

Petition for Covered Business Method Review
of U.S. Patent No. 8,856,539

DOCKET NO.: 1033300-00305US1

Filed on behalf of Apple Inc.

By: Monica Grewal, Reg. No. 40,056 (Lead Counsel)
Ben Fernandez Reg. No. 55,172 (Backup Counsel)
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
Email: monica.grewal@wilmerhale.com
ben.fernandez@wilmerhale.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

UNIVERSAL SECURE REGISTRY, LLC,

Patent Owner.

Case CBM2018-00023

U.S. Patent No. 8,856,539

PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD REVIEW
OF CLAIMS 1-38

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iv
I. MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(A)(1))	3
A. Real Party-In-Interest.....	3
B. Related Matters	3
C. Counsel.....	5
D. Service Information.....	5
II. BACKGROUND OF THE '539 PATENT	6
A. Priority	6
B. Brief Description of the '539 Patent Disclosure.....	6
C. Prosecution History.....	9
III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL.....	36
IV. GROUNDS FOR STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(A))	37
A. Petitioner Has Standing And Is Not Estopped (37 C.F.R. § 42.302)	37
B. The '539 Patent Qualifies As A CBM Patent (37 C.F.R. § 42.301)	38
1. At Least One Claim of The '539 Patent Is A Method Or Corresponding System Used In The Practice, Administration, Or Management Of A Financial Product Or Service	39
2. The '539 Patent Is Not Directed To A “Technological Invention”	41

Petition for Covered Business Method Review
of U.S. Patent No. 8,856,539

V.	STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED FOR EACH CHALLENGED CLAIM (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b))	49
A.	Claims For Which Review Is Requested (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(1))	49
B.	Statutory Grounds Of Challenge (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(2))	49
C.	Standard For Granting A Petition For CBM Review	50
VI.	PROPOSED CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS FOR CBM REVIEW (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(3))	50
A.	Provider (All Challenged Claims)	51
B.	Entity (All Challenged Claims)	52
C.	Time-Varying Multicharacter Code (All Challenged Claims)	54
D.	Indication of the Provider (Claims 1-36)	55
E.	Account Identifying Information (All Challenged Claims)	56
F.	Biometric Information (Claims 12-15, 34-36)	58
G.	Secure Registry (All Challenged Claims)	60
VII.	CLAIMS 1-38 OF THE '539 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101 (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(4))	61
A.	Alice Step 1: The '539 Patent Claims Are Directed to the Abstract Idea Of Verifying an Account Holder's Identity Based On Codes And/Or Information Related to an Account Holder Before Enabling a Transaction	62
1.	Independent Claim 22	63
2.	The Remaining Claims	69
B.	Alice Step 2: The Remaining Limitations Of The '539 Patent Claims Add Nothing Inventive To The Abstract Idea Of Verifying An Account Holder's Identity Based on Codes And/Or Information Related To The Account Holder Before Enabling A Transaction	74

Petition for Covered Business Method Review
of U.S. Patent No. 8,856,539

1. Independent Claim 22.....	76
2. The Remaining Claims	81
VIII. CONCLUSION	84
TABLE OF EXHIBITS	85

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Accenture Global Servs., GmbH v. Guidewire Software, Inc.</i> , 728 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	79
<i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1229 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	48, 84
<i>Bancorp Servs., L.L.C. v. Sun Life Assurance Co. of Can. (U.S.)</i> , 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	81
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 561 U.S. 593 (2010).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	48
<i>Blue Spike, LLC v. Google Inc.</i> , No. 14-CV-01650-YGR, 2015 WL 5260506 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 8, 2015), <i>aff’d</i> , 669 F. App’x 575 (Fed. Cir. 2016), <i>cert. denied</i> , 137 S. Ct. 2246 (2017).....	67, 78
<i>buySAFE, Inc. v. Google, Inc.</i> , 765 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	66, 76, 78
<i>CLS Bank Int’l v. Alice Corp. Pty.</i> , 717 F.3d 1269 (Fed. Cir. 2013), <i>aff’d</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....	64, 70
<i>CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	67, 81, 82
<i>Data Distribution Techs., LLC v. BRER Affiliates, Inc.</i> , No. 12-4878 JBS/KMW, 2014 WL 4162765 (D.N.J. Aug. 19, 2014)	84
<i>Dealersocket, Inc. v. Autoalert, LLC</i> , CBM2014-00132, Paper No. 11 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 29, 2014)	39

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.