

Petition for Covered Business Method Review
of U.S. Patent No. 8,577,813

DOCKET NO.: 1033300-00306US1

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 CBM2018-00024

U.S. Patent No. 8,577,813

PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD REVIEW
OF CLAIMS 1-2, 4-11, 13-20, AND 22-26

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
I. MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(A)(1))	2
A. Real Party-In-Interest.....	2
B. Related Matters	2
C. Counsel	4
D. Service Information	4
II. BACKGROUND OF THE '813 PATENT.....	4
A. Priority	4
B. Brief Description of the '813 Patent Disclosure.....	5
C. Prosecution History	8
III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL	8
IV. GROUNDS FOR STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(A)).....	9
A. Petitioner Has Standing And Is Not Estopped (37 C.F.R. § 42.302).....	9
B. The '813 Patent Qualifies As A CBM Patent (37 C.F.R. § 42.301).....	9
1. At least one claim of the '813 patent is a method or corresponding system used in the practice, administration, or management of a financial product or service.....	10
2. The '813 patent is not directed to a “technological invention”	12
V. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED FOR EACH CHALLENGED CLAIM (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)).....	18

Petition for Covered Business Method Review
of U.S. Patent No. 8,577,813

A.	Claims For Which Review Is Requested (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(1)).....	18
B.	Statutory Grounds Of Challenge (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(2))	18
C.	Standard For Granting A Petition For CBM Review	19
VI.	PROPOSED CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS FOR CBM REVIEW (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(3))	19
A.	Biometric Input	20
B.	Secret Information	21
C.	Authentication Information	22
D.	Point-of-Sale Device.....	23
E.	Secure Registry	24
VII.	CLAIMS 1-2, 4-11, 13-20, AND 22-26 OF THE '813 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(4))	25
A.	Prior Art Patents and Printed Publications	25
1.	Ex-1213 – Maes	25
2.	Ex-1214 - Jakobsson	26
3.	Ex-1215 - Maritzen	26
4.	Ex-1216 - Labrou	27
B.	Ground 1: Claims 1-2, 4-5, 11, 13, 16-20, and 24 Are Obvious in View of Maes and Jakobsson	27
1.	Independent Claim 1	28
2.	Dependent Claim 2.....	52
3.	Dependent Claim 4.....	54
4.	Dependent Claim 5.....	56

Petition for Covered Business Method Review
of U.S. Patent No. 8,577,813

5.	Dependent Claim 11	57
6.	Dependent Claim 13	58
7.	Independent Claim 16	59
8.	Dependent Claim 17	62
9.	Dependent Claim 18	62
10.	Dependent Claim 19	63
11.	Dependent Claim 20	65
12.	Independent Claim 24	66
C.	Ground 2: Claims 6-10 Are Obvious in View of Maes, Jakobsson, and Maritzen	69
1.	Dependent Claim 6	69
2.	Reasons to Combine Maes, Jakobsson, and Maritzen	71
3.	Dependent Claim 7	75
4.	Dependent Claim 8	77
5.	Dependent Claim 9	78
6.	Dependent Claim 10	79
D.	Ground 3: Claims 14, 15, 22, 23, 25, and 26 Are Obvious in View of Maes, Jakobsson, and Labrou	83
1.	Dependent Claims 14, 15, 22, 23, 25, and 26	84
2.	Reasons to Combine Maes, Jakobsson, and Labrou	86
VIII.	CONCLUSION	91
	TABLE OF EXHIBITS	92

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1229 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	18
<i>Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	19
<i>Dealersocket, Inc. v. Autoalert, LLC</i> , CBM2014-00132, Paper No. 11 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 29, 2014)	13
<i>Essociate, Inc. v. 4355768 Canada Inc.</i> , No. 14-CV-0679-JVS, 2015 WL 4470139 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 11, 2015)	18-19
<i>Interthinx, Inc. v. Corelogic Solutions, LLC</i> , CBM2012-00007, Paper No. 15 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 31, 2013).....	18
<i>Liberty Mut.</i> , CBM2012-00004, Paper No. 10 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 25, 2013).....	18
<i>Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.</i> , CBM2012-00003, Paper No. 15 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 12, 2013).....	14, 17
<i>Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.</i> , CBM2012-00004, Paper No. 60 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 23, 2014).....	12
<i>Salesforce.com, Inc. v. Virtual Agility, Inc.</i> , CBM2013-00024, Paper No. 16 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 19, 2013).....	12
<i>SAS Institute Inc. v. Iancu</i> , ___ U.S. ___, No. 16-969 (Apr. 24, 2018)	19
<i>Versata Development Group, Inc. v. SAP America, Inc.</i> , 793 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 21
STATUTES	
35 U.S.C. § 101	3, 4

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.