

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. ARGUMENT2

A. DISPUTED CLAIM TERMS OF THE '432 PATENT2

1. “dynamic code”2

2. “central-entity” and “external entity”7

3. “digital identity”11

4. “wherein the dynamic code is valid for a predefined time and becomes invalid after being used”12

5. “transaction”15

6. “another computer associated with the central-entity”17

7. “receiving electronically a request for a dynamic code for the user by a computer associated with a central entity”18

8. “generating a dynamic code for the user in response to a request during the electronic transaction”/ “generating [by the central-entity during the electronic transaction] a dynamic code for the user”/ “generate a dynamic code for the user”22

9. “first central entity computer”/ “second central entity computer”23

B. USAA’S NEW INVALIDITY ALLEGATIONS26

1. “Algorithmically Combined” / “Predetermined Algorithm” (Claims 2, 9, 10, 28).....26

2. Claims 34, 35, 40-43, 4527

3. USAA’s New Means-Plus-Function Contention: “An Apparatus for Authenticating a User During an Electronic Transaction with an External-Entity” (Claim 25).....28

III. CONCLUSION29

PLAINTIFFS’ REBUTTAL BRIEF ON CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Case	Page
<i>Becton, Dickinson, & Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Grp., LP</i> , 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	16
<i>Cacace v. Meyer Mktg. (Macau Commercial Offshore) Co., Ltd.</i> , 812 F. Supp. 2d 547, 561 (S.D.N.Y. 2011)	26
<i>Computer Docking Station Corp. v. Dell, Inc.</i> , 519 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	5, 17
<i>Control Resources, Inc. v. Delta Electronics, Inc.</i> , 133 F. Supp. 2d 121 (D. Mass Mar. 30, 2001)	11
<i>Curtiss–Wright Flow Control Corp. v. Velan, Inc.</i> , 438 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	22
<i>Deere & Co. v. Bush Hog, LLC</i> , 703 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	2
<i>Ecolab, Inc. v. Envirochem, Inc.</i> , 264 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	2
<i>Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kamushiki Co., Ltd.</i> , 535 U.S. 722, 736 (2002)	19
<i>Gemalto S.A. v. HTC Corp.</i> , 754 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	14, 16
<i>Grober v. Mako Products, Inc.</i> , 686 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>HTC Corp. v. ICom GmbH & Co., KG</i> , 667 F.3d 1270, 1277 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	27
<i>Innova/Pure Water v. Safari Water Filtration</i> , 381 F.3d 1111 (Fed. Cir., 2004)	18
<i>Invitrogen Corp. v. Clontech Labs, Inc.</i> , 429 F.3d 1052 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	6
<i>In re Katz Interactive Call Processing Patent Litig.</i> , 639 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	27

IPXL Holdings, L.L.C. v. Amazon.com, Inc.,
430 F.3d 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2005)27

Kinik Co. v. International Trade Com'n.,
362 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004)19

LG Elecs., Inc. v. Bizcom Elecs., Inc.,
453 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....6

Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.,
517 U.S. 370 (1996).....18

Microprocessor Enhancement Corp. v. Texas Instruments Inc.,
520 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2008)27

Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc., No. 13-369,
2014 U.S. LEXIS 3818 (June 2, 2014)3, 26

nCube Corp. v. Seachange Int'l, Inc.,
436 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....22

Netcraft Corp. v. Ebay, Inc.,
549 F.3d 1394 (Fed. Cir. 2008)20

Netscape Commc'ns Corp. v. ValueClick, Inc.,
684 F.Supp.2d 678 (E.D. Va. 2009)18, 19

N. Telecom Ltd. v. Samsung Elec. Co.,
215 F.3d 1281 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....4, 15

Omega Eng'g, Inc. v. Raytek Corp.,
763 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....4, 15

Pall Corp. v. Micron Separations, Inc.,
66 F.3d 1211 (Fed. Cir. 1995)..... 2-3

Pall Corp. v. PTI Techs. Inc.,
259 F.3d 1383 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....4, 15

PerfectVision Mfg. v. PPC Broadband, Inc., No. 4:12-cv-00623,
2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 121057 (E.D. Ark. Aug. 29, 2014)3

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... *passim*

PLAINTIFFS' REBUTTAL BRIEF ON CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

Rambus Inc. v. Infineon Techs. Ag,
318 F.3d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 2003) 4-5, 17

Schwing GmbH v. Putzmeister Aktiengesellschaft,
305 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....26

SciMed Life Sys. Inc. v. Adv. Cardiovascular Sys., Inc.,
242 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....14

Storage Tech. Corp. v. Cisco Systems, Inc.,
329 F.3d 823 (Fed. Cir. 2003)..... 4, 16, 25-26

Takeda Pharm. Co. v. Zydus Pharms. USA, Inc.,
743 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2014)26

Thomas Swan & Co. v. Finisar Corp., No. 2:13-cv-00178,
2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 86209 (E.D. Tex. June 25, 2014).....3

UltimatePointer, L.L.C. v. Nintendo Co.,
816 F.3d 816, 827 (Fed. Cir. 2016)27

Vanderlande Industries Nederland Bv v. I.T.C.,
366 F.3d 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2004)20

Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptoronic,
90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996)18

Watts v. XL Sys., Inc.,
232 F.3d 877 (Fed. Cir. 2000)28

Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC,
792 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2015)28

Statutes and Rules

35 U.S.C. § 112 (pre-AIA).....26, 29

PLAINTIFFS’ REBUTTAL BRIEF ON CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

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.