

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

**UNITED SERVICES AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION,
Petitioner**

v.

**NADER ASGHARI-KAMRANI and KAMRAN ASGHARI-KAMRANI,
Patent Owners**

U.S. PATENT NO. 8,266,432
Case IPR2015-01842

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Mail Stop: PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	SUMMARY OF THE ‘432 PATENT	2
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	9
A.	“central entity” and “external entity”	10
B.	“first central-entity computer” and “second central-entity computer”	19
C.	“authenticating”	20
D.	“transaction”.....	21
E.	“dynamic code”	23
IV.	REASONS WHY <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED	24
A.	Ground 1: Petitioner Did Not Establish a <i>prima facie</i> Case That Brown in View of Myers Renders Obvious Claims 1-55.....	25
1.	The combination of Brown and Myers dose not disclose the claimed feature “receiving electronically by the central-entity a request for authenticating the user from a computer associated with the external-entity ...”	26
2.	The proposed combination of Brown and Myers fails to disclose the claimed features “authenticating by the central-entity the user and providing a result of the authenticating to the external-entity during the transaction ...”	33
3.	The proposed combination of Brown and Myers fails to disclose claimed feature “generating by the central-entity ... a dynamic code for the user...”	40
B.	Ground 2: Petitioner Did Not Establish a <i>prima facie</i> Case That Neuman Anticipates Claims 1-3, 6-28, and 31-55.....	44
1.	Neuman fails to disclose the claimed feature “receiving electronically by the central-entity a request for authenticating the user from a computer associated with the external-entity based on a user-specific information and the dynamic code ...”	46
2.	Neuman fails to disclose the claimed feature, “generating by the central-entity ...a dynamic code...authenticating by the central-entity the user”	51

3. Neuman fails to disclose the claimed feature, “authenticating by the central-
entity the user and providing a result of the authenticating to the external-entity
during the transaction if the digital identity is valid”52

4. Claims 25 and 5254

5. Claim 48.....55

C. Ground 3: Petitioner Did Not Establish a *prima facie* Case That Neuman
Renders Obvious Claims 4, 5, 29, and 30.....56

D. Petition Fails To Meet the Page Limit and Should Be Rejected Due To Lack Of
Signature56

E. 35 U.S.C. 101 Issue Was Raised.....58

F. Exhibits Not Presented59

V. CONCLUSION60

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit No.	Description
Ex. 2001	Affidavit by Abolfazl Hosseinzadeh dated on Feb. 28, 2012 and submitted to the USPTO on March 1, 2012 during the prosecution of U.S. patent No. 8,266,432
Ex. 2002	Affidavit by Kamran Asghari-Kamrani dated on Feb. 27, 2012 and submitted to the USPTO on March 1, 2012 during the prosecution of U.S. patent No. 8,266,432
Ex. 2003	Affidavit by Nader Asghari-Kamrani dated on Feb. 27, 2012 and submitted to the USPTO on March 1, 2012 during the prosecution of U.S. patent No. 8,266,432
Ex. 2004	Affidavit by James Hewitt dated on Feb. 28, 2012 and submitted to the USPTO on March 1, 2012 during the prosecution of U.S. patent No. 8,266,432

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Gubelmann v. Gang,
408 F.2d 758 (C.C.P.A. 1969) 45, 50

Haemonetics Corp. v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.,
607 F.3d 776 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....10

In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.,
367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....9

In re Eli Lilly & Co.,
90 F.2d 943 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....42

In re Gordon,
733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....30

In re Grasselli,
713 F.2d 731 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....35

In re Oelrich,
666 F.2d 578 (C.C.P.A. 1981)45

In re Piasecki,
745 F. 2d 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....42

In re Ratti,
270 F.2d 810 (CCPA 1959) 30, 42, 43

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.