

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 CBM2019-00026
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.....	5
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.....	9
III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL	9
IV. GROUNDS FOR STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(A))	10
A. Petitioner Has Standing And Is Not Estopped (37 C.F.R. § 42.302)	10
B. The '813 Patent Qualifies As A CBM Patent (37 C.F.R. § 42.301)	10
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.....	11
2. The '813 patent is not directed to a “technological invention”	13
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))	20
C.	Standard For Granting A Petition For CBM Review	20
VI.	PROPOSED CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS FOR CBM REVIEW (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(3))	21
A.	Biometric Input	21
B.	Secret Information.....	23
C.	Authentication Information.....	23
D.	Point-of-Sale Device	24
E.	Secure Registry	25
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))	26
A.	Prior Art Patents and Printed Publications	26
1.	Ex-1115 - Jakobsson	26
2.	Ex-1116 - Maritzen	27
3.	Ex-1117 - Labrou	27
B.	Ground 1: Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 13, 16-20, and 24 Are Obvious in View of Jakobsson and Maritzen	28
1.	Independent Claim 1	28
2.	Dependent Claim 2.....	56
3.	Dependent Claim 4.....	57
4.	Dependent Claim 5.....	59

5.	Dependent Claim 6.....	60
6.	Dependent Claim 7.....	63
7.	Dependent Claim 8.....	64
8.	Dependent Claim 9.....	65
9.	Dependent Claim 10.....	66
10.	Dependent Claim 11.....	69
11.	Dependent Claim 13.....	70
12.	Independent Claim 16	71
13.	Dependent Claim 17.....	74
14.	Dependent Claim 18.....	75
15.	Dependent Claim 19.....	80
16.	Dependent Claim 20.....	82
17.	Independent Claim 24	83
C.	Ground 2: Claims 14, 15, 22, 23, 25, and 26 Are Obvious in View of Jakobsson, Maritzen, and Labrou	87
1.	Dependent Claims 14, 15, 22, 23, 25, and 26	87
2.	Reasons to Combine Jakobsson, Maritzen, and Labrou ..	89
VIII.	CONCLUSION	93
	TABLE OF EXHIBITS	1

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)	12
<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).....	17
<i>Liberty Mut., 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).....	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).....	11
<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, <i>slip op.</i> (Apr. 24, 2018)	20
<i>Universal Secure Registry LLC v. Apple Inc. et al.</i> , No. 17-585-VAC- MPT (D. Del.), ECF No. 1	2, 10
<i>Versata Development Group, Inc. v. SAP America, Inc.</i> , 793 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	10, 11, 13, 14, 19, 21

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.