administrator that determines whether the medical services conducted by the service provider meet the preselected conditions by the payer, generates an explanation of benefits, and authorizes payment of the service provider for an authorized amount;

   intercepting the explanation of benefits and payment information transmitted from the administrator to the health care provider;

   acquiring a single-use, stored-value card account number and loading it with funds equal to the authorized amount;

   merging the stored-value card account number, the authorized amount, a card verification value code, and an expiration date with the explanation of benefits into a computer-generated image file; and

   transmitting the image file to the health care provider via a computer-implemented transmission.


Ultramercial Model

Stoneeagle (continued)

- No Abstract Idea
  - “… the relevant claims stand apart because (1) the claims are different enough in substance from the prior art and (2) the claims do not merely recite the performance of some prior art business practice.”
  - “Instead, the claimed solution is necessarily rooted in computer technology in order to overcome a problem specifically arising in the realm of the health care industry.”
  - “Likewise, the claims do not ‘simply instruct the practitioner to implement [an] abstract idea with routine, conventional activity.’”

- No Preemption
  - Claims “recite a ‘specific way’ medical benefits are paid by a particular class (third party payers) by incorporating elements from multiple sources (EOB information from the health care claims administrator and stored-value card account information from a stored-value card processor) to solve a problem faced by the health care industry.”
  - Claims “do not attempt to preempt ‘the payment to service providers by third party payers in all fields,’ and do not seek to grant Plaintiff a monopoly over the relevant practice in the health care industry.”
Ultramercial Model

eDekka v. 3Balls.com (E.D.Tex., September 21, 2015)

Ineligible under section 101 in view of Alice.

Method for storing information provided by a user.

1. Method for storing information provided by a user which comprises:
   in response to user input, receiving and storing information;
   in response to user input, designating the information as data while the information is being received;
   in response to user input, designating at least a portion of the information as a label while the information is being received;
   in response to user input, traversing a data structure and providing an indication of a location in the data structure;
   in response to user input, storing the label at the location in the data structure; and
   associating the label with the data.

3. Method for storing information provided by a user which comprises:
   in response to user input, receiving and storing information;
   in response to user input, designating the information as data while the information is being received;
   in response to user input, conveying the stored information to the user and designating at least a portion of the stored information as a label while the stored information is being conveyed;
   in response to user input, traversing a data structure and providing an indication of a location in the data structure;
   in response to user input, storing the label at the location in the data structure; and
   associating the label with the data.
"… the claimed idea represents routine tasks that could be performed by a human."

"While the generic requirement of a “data structure” is included, Claim 1 essentially describes the common process of receiving, labeling, and storing information, while Claim 3 encompasses retrieving such information."

"eDekka contends that the claims are not directed toward an abstract idea because they improve the functioning of technology."

... improves a computer’s function “because it creates a structure that substantially reduces the time to retrieve information and the amount of information that must be retrieved.”

"The Court concludes that, under the first step of the analysis, the claimed idea is directed toward an ineligible concept which is abstract.

“While preemption may signal patent ineligible subject matter, the absence of complete preemption does not demonstrate patent eligibility.” (Ariosa)
Eligible under section 101 in view of Alice.

Directed to “providing an empirical model of a defined space” by a series of steps.

1. A method for providing an empirical model of a defined space comprising steps of:
   a. defining the desired space;
   b. describing at least a portion of the defined space with multiple correlated dimensions;
   c. reducing the dimensionality of the described portion;
   d. combining the described portion with the remaining portion of the defined space;
   e. creating a hypothetical model of the defined space; and
   f. calculating coefficients for the hypothetical model according to an analysis of real and/or or virtual objects.
“According to Appellant, nothing in these steps may be considered necessary, routine, or conventional in terms of the fundamental abstraction set forth by the Examiner.”

“We agree with Appellant. Claim 1 not only sets forth the steps emphasized by the Examiner, it further requires ‘calculating coefficients for the hypothetical model according to an analysis of real and/or or virtual objects.’”

“We find that these steps are sufficiently concrete as to set them outside the broad definition of abstract idea as set forth in *Alice*. Consequently, because we agree with Appellant that claim 1 is not directed to an abstract idea, we reverse …”
The Takeaways
The Takeaways

Tangible
- Process affecting/affected by a real-world, tangible output/input
- Claim real-world, tangible result
  - Press opened, door opened, drill oscillated, clutch [dis]engaged, alarm triggered
- Lowest hurdle for eligibility

Intangible – Technology as Necessity
- Technological/Business Problem
- Establish that subject matter cannot exist outside of technical environment
- Even if technical environment is generic (e.g., Internet)
- Middle hurdle for eligibility

Intangible – Technology as Implementation
- Improvement to technology
  - Resources (processors, memory) / bandwidth conserved
  - Reduced power consumption
- No preemption
- Highest hurdle for eligibility
All the Other Cases?
What is it?

