

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

UNIVERSAL SECURE REGISTRY LLC,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 17-585 (JFB) (SRF)
)	
APPLE INC., VISA INC. and)	REDACTED - PUBLIC VERSION
VISA U.S.A., INC.,)	FILED 07/16/2018
)	
Defendants.)	

**PLAINTIFF UNIVERSAL SECURE REGISTRY LLC’S ANSWERING BRIEF IN
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT APPLE INC.’S MOTION TO STAY PENDING
INTER PARTES AND COVERED BUSINESS METHOD REVIEWS**

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP
 Jack B. Blumenfeld (#1014)
 Jeremy A. Tigan (#5239)
 1201 North Market Street
 P.O. Box 1347
 Wilmington, DE 19899-1347
 (302) 658-9200
 jblumenfeld@mnat.com
 jtigan@mnat.com
Attorneys for Universal Secure Registry LLC

OF COUNSEL:

Harold Barza
 Tigran Guledjian
 Valerie Roddy
 Jordan Kaericher
 Nima Hefazi
 Richard H. Doss
 QUINN EMANUEL
 URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
 865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
 Los Angeles, CA 90017
 (213) 443-3000

Sean Pak
 Brian E. Mack
 QUINN EMANUEL
 URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
 50 California Street, 22nd Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94111
 (415) 875-6600

July 6, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. The Nature and Stage of the Proceedings	1
II. Summary of Argument	2
III. Statement of Facts.....	4
A. The Activity In This Litigation To Date	4
B. Remaining Litigation Activity In This Case.....	5
C. Status Of Proceedings In The PTO.....	6
IV. Argument	6
A. The Court Should Deny Apple’s Requested Stay Because There Is No Non-Speculative Basis To Conclude That A Stay Will Simplify The Issues For Trial	7
1. Courts In This District Disfavor Pre-Institution Stays Because The Ability To Simplify The Issues For Trial Is Too Speculative	7
2. None Of Apple’s Arguments Makes The Effect Of A Stay Any Less Speculative In This Case	11
B. The Current Status Of This Litigation Favors Denying Apple’s Motion	16
C. A Stay Will Cause Undue Prejudice	18
V. Conclusion	20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

454 Life Scis. Corp. v. Ion Torrent Sys., Inc.,
No. CV 15-595-LPS, 2016 WL 6594083 (D. Del. Nov. 7, 2016) 9

Advanced Microscopy Inc. v. Carl Zeiss Microscopy, LLC,
No. CV 15-516-LPS-CJB, 2016 WL 558615 (D. Del. Feb. 11, 2016)..... 7, 8, 10, 17

CANVS Corp. v. United States,
118 Fed. Cl. 587 (2014) 15

Copy Prot. LLC v. Netflix, Inc.,
No. CV 14-365-LPS, 2015 WL 3799363 (D. Del. June 17, 2015)..... 8, 9

DermaFocus LLC v. Ulthera, Inc.,
No. 1:15-CV-00654-JFB-SRF, 2018 WL 2733363 (D. Del. June 7, 2018) 13

Freeny v. Apple Inc.,
No. 2:13-CV-00361-WCB, 2014 WL 3611948 (E.D. Tex. July 22, 2014)..... 8, 9

Koninklijke Philips N.V. v. ASUSTeK Computer Inc.,
C.A. No. 15-1125-GMS (D. Del. Mar. 30, 2017)..... 8

McRo, Inc. v. Bethesda Softworks LLC,
No. CV 12-1509-LPS-CJB, 2014 WL 1711028 (D. Del. May 1, 2014) 8, 17

Nexans Inc. v. Belden, Inc.,
C.A. No. 12-1491-SLR-SRF, 2014 WL 651913 (D. Del. Feb. 9, 2014)7, 18

NuVasive, Inc. v. Neurovision Med. Prod., Inc.,
No. CV 15-286-LPS-CJB, 2015 WL 3918866 (D. Del. June 23, 2015) 8, 16

