

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.
Petitioner,

v.

UNIVERSAL SECURE REGISTRY LLC
Patent Owner

Case CBM2018-00026
U.S. Patent No. 8,577,813

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. OVERVIEW OF THE '813 PATENT	5
A. The '813 Patent Specification	5
B. The '813 Patent Claims	8
C. Prosecution History of the '813 Patent	11
III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	11
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	12
V. THE PETITION FAILS TO IDENTIFY RELATED MATTERS	13
VI. THE '813 PATENT DOES NOT QUALIFY AS A "COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT"	16
A. Petitioner fails to show the '813 patent does not claim a "technological invention."	16
B. The Claims Are Directed to a "Technological Invention"	23
1. The claimed subject matter as a whole recites technological features that are novel and unobvious over the prior art	23
(a) Independent Claim 1	24
(b) Independent Claim 16	26
(c) Independent Claim 24	28
2. The claimed subject matter solves a technical problem with a technical solution	30
VII. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OF THE '813 PATENT ARE DIRECTED TO PATENT-ELIGIBLE SUBJECT MATTER	34
A. The Claims Are Not Directed to an Abstract Idea	37
1. Petitioner's Alice Step 1 analysis fails to properly address individual claim limitations and oversimplifies key inventive concepts found in the plain language of the claims	37
2. Petitioner fails to address the unique combination of elements of the claims	44

3.	Petitioner's Reliance on Secured Mail Solutions and Smart Systems Innovation is Improper and Inapplicable to the Present Claims.	46
B.	The Claims Provide a Technical Innovation That Transforms Any Purported Abstract Idea Into a Patent-Eligible Application	49
VIII.	THE BOARD SHOULD STAY THE PRESENT PROCEEDING PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.122	55
IX.	CONCLUSION.....	56
	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....	57

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page</u>
<u>CASES</u>	
<i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int'l,</i> 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....	passim
<i>Apple, Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.,</i> IPR2015-00356 (PTAB June 26, 2015)	1, 2, 13, 14
<i>Bascom Glob. Internet Servs., Inc. v. AT&T Mobility, LLC,</i> 827 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	50, 52, 53, 54
<i>Bilski v. Kappos,</i> 561 U.S. 593 (2010).....	35, 44
<i>In re Bilski,</i> 545 F.3d 943 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	50
<i>Bloomberg L.P. v. Quest Licensing Corporation,</i> CBM2014-00205 (PTAB Apr. 7, 2015).....	2, 21
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee,</i> 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	12
<i>Diamond v. Diehr,</i> 450 U.S. 175 (1981).....	50
<i>Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.,</i> 822 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	2, 19, 38, 43, 49
<i>E*Trade Fin. Corp. v. Droplets, Inc.,</i> CBM2014-00123 (PTAB Oct. 30, 2014)	17, 18
<i>Experian Mktg. Sol'ns, Inc. v. RPost Commc'n Ltd.,</i> CBM2014-00010 (PTAB Apr. 22, 2014).....	18, 21
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Systems, Inc.,</i> 879 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	19, 47, 48, 49
<i>Google LLC v. UNILOC Luxembourg S.A.,</i> Case No. 2017-02067 (PTAB March 29, 2018).....	4, 55
<i>Idexx Labs., Inc. v. Charles River Labs., Inc.,</i> 2016 WL 3647971 (D. Del. Jul. 1, 2016)	44
<i>King Pharms., Inc. v. Eon Labs, Inc.,</i> 616 F.3d 1267 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	50

<i>Mayo Collaborative Services v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.</i> , 132 S. Ct. 1289 (2012).....	35
<i>McRO, Inc. v. Bandai Namco Games Am. Inc.</i> , 837 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	38, 43, 44
<i>Research Corp. Techs., Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 627 F.3d 859 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	37
<i>SAS Institute, Inc. v. Iancu</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018).....	35
<i>Secured Mail Sols. v. Universal Wilde</i> , 873 F.3d 905 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	46, 50
<i>Smart Meter Techs., Inc. v. Duke Energy Corp.</i> , 2017 WL 2954916 (D. Del. July 11, 2017)	45
<i>Smart Sys. Innovations, LLC v. Chi. Transit Auth.</i> , 873 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	46, 47
<i>Unified Patents, Inc. v. Universal Secure Registry LLC</i> , Case No. IPR2018-00067 (PTAB October 16, 2017)	1, 4, 14, 55, 56
<i>Universal Secure Registry LLC v. Apple Inc. et, al.</i> , No. 17-585-VAC-MPT (D. Del.) (complaint served July 5, 2017)	14

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

35 U.S.C. § 101	passim
35 U.S.C. § 324(a)	3, 34
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a).....	1, 13
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2).....	13
37 C.F.R. § 42.122	4, 55
37 C.F.R. § 42.300(b)	12
37 C.F.R. § 42.301	16, 21
37 C.F.R. § 42.301(a).....	2
37 C.F.R. § 42.301(b)	2, 17, 20, 23
37 C.F.R. § 42.304(a).....	16
AIA § 18(a)(1)	16
AIA § 18(d)(1)	2, 16, 23

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.