

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

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

*Petitioners,*

v.

UNIVERSAL SECURE REGISTRY LLC

*Patent Owner*

---

Case CBM2018-00025<sup>1</sup>  
U.S. Patent No. 8,577,813

---

**PATENT OWNER'S SUR-REPLY**

---

<sup>1</sup> Visa Inc. and Visa U.S.A. Inc., which filed a petition in CBM2019-00026 have been joined as a party to this proceeding.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. THE '813 PATENT IS NOT CBM ELIGIBLE.....	1
A. <i>IBG LLC v. Trading Technologies Int'l, Inc.</i> Requires Dismissal.....	1
B. Petitioner Fails To Prove The Claimed Subject Matter As A Whole Does Not Recite A Technological Feature That Is Novel And Unobvious.....	2
C. Petitioner Fails To Prove The Claimed Subject Matter As A Whole Does Not Solve A Technological Problem Using A Technical Solution.....	3
II. PETITIONER FAILS TO PROVE THAT THE INDEPENDENT CLAIMS WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS.....	4
A. The Petition Fails to Show the Recited “Secure Registry” (all Claims) .....	4
1. The Board Should Reject Petitioner’s Construction As Inconsistent with the Intrinsic Evidence.....	5
2. The Petition Failed to Show a Secure Registry Because the Verification Device Cannot Store Information for Multiple Entities.....	6
B. The Petition Fails to Show the “Electronic ID Device” (All Claims) .....	8
1. Jakobsson Does not Render Obvious the Electronic ID Limitation.....	9
2. Jakobsson in View of Maritzen Does Not Render Obvious the Electronic ID Limitation .....	12
C. The Petition Fails to Show the “Point-of-Sale Terminal” (All Claims) .....	16
III. THE PETITION FAILS TO PROVE THAT MANY DEPENDENT CLAIMS WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS.....	18
A. The Petition Fails to Show That Dependent Claims 10 and 19 Would Have Been Obvious.....	18
B. The Petition Fails to Show That Dependent Claims 6 and 18 Would Have Been Obvious.....	21

C. The Petition Fails to Show That Dependent Claims 4 and 20  
Would Have Been Obvious.....23

D. The Petition Fails to Show That Dependent Claims 14-15, 22-  
23, and 25-26 Would Have Been Obvious.....23

IV. PETITIONER FAILED TO REBUT EVIDENCE OF SECONDARY  
CONSIDERATIONS OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS.....24

V. CONCLUSION.....25

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
<b><u>Cases</u></b>	
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Universal Secure Registry LLC</i> , CBM2018-00026, (Paper 11), slip op., 24 (PTAB Dec. 10, 2018) .....	1
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	22
<i>Cisco v. C-Cation Techs.</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper, 12 at 7-11 (Aug. 29, 2014).....	20
<i>Experian Mktg. Sol’ns, Inc. v. RPost Commc’ns Ltd.</i> , CBM2014-0010 (Paper 20) slip op., 9 (PTAB Apr. 22, 2014) .....	3
<i>IBG LLC v. Trading Technologies Int’l, Inc.</i> , 2019 WL 581580 (Fed Cir., Feb. 13, 2019) .....	1, 2, 3
<i>Kaneka Corp. v. Xiamen Kingdomway Grp. Co.</i> , 790 F.3d 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	14
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	5
<i>Universal Secure Registry, LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , No. 1:17-cv-00585-CFC-SRF, Doc. 137 (D. Del., 2018) .....	1

**Rules and Regulations**

37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e).....	28
37 C.F.R. § 42.24 .....	27
37 C.F.R. § 42.24(b) .....	27
37 C.F.R. § 42.301(b) .....	3

**Additional Authorities**

“A Practical Secure Physical Random Bit Generator” at Introduction, <a href="http://www.arijuels.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/JSHJ98.pdf">http://www.arijuels.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/JSHJ98.pdf</a> .....	20
--	----

“A Proposal for an ISO Standard for Public Key Encryption (version 2.1)”,  
p. 17, [https://www.shoup.net/papers/iso-2\\_1.pdf](https://www.shoup.net/papers/iso-2_1.pdf) .....19

# 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.