

Paper No. _____
Filed: December 20, 2018

Filed on behalf of: Visa Inc. and Visa U.S.A. Inc.
By: Matthew A. Argenti (margenti@wsgr.com)
Michael T. Rosato (mrosato@wsgr.com)
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
650 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

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

v.

UNIVERSAL SECURE REGISTRY, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case CBM2019-00025
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))	3
A. Real Party-In-Interest.....	3
B. Related Matters	3
C. Counsel.....	4
D. Service Information.....	5
II. BACKGROUND OF THE '813 PATENT.....	5
A. Priority	5
B. Brief Description of the '813 Patent Disclosure.....	6
C. Prosecution History.....	10
III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL	10
IV. GROUNDS FOR STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(A))	11
A. Petitioner Has Standing And Is Not Estopped (37 C.F.R. § 42.302)	11
B. The '813 Patent Qualifies As A CBM Patent (37 C.F.R. § 42.301)	11
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.....	12
2. The '813 patent is not directed to a “technological invention”	14
V. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED FOR EACH CHALLENGED CLAIM (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)).....	20

A.	Claims For Which Review Is Requested (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(1))	20
B.	Statutory Grounds Of Challenge (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(2))	21
C.	Standard For Granting A Petition For CBM Review	21
VI.	PROPOSED CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS FOR CBM REVIEW (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(3))	22
A.	Biometric Input	22
B.	Secret Information.....	24
C.	Authentication Information.....	24
D.	Point-of-Sale Device	25
E.	Secure Registry	26
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))	27
A.	Prior Art Patents and Printed Publications	27
1.	Ex-1213 – Maes	27
2.	Ex-1214 - Jakobsson	28
3.	Ex-1215 - Maritzen	28
4.	Ex-1216 - Labrou	29
B.	Ground 1: Claims 1-2, 4-5, 11, 13, 16-20, and 24 Are Obvious in View of Maes and Jakobsson.....	29
1.	Independent Claim 1	30
2.	Dependent Claim 2.....	55
3.	Dependent Claim 4.....	56

4.	Dependent Claim 5.....	58
5.	Dependent Claim 11.....	59
6.	Dependent Claim 13.....	60
7.	Independent Claim 16	61
8.	Dependent Claim 17.....	64
9.	Dependent Claim 18.....	64
10.	Dependent Claim 19.....	66
11.	Dependent Claim 20.....	68
12.	Independent Claim 24	69
C.	Ground 2: Claims 6-10 Are Obvious in View of Maes, Jakobsson, and Maritzen.....	72
1.	Dependent Claim 6.....	72
2.	Reasons to Combine Maes, Jakobsson, and Maritzen.....	74
3.	Dependent Claim 7.....	78
4.	Dependent Claim 8.....	79
5.	Dependent Claim 9.....	80
6.	Dependent Claim 10.....	82
D.	Ground 3: Claims 14, 15, 22, 23, 25, and 26 Are Obvious in View of Maes, Jakobsson, and Labrou.....	86
1.	Dependent Claims 14, 15, 22, 23, 25, and 26	86
2.	Reasons to Combine Maes, Jakobsson, and Labrou.....	88
VIII.	CONCLUSION	94
	TABLE OF EXHIBITS	95

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1229 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	19
<i>Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	20
<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)	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. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.</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)	15, 18
<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)	13
<i>SAS Institute Inc. v. Iancu</i> , __ U.S. ___, No. 16-969 (Apr. 24, 2018)	21
<i>Versata Development Group, Inc. v. SAP America, Inc.</i> , 793 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	11, 12, 14, 15, 20, 22
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.