Personalized User Model, L.L.P. v. Google, Inc.,
No. CA 09-525-LPS, 2012 WL 5379106 (D. Del. Oct. 31, 2012) 19

Personalweb Technologies, LLC v. Google, Inc.,
No. 5:13-CV-01317-EJD, 2014 WL 4100743 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 20, 2014)..... 15

Pragmatus Mobile, LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc.,
C.A. No. 14-436-LPS, 2015 WL 3799433 (D. Del. June 17, 2015)..... 8

SAS Institute, Inc. v. Iancu,
138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018)..... 6, 12

Sioux Chief Mfg. Co. v. Zurn Indus., LLC,
No. 1-18-cv-00163 RGA (D. Del. June 7, 2018)..... 8

Textron Innovations Inc. v. Toro Co.,
 No. CIV. A. 05-486 GMS, 2007 WL 7772169 (D. Del. Apr. 25, 2007) 12

Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc. v. Agilent Techs., Inc.,
 No. 1-17-cv-00600 LPS CJB (D. Del. Apr. 26, 2018)..... 7

Toshiba Samsung Storage Tech. Korea Corp. v. LG Elecs., Inc.,
 No. CV 15-691-LPS-CJB, 2015 WL 7824098 (D. Del. Dec. 3, 2015) 9, 10, 11

Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Seadrill Americas, Inc.,
 No. CIV. A. H-15-144, 2015 WL 6394436 (S.D. Tex. Oct. 22, 2015) 19

VirtualAgility Inc. v. Salesforce.com, Inc.,
 759 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 19

Wi-LAN, Inc. v. LG Elecs., Inc.,
 No. 3:17-cv-00358-BEN-MDD, 2018 WL2392161 (S.D. Cal. May 22, 2018) 13

Yodlee, Inc. v. Plaid Techs. Inc.,
 No. CV 14-1445-LPS-CJB, 2017 WL 401896 (D. Del. Jan. 27, 2017) 19

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 101..... 4

35 U.S.C. § 315(e)(2)..... 14, 16

Leahy-Smith America Invents Act, Pub. L. No. 112-29 § 18(b)(1)(D)..... 7

Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1)..... 5

Plaintiff Universal Secure Registry LLC (“USR”) respectfully opposes Defendant Apple Inc.’s (“Apple”) motion to stay this litigation pending resolution of its pre-institution petitions for *inter partes* review (“IPR”) and covered business method review (“CBM review”). For the reasons set forth below, the Court should deny Apple’s motion or, at minimum, deny it without prejudice to renew after the Board has made its institution decisions on Apple’s pending petitions.

I. The Nature and Stage of the Proceedings

On May 21, 2017, USR filed suit against Apple, along with Visa Inc. and Visa U.S.A., Inc. (collectively, “Visa”) for direct, induced, and contributory infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 8,577,813 (“the '813 patent”); 8,856,539 (“the '539 patent”); 9,100,826 (“the '826 patent”); and 9,530,137 (“the '137 patent” and, with the '813 patent, '539 patent, and '826 patent, “the Asserted Patents”). D.I. 1.

As set forth in more detail in the Statement of Facts, motions to dismiss and to transfer are pending; a scheduling order has been entered and trial date set; initial disclosures have been exchanged; and the parties have served responses to extensive written discovery requests. The parties are currently engaged in active discovery.

On April 3, 4, and 12 and May 3, 2018, Apple filed eleven IPR and CBM review petitions before the Patent Trials and Appeals Board (“Board” or “PTAB”) of the United States Patent & Trademark Office (“USPTO”). Institution decisions on all eleven petitions are due no later than December 12, 2018. *See* Declaration of Jeremy Tigan, filed concurrently herewith (“Tigan Decl.”) Ex. 1.¹ To date, the Board has instituted review of certain claims of only one of

¹ One day prior to filing this opposition, USR received notice that Visa had filed two additional IPR petitions against the '539 patent on July 3, 2018. Because Visa has not joined in Apple’s request for a stay, and because these petitions relate to a patent as to which Apple has

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.