

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

UNITED SERVICES AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION

Petitioner

v.

MAXIM INTEGRATED PRODUCTS, INC.

Patent Owner

U.S. Patent 6,105,013

**TITLE: METHOD, APPARATUS, SYSTEM AND FIRMWARE FOR
SECURE TRANSACTIONS**

Issue Date August 15, 2000

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 312

Petitioner's Exhibit List

Exhibit No.	Description
1001	U.S. Patent No. 6,105,013 (filed Mar. 10, 1998) (issued Aug. 15, 2000) (“’013 Patent”)
1002	Declaration of Dr. James L. Olivier (“Olivier Declaration”)
1003	PETER L. HAWKES ET AL., INTEGRATED CIRCUIT CARDS, TAGS AND TOKENS, NEW TECHNOLOGY AND APPLICATIONS, (Peter L. Hawkes et al. eds., BSP Professional Books 1990) (“Hawkes”)
1004	European Pat. Pub. 0588339 A2 (“Ishiguro”)
1005	U.S. Patent No. 4,575,621 (filed Mar. 7, 1984) (issued Mar. 11, 1986) (“Dreifus”)
1006	U.S. Patent No. 4,906,828 (filed May 31, 1988) (issued Mar. 6, 1990) (“Halpern”)
1007	Don Lancaster, <i>BASIC Stamp Microcontroller</i> , Hardware Hacker, Selected Reprints, Vol. IV, (July 1993) (“Lancaster”)
1008	Prosecution history for ‘013 Patent
1009	<i>Square, Inc. v. J. Carl Cooper</i> , IPR 2014-00157, Papers 12 and 17
1010	<i>Compass Bank, American Express Company, American Express Travel Related Services Company, Inc., Discover Financial Services, Discover Bank, Discover Products Inc., and State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company v. Maxim Integrated Products, Inc.</i> , CBM 2015-00101, Paper 17

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(A)(1)	1
A. Real Party-in-Interest Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)	1
B. Related Matters Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)	1
C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)	2
D. Service Information Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4).....	2
E. Payment of Fees	2
III. REQUIREMENTS FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW UNDER 37 C.F.R. §42.104.....	3
A. Grounds for Standing Under 37 C.F.R. §42.104(a).....	3
B. Identification of Challenge Under 37 C.F.R. §42.104(B).....	3
1. Claims for Which Review is Requested (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(1))	3
2. Statutory Grounds of Challenge (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(2))	3
IV. REASONS FOR THE RELIEF REQUESTED UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.22(A)(2) AND 42.104(B)(4)	5
A. Background	5
1. The ‘013 Patent	5
B. Relevant Prosecution History	7
C. Claim Construction (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3)).....	8
D. Summary of the Prior Art.....	9
1. Hawkes	9
2. Lancaster	12
3. Dreifus.....	13
4. Halpern.....	13
5. Ishiguro	14

E.	Summary regarding the prior art references.....	15
F.	The Challenged Claims Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103(a).....	16
6.	Grounds 1 and 2: Claims 1-4, 6, 9 10, 11, 12, 14, and 15 are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by Hawkes, and are alternatively obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hawkes.....	16
	a. Claim 1.....	16
	b. Claims 2 and 14	22
	c. Claims 3 and 12	23
	d. Claims 4 and 10	24
	e. Claims 6 and 15	24
	f. Claim 9.....	25
	g. Claim 11.....	28
7.	Ground 3: Claim 5 is obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hawkes in view of Lancaster.....	29
8.	Ground 4: Claim 8 is obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hawkes in view of Dreifus	31
9.	Ground 5: Claims 1-4, 6, 9, 10, 12, 14, and 15 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Halpern in view of Ishiguro	32
	a. Claim 1.....	33
	b. Claim 2.....	42
	c. Claims 3 and 12	42
	d. Claims 4 and 10	43
	e. Claims 6 and 15	44
	f. Claim 9.....	47
10.	Ground 6: Claim 5 is obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Halpern, in view of Ishiguro, and in further view of Lancaster	44

11.	Ground 7: Claims 8 and 11 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Halpern, in view of Ishiguro, and in further view of Dreifus.....	46
a.	Claim 8.....	46
b.	Claim 11.....	54
V.	CONCLUSION.....	57

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.