

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

PLAID TECHNOLOGIES INC.  
Petitioner

v.

YODLEE, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2016-00273  
Patent 6,317,783

---

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED .....	5
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	5
	A. “non-public personal information” (claims 1, 18, 20) .....	5
	1. Patent Owner’s Proposed Construction is Correct .....	6
	2. The Full Term Should be Given Patentable Weight.....	11
	B. “intermediary web site” (claims 14, 33) .....	15
	C. “protocol for instructing the processor how to access the securely stored personal information via the network” (claims 1, 18, and 20).17	
IV.	PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO SHOW THAT ANY CLAIM OF THE ’783 PATENT IS INVALID .....	19
	A. Sugiarto and Brandt Do Not Render Obvious Independent Claims 1, 18, and 20 Regardless of Whether “non-public personal information” is Given Patentable Weight .....	21
	1. The references do not disclose a “protocol for instructing the processor how to access the securely stored personal information via the network” .....	21
	2. The references do not disclose “storing the retrieved personal information in [a/the] personal information store” .....	26
	B. Sugiarto and Brandt Do Not Render Obvious Independent Claims 1, 18, and 20 if “non-public personal information” is Given Patentable Weight .....	30
	1. The references do not disclose “non-public personal information” .....	30
	2. The references do not disclose non-public personal information “also being accessible by the end user via the network	

	independently of the system for delivering personal information” .....	38
C.	Petitioner’s Proposed Combination is Deficient and the References Teach Away from Making this Combination.....	39
D.	Sugiarto and Brandt Do Not Render Obvious the Dependent Claims of the ’783 Patent, Regardless of Whether “non-public personal information” is Given Patentable Weight .....	43
1.	The references do not disclose “intermediary web site” (claims 14-17, 33-36).....	43
2.	The references do not disclose “associated user interface format” / “format associated with the intermediary web site” / “format other than the format associated with the intermediary web site” (claims 14, 15, 17, 33, 34, 36) .....	45
3.	The references do not disclose “monitoring information providers for changes” (claims 2 and 21) .....	46
V.	CONCLUSION.....	47

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

**Cases**

*Allergan, Inc. v. Apotex Inc.*,  
754 F.3d 952 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....41

*In re Distefano*,  
808 F.3d 845 (Fed. Cir. 2015) ..... 11

*KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*,  
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....29, 32, 36

*In re Lowry*,  
32 F.3d 1579 (Fed. Cir. 1994) ..... 12

*Merck & Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.*,  
395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....9

*Mintz v. Dietz & Watson, Inc.*,  
679 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....41

*Yodlee, Inc. v. Block Financial Corp.*,  
No. 03-0831-CV-W-DW (W.D. Mo. Dec. 2, 2004).....10

*Yodlee, Inc. v. CashEdge, Inc.*,  
No. C 05-01550 SI, Dkt. 66 (N.D. Cal. July 7, 2006) ..... 10

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 103 .....32

**EXHIBIT LIST**

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	ESPN Insider: Benefits, WayBackMachine June 22, 2001
2002	Declaration of David Barkan in Support of Motion for <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> Admission
2003	Declaration of Matthew McCullough in Support of Motion for <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> Admission
2004	Declaration of Todd C. Mowry in Support of Petition in Case No. CBM2016-00045
2005	Transcript of Deposition of Todd Mowry
2006	Memorandum Opinion re Claim Construction, <i>Yodlee, Inc. v. Plaid Techs., Inc.</i> , No. 14-1445-LPS, Dkt. 96 (D. Del. Jan. 15, 2016)
2007	Declaration of Zaydoon Jawadi in Support of Patent Owner's Response
2008	Curriculum Vitae of Zaydoon Jawadi
2009	Order re Claim Construction, <i>Yodlee, Inc. v. Block Financial Corp.</i> , No. 03-0831-CV-W-DW, Dkt. 79 (W.D. Mo. Dec. 2, 2004)
2010	Claim Construction Order, <i>Yodlee, Inc. v. CashEdge, Inc.</i> , No. C 05-01550 SI, Dkt. 66 (N.D. Cal. July 7, 2006)

# 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.