

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

UNIVERSAL SECURE REGISTRY, LLC,

Plaintiff,

vs.

APPLE INC., VISA INC., and VISA U.S.A., INC.,

Defendants.

C.A. No. 17-585-CFC-SRF

**DEFENDANT APPLE INC.'S NOTICE OF SUBSEQUENT AUTHORITY**

OF COUNSEL:

Mark D. Selwyn  
Liv L. Herriot  
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
HALE AND DORR LLP  
950 Page Mill Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94304  
(650) 858-6000

Monica Grewal  
Kate Saxton  
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
HALE AND DORR LLP  
60 State Street  
Boston, MA 02109  
(202) 663-6000

Derek A. Gosma  
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
HALE AND DORR LLP  
350 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2100  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
(213) 443-5300

Dated: August 30, 2018

Fredrick L. Cottrell, III (#2555)  
Jason J. Rawnsley (#5379)  
RICHARDS LAYTON, & FINGER, P.A.  
920 North King Street  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
(302) 651-7700  
rawnsley@rlf.com  
cottrell@rlf.com

*Attorneys for Defendant Apple Inc.*

Pursuant to D. Del. LR 7.1.2(b), Defendant Apple Inc. submits supplemental authority in support of its Motion to Stay (D.I. 90).

**First**, in the recent decision in *Qualcomm Inc. v. Apple Inc.*, No. 3:17-cv-2402-CAB-MDD, D.I. 172 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 29, 2018), attached as Ex. 1, Judge Bencivengo granted a motion to stay pending decision by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB”) on whether to institute Apple’s petitions for *inter partes* review (“IPR”) of the six patents at issue. *Id.* at 2. The court found that the simplification of the issues factor favors a stay because, as a result of *SAS Institute, Inc. v. Iancu*, 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018), “for any petition on which the PTAB institutes IPR, each of the challenged claims will either (1) be confirmed, estopping Apple from asserting invalidity challenges in this case that it raised or could reasonably have raised in the IPR, or (2) be invalidated, reducing the number of issues before the Court.” *Id.* at 3. The court further reasoned that “[i]n this case with six patents and numerous claims at issue, the PTAB’s decisions whether to institute will impact the contours of the case. If the PTAB institutes and cancels all the asserted claims of any patent, it will remove that patent from the case, thereby significantly reducing the scope of this litigation. Alternatively, if the PTAB declines to institute or institutes and confirms any patent, statutory estoppel may simplify the assertion of invalidity defenses. This factor favors a temporary stay.” *Id.* at 4.

**Second**, in USR’s Patent Owner Preliminary Response to Apple’s CBM Petition for U.S. Patent No. 8,856,539, CBM2018-0023, attached as Ex. 2, USR disclaimed claims 5–8, 17–20, and 26–30 of the ’539 patent. All these claims were asserted in USR’s infringement contentions in this litigation. This is relevant to Apple’s argument in its pending Motion to Stay because it demonstrates that the PTAB proceedings are already simplifying this case and will likely continue to do so.

OF COUNSEL:

Mark D. Selwyn  
Liv L. Herriot  
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
HALE AND DORR LLP  
950 Page Mill Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94304  
(650) 858-6000

Monica Grewal  
Kate Saxton  
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
HALE AND DORR LLP  
60 State Street  
Boston, MA 02109  
(202) 663-6000

Derek A. Gosma  
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
HALE AND DORR LLP  
350 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2100  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
(213) 443-5300

Dated: August 30, 2018

/s/ Jason J. Rawnsley

Frederick L. Cottrell, III (#2555)  
Jason J. Rawnsley (#5379)  
RICHARDS, LAYTON & FINGER, P.A.  
920 North King Street  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
(302) 651-7700  
cottrell@rlf.com  
rawnsley@rlf.com

*Attorneys for Defendant Apple Inc.*