

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

DOCKET NO.: 1033300-00307US1

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 CBM2018-00026

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

PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD REVIEW
OF CLAIMS 1-26

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	4
C. Counsel.....	5
D. Service Information.....	5
II. BACKGROUND OF THE '813 PATENT	6
A. Priority	6
B. Brief Description of the '813 Patent Disclosure.....	6
C. Prosecution History.....	9
D. Rejection of Patent Family Members Under §101	17
III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL.....	21
IV. GROUNDS FOR STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(A))	21
A. Petitioner Has Standing And Is Not Estopped (37 C.F.R. § 42.302)	21
B. The '813 Patent Qualifies As A CBM Patent (37 C.F.R. § 42.301)	22
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	23
2. The '813 Patent Is Not Directed To A “Technological Invention”	25
i. The '813 patent claims include only conventional technology components that were well known in the art.....	25

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

ii. The '813 patent does not solve a technical problem
with a technical solution.....30

V. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED FOR
EACH CHALLENGED CLAIM (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b))32

A. Claims For Which Review Is Requested
(37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(1)).....32

B. Statutory Grounds Of Challenge
(37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(2)).....32

C. Standard For Granting A Petition For CBM Review33

VI. PROPOSED CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS FOR CBM
REVIEW (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(3)).....33

A. Biometric Input (All Challenged Claims).....34

B. Secret Information.....36

C. Authentication Information.....37

D. Point-of-Sale Device39

E. Secure Registry (All Challenged Claims).....41

VII. CLAIMS 1-26 OF THE '813 PATENT ARE
UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101 (37 C.F.R. §
42.304(b)(4))42

A. *Alice* Step 1: The '813 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.....44

1. Independent Claim 144

2. The Remaining Claims52

B. *Alice* Step 2: The Remaining Limitations Of The '813 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 Transaction58

1. Independent Claim 161

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

2.	Independent Claims 16 and 24	67
3.	Dependent Claims.....	67
VIII.	CONCLUSION	69
	TABLE OF EXHIBITS	70

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Federal Cases	
<i>Alice Corporation Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank International</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Apple Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1229 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	31, 67
<i>Bancorp Services., L.L.C. v. Sun Life Assurance Company of Canada</i> (U.S.), 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	64
<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)	32
<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).....	48, 62
<i>buySAFE, Inc. v. Google, Inc.</i> , 765 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	47, 59
<i>CLS Bank International v. Alice Corporation Pty.</i> , 717 F.3d 1269 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	44, 52
<i>CyberSource Corporation v. Retail Decisions, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	48, 64, 66
<i>Data Distribution Technologies v. Brer Affiliates, Inc.</i> , No. 12-4878, 2014 WL 4162765 (D.N.J. Aug. 19, 2014)	67
<i>Dealersocket, Inc. v. Autoalert, LLC</i> , CBM2014-00132, Paper No. 11 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 29, 2014)	24

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.