Paper No. ____ Filed: May 10, 2016

Filed on behalf of: Mitek Systems, Inc.

By: Edward J. Benz III

Naveen Modi Paul Hastings

1170 Peachtree Street, N.E.

Suite 100

Atlanta, GA 30309

Telephone: 404-815-2329 Facsimile: 404-685-5329

Email: joebenz@paulhastings.com

naveenmodi@paulhastings.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ROTHSCHILD MOBILE IMAGING INNOVATIONS, LLC Petitioner

v.

MITEK SYSTEMS, INC. Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-00457 Patent 8,379,914

Patent Owner's Preliminary Response to Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,379,914



Table of Contents

		Pa	age
I.	Intro	oduction	1
II.	Ove	rview of the '914 Patent	2
III.	Overview of Hoyos		
IV.	Claim Construction		9
	A.	Mobile Device	10
	В.	Address Database	13
	C.	Code Line	16
V.	Prev Cert	Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood that the Petition vail in Establishing that any Challenged Claim is Unpatentable Becautain Claimed Features Are Not Disclosed or Taught by the Cited erences.	
	A.	Petitioner Has Not Shown that Hoyos Discloses "a mobile device' Recited in the Challenged Claims.	
	В.	Petitioner Has Not Shown that Hoyos Discloses Limitation (e) of Claims 1 and 10: "identifying an address of a biller on the remittar coupon by comparing address content in the extracted content with address database."	h an
	C.	Petitioner Has Not Shown that Hoyos Discloses Limitation (f) of Claims 1 and 10: "determining biller profile information of the bil including an identity of the biller on the remittance coupon, by comparing the identified address of the biller with a database of biprofile information."	ller
	D.	Petitioner Has Not Shown that the Prior Art Discloses "reading a cline on the remittance coupon and correcting a scale of the remittance coupon based on a size of the code line" as Recited in Claim 2	nce
VI.	Petitioner Fails to Articulate a Motivation to Combine Hoyos with Any of the Cited Secondary References		
VII	Con	clusion	34



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page	(S)
Cases	
CAE Screenplates Inc. v. Heinrich Fiedler GmbH & Co. KG, 224 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	30
Dominion Dealer Solutions, LLC v. Autoalert, Inc., IPR2013-00223, Paper No. 9 at 19 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 15, 2013)	.33
Ieart Failure Technologies, LLC v. Cariokinetix, Inc., IPR2013-00183, Paper No. 12 at 9 (P.T.A.B. July 31, 2013)	.34
n re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	.33
Cinetic Tech., Inc. v Skyworks Solutions, Inc., No. IPR2014-00530, 2014 WL 4925282	.32
SR Int'l Co. v Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007)21,	33
n re NTP, 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	.10
n re Rouffet, 149 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	.33
n re Vaidyanathan, 381 Fed. Appx. 985 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	.10
tatutes	
5 U.S.C. § 102 § 103(a) § 313 § 314(a)	1



Other Authorities

37 C.F.R.	
§ 42.100(b)(2014)	10
§ 42.107	
M.P.E.P. 8 2131	21



I. Introduction

In accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 313 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.107, Patent Owner Mitek Systems, Inc. ("Mitek" or "Patent Owner") respectfully submits this Preliminary Response to the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of Mitek's U.S. Patent No. 8,379,914 ("the '914 patent") filed by Rothschild Mobile Imaging Innovations, LLC. ("RMII" or "Petitioner"). Mitek requests that the Board deny institution of the *inter partes* review for at least the following reasons.

First, the prior art on which RMII relies to establish the unpatentability of challenged claims 1-7 and 9-10 (the "Challenged Claims") fails to recite each and every limitation of any Challenged Claim. Specifically, the prior art fails to recite at least (i) a "mobile device," recited in all Challenged Claims; (ii) "identifying an address of a biller on the remittance coupon by comparing address content in the extracted content with an address database," recited in all Challenged Clams; (iii) "determining biller profile information of the biller, including an identity of the biller on the remittance coupon, by comparing the identified address of the biller with a database of biller profile," recited in all Challenged Claims; and (iv) "reading a code line on the remittance coupon and correcting a scale of the remittance coupon based on a size of the code line," recited in claim 2. As a result, Petitioner has not met its burden of demonstrating a reasonable likelihood of prevailing in proving the unpatentability of any Challenged Claim. Second,



DOCKET

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.