- A single source for significant decisions, in which the patent-eligibility of claims is addressed under Alice
- Updated regularly, captures the most relevant and informative decisions and posts new decisions as they are published

The Alice Tracker provides a single source for significant decisions in which the patent-eligibility of claims is addressed under Alice. Our index of sampled cases is updated regularly, and can be filtered on various parameters. Although this page does not include every Alice-related decision, we strive to capture the most relevant and informative decisions, and post new decisions as they are published. Although Alice dealt with software, Alice was not about software per se. Instead, it was about the patent-eligibility of an invention encompassing an abstract idea, regardless of whether the abstract idea is implemented in software. Alice has changed the landscape for prosecutors and litigators alike. Since the decision, courts have struggled with identifying abstract ideas, as well as the "something more" required to meet part two of the test.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Abstract Idea</th>
<th>Something More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prism Technologies v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.</td>
<td>9/22/2015</td>
<td>D. Neb.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDekka LLC v. 3Balls.com, Inc., et al.</td>
<td>9/21/2015</td>
<td>E.D. Tex.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex Parte Wegman</td>
<td>9/18/2015</td>
<td>PTAB</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canrig Drilling Technology LTD. v. Trinidad Drilling, L.P.</td>
<td>9/17/2015</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klaustech, Inc. v. Admob, Inc.</td>
<td>8/31/2015</td>
<td>N.D. Cal.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxus Strategic Systems, Inc. v. Aquumin, LLC</td>
<td>8/18/2015</td>
<td>W.D. Tex.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Guard Holdings, Inc. v. Google, Inc.</td>
<td>8/6/2015</td>
<td>E.D. Tex.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thales Visionix, Inc. v. The United States</td>
<td>7/20/2015</td>
<td>Fed. Cl.</td>
<td>Mathematical Formula</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What is Alice?**


[Read more]

**Resources**

[Fish Patent Services]
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</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrigr Drilling Technology LTD., Trinidad Drilling, L.P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klaustech, Inc. v. Admob, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxus Strategic Systems, Inc. v. Aquinn, LLC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Guard Holdings, Inc. v. Google, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thales Visionix, Inc. v. The United States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmaticus Telecomm, LLC v. Genesys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prism Technologies v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.**

**Representative Claim**

1. (345 Patent) A method for controlling access, by at least one authentication server, to protected computer resources provided via an Internet Protocol network, the method comprising: receiving, at the at least one authentication server from at least one access server, identity data associated with at least one client computer device, the identity data forwarded to the at least one access server from the at least one client computer device with a request from the at least one client computer device for the protected computer resources; authenticating, by at least one authentication server, the identity data received from the at least one access server, the identity data being stored in the at least one authentication server, authenticating, by at least one authentication server, the at least one client computer device to receive a portion of the protected computer resources requested by the at least one client computer device, based on data associated with the requested protected computer resources stored in at least one database associated with at least one authentication server, and permitting access, by at least one authentication server, to the at least one portion of the protected computer resources upon successfully authenticating the identity data and upon successfully authenticating the at least one client computer device.

2. (155 Patent) A system for controlling access to protected computer resources provided via a network utilizing at least one Internet Protocol, the system comprising: at least one authentication server having an associated database to store (i) identity data associated with at least one client computer device, and (ii) data associated with said protected computer resources, at least one client computer adapter to receive said identity data from said at least one client computer device; said at least one access server adapted to forward said identity data received from said at least one client computer device to said at least one authentication server; said at least one authentication server adapted to authenticate said identity data responsive to a request for said protected resources.

**Other References**

- 8/6/2015 E.D. Tex. None No Yes/No
- 7/20/2015 Fed. Cl. Mathematical Formula Yes No
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- Fish Patent Services
Thank You!

With special thanks to:
Ken Hoover | Austin
Michael Shepherd | Silicon Valley
Kenneth Darby | Austin

Please send your NY CLE forms or questions about the webinar to Crystal Chisholm at chisholm@fr.com

A replay of the webinar will be available for viewing at www.fr.com/patent-webinar-series/

© Copyright 2015 Fish & Richardson P.C. These materials may be considered advertising for legal services under the laws and rules of professional conduct of the jurisdictions in which we practice. The material contained in this presentation has been gathered by the lawyers at Fish & Richardson P.C. for informational purposes only, is not intended to be legal advice and does not establish an attorney-client relationship. Legal advice of any nature should be sought from legal counsel. Unsolicited e-mails and information sent to Fish & Richardson P.C. will not be considered confidential and do not create an attorney-client relationship with Fish & Richardson P.C. or any of our attorneys. Furthermore, these communications and materials may be disclosed to others and may not receive a response. If you are not already a client of Fish & Richardson P.C., do not include any confidential information in this message. For more information about Fish & Richardson P.C. and our practices, please visit www.fr.com.