

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE
FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND DIRECTOR OF THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

META PLATFORMS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

SITNET LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2026-00112
Patent 12,256,463 B2

Before JOHN A. SQUIRES, *Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual
Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.*

DECISION
Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review

Meta Platforms, Inc. (“Petitioner”) filed a petition requesting review of claims 1–12 of U.S. Patent No. 12,256,463 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’463 patent”). Paper 1 (“Petition” or “Pet.”). SitNet LLC (“Patent Owner”) filed a preliminary response. Paper 9 (“Prelim. Resp.”). Patent Owner filed a request for denial (Paper 7), and Petitioner filed an opposition (Paper 8). On March 10, 2026, after considering the parties’ discretionary arguments, I issued a Notice indicating that this proceeding would be reviewed for merits and non-discretionary considerations. Paper 10. After considering the arguments presented and the record for merits and non-discretionary considerations, denial of institution was appropriate in this proceeding. *See* Paper 11 (“Notice”), 2. This determination was based on the totality of the evidence and arguments presented, only a select portion of which I discuss in the following opinion identified as forthcoming in the Notice. *See id.*

Independent claims 1 and 7 of the ’463 patent recite a method and system, respectively, for forming a situational network, including maintaining a database and “establishing an event node” that is “discoverable . . . by browsing a data feed provided based on the database.” The ’463 patent repeatedly uses the term “data feed,” but does not explicitly define the term. *See, e.g.*, Ex. 1001, 8:64–9:2, 9:38–44, 9:53–64, 10:19–24, 10:29–36, 10:43–45. For example, the ’463 patent describes data feeds as having a “FeedID” and as including “input data feeds that are generated by providers of goods and services, healthcare providers, organizations, clubs, social contacts and other persons and entities.” *See, e.g., id.* at Figs. 5–8, 10, 11, 8:64–9:2, 10:46–11:13.

Petitioner asserts that claims 1–12 of the ’463 patent are unpatentable as obvious over (i) Kraft and Altman, (ii) Wong, Gogic, and Gage, and

(iii) Wong, Gogic, Gage, and Kraft. Pet. 3. For the first ground, Petitioner asserts that Kraft teaches the claimed “data feed” because Kraft’s “search results Web page listing” based on a user’s search query “is consistent with the ’463 patent’s use of the term ‘data feed.’” *Id.* at 22–23 (emphases omitted), 34. For the second and third grounds, Petitioner asserts that an ordinarily skilled artisan would have recognized that Wong’s system allows for browsing a data feed by presenting a “list or graphical display of nodes” matching a user’s search query. *Id.* at 58–59, 67–68.

Patent Owner contends that Petitioner does not show that Kraft or Wong teaches the claimed “data feed.” Prelim. Resp. 6–8, 16–19. Specifically, Patent Owner argues that Petitioner does not explain how the ordinary and customary meaning of “data feed,” in light of the specification, would have included Kraft’s “search results Web page” or Wong’s “list or graphical display” of search results. *Id.* at 6–7, 17.

I agree with Patent Owner. Neither Kraft nor Wong uses the term “data feed” or characterizes its listing of Web pages (Kraft) or nodes (Wong) provided in response to a user-provided query as a “data feed.” *See* Ex. 1005, 5:8–12, 6:52–59, 16:52–59, 18:31–54, 18:61–19:23; Ex. 1007 ¶¶ 22, 28, 35. Petitioner points to a disclosure in the ’463 patent of a user requesting a personal information aggregator (PIA) to “receive a data feed.” Pet. 23 (citing Ex. 1001, 12:52–64). But Petitioner does not sufficiently explain how this disclosure provides support for broadly construing “browsing a data feed” to encompass a user entering criteria for a search (and not specifically requesting a “data feed”) and receiving a listing of Web pages or nodes in response. *See* Pet. 23, 58–59; Ex. 1003 ¶¶ 102, 201–202; Ex. 1005, 6:57–59 (describing users searching a data store for models that

match “user-specified criteria”), 18:41–54 (describing a user submitting a query); Ex. 1007 ¶ 28 (describing “searching and selecting from keyword identifiers or other search terms”). Petitioner’s reliance on a separate disclosure in the ’463 patent of the PIA “searching . . . the network for information about the situation or event” also is not persuasive, because the ’463 patent does not describe that embodiment as involving a data feed or browsing a data feed. *See* Pet. 23 (citing Ex. 1001, 20:46–51) (emphasis omitted); Ex. 1001, 20:46–51.

Although Petitioner asserts that the ’463 patent “does not limit the form of a data feed,” Petitioner does not explain what the ordinary and customary meaning of “data feed” was at the time of the claimed invention or otherwise propose an express construction of “data feed.” Pet. 6–7, 23. Nor does Petitioner point to any prosecution history that bears on the meaning of “data feed.” *Id.*; *see* 37 C.F.R. § 42.100.

Accordingly, Petitioner does not provide sufficient evidence showing that Kraft’s or Wong’s disclosure of search results in response to a user-entered search query teaches a “data feed,” as recited in each challenged claim of the ’463 patent. As such, Petitioner does not demonstrate a reasonable likelihood it would prevail in showing at least one claim is unpatentable, as 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) requires.

It is:

ORDERED that the Petition is *denied*, and no trial is instituted.

IPR2026-00112
Patent 12,256,463 B2

FOR PETITIONER:

Jonathan Tuminaro
Michael D. Specht
Jennifer Meyer Chagnon
Steven M. Pappas
Timothy L. Tang
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC
jtuminar-PTAB@sternekessler.com
mspecht-PTAB@sternekessler.com
jchagnon-PTAB@sternekessler.com
spappas-PTAB@sternekessler.com
ttang-PTAB@sternekessler.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

David L. Hecht
HECHT PARTNERS LLP
dhecht@hechtpartners.com

Patrick G. Maloney
CORK MALONEY LLP
pmaloney@corkmaloney.com