

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Twilio Inc.
Petitioner

v.

TeleSign Corporation
Patent Owner

Patent No. 9,300,792
(filed April 3, 2015, issued March 29, 2016)

Title: REGISTRATION, VERIFICATION AND NOTIFICATION
SYSTEM

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2016-01688

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction.....	1
2.	Miscellaneous.	3
	2(A). Claims 3, 5, 7, 12, 14, and 16 are disclaimed.	3
	2(B). Matters Involving Related Patents.	4
3.	The '792 Patent.....	4
	3(A). Background and context.....	5
	3(B). Problems Addressed.....	5
	3(C). Solutions.....	7
4.	Legal Authority.....	9
	4(A). Standard for Granting <i>Inter Partes</i> Review.	9
	4(B). The Burden of Proof is on the Petitioner.	10
	4(C). The Petition may not incorporate argument by reference to other documents, including an expert declaration.	10
	4(D). Standard for Claim Construction in <i>Inter Partes</i> Review.....	11
	4(E). Standard for Obviousness.....	13
	4(F). Failure to Articulate a Motivation to Combine Prior Art References is Reversible Error.....	14
5.	Claim Construction.....	15
	5(A). “notification event”	15
	5(B). “verifying the telephone number”	16
	5(C). Because the intrinsic record is reasonably clear, recourse to extrinsic evidence to construe the claim terms is inappropriate.	17
	5(D). Petitioner’s reservations regarding the proper BRI for “notification event” show that Petitioner is relying on a claim construction previously considered and rejected by the Board in	

the context of related patents.....	20
6. The Petition should be denied because the same or substantially the same prior art or arguments previously were presented to the Office.....	27
7. Twilio has not met its burden to show that the Remaining Claims are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Bennett in view of Campbell.....	33
7(A). Notification events in the '792 Patent Claims.....	33
7(B). Overview of Bennett.	34
7(C). Bennett does not teach the notification-event limitations.....	36
7(D). It would not have been obvious to modify Bennett to notify a user of a notification event where the alleged notification is based on a variety of factors including multiple events and characteristics of a transaction, the user, the institution, and other users' activity.	39
7(E). Vague cross-references do not constitute argument or evidence.....	41
7(F). Campbell does not cure the defects of Bennett.....	42
7(F)(1). The Petition fails to make out a <i>prima facie</i> case of obviousness with the proposed combination of Campbell and Bennett, at least because the proposed combination relies upon an alleged teaching in Bennett that is not there. 42	
7(F)(2). There was no apparent reason to combine Campbell with Bennett.	44
7(F)(3). The proposed combination of Campbell with Bennett would not result in a “notification event” as claimed.	45
7(F)(4). The proposed combination of Campbell and Bennett is contrary to the stated goals of Bennett.	48
7(F)(5). The Petition fails to show that the proposed combination of Bennett and Campbell reaches the other claim limitations involving a notification event.	49
7(G). Geddes does not cure the defects of Bennett.	54

7(G)(1).	Ground 2 is redundant with Ground 1.....	55
7(G)(2).	The Petition fails to make out a <i>prima facie</i> case of obviousness with the proposed combination of Geddes and Bennett, at least because the proposed combination relies upon an alleged teaching in Bennett that is not there. 56	
7(G)(3).	There was no apparent reason to combine Geddes with Bennett.	57
7(G)(4).	The proposed combination confounds the Petition’s outline of how Bennett allegedly meets the claims.	59
7(G)(5).	The proposed combination of Geddes with Bennett would not result in a notification event.	61
7(G)(6).	The proposed combination of Geddes and Bennett is contrary to the stated goals of Bennett.....	63
7(H).	The Remaining Claims, which depend from claim 1 or claim 10, are also not unpatentable over the proposed combinations of Bennett with Campbell or Geddes.	64
8.	Conclusion.	64

Patent Owner's List of Exhibits:

Exhibit Number	Document
2001	BBC News Article, "Tinder accounts spammed by bots masquerading as singles", http://www.bbc.com/news/26850761 , last accessed Nov. 29, 2016.
2002	Technology Review Article, "Fake Persuaders", https://www.technologyreview.com/s/535901/fake-persuaders/ , last accessed Nov. 29, 2016.
2003	Certified copy of the file wrapper and contents of the application (14/678,815) leading to U.S. Patent No. 9,300,792.

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.