

**PUBLIC VERSION**

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

UNIFIED PATENTS INC.  
*Petitioner,*

v.

UNIVERSAL SECURE REGISTRY LLC  
*Patent Owner*

---

Case IPR2018-00067  
U.S. Patent No. 8,577,813

---

**[CORRECTED] PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE  
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.120**

**PUBLIC VERSION**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. OVERVIEW OF THE ‘813 PATENT .....	4
A. The ‘813 Patent Specification .....	4
B. The ‘813 Patent Claims .....	6
C. Prosecution History of the ‘813 Patent .....	6
III. OVERVIEW OF THE ASSERTED PRIOR ART .....	6
A. <i>Maes</i> (Exhibit 1003).....	6
B. <i>Pare</i> (Exhibit 1004).....	10
C. <i>Labrou</i> (Exhibit 1005).....	14
D. <i>Pizarro</i> (Ex. 1007).....	16
E. <i>Burger</i> (Exhibit 1006) .....	16
IV. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	16
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	17
VI. STANDARD OF REVIEW .....	17
VII. GROUND 1 – <i>MAES</i> AND <i>PARE</i> DO NOT RENDER THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OBVIOUS .....	18
A. A POSITA Would Not Combine <i>Maes</i> And <i>Pare</i> To Arrive At The Independent Claims Of The ‘813 Patent.....	18
1. There Is No Motivation To Combine Because <i>Pare</i> Teaches Away From The Claimed Electronic ID Device .....	20
2. There Is No Motivation To Combine <i>Maes</i> And <i>Pare</i> Because The Combination Is Redundant.....	23
3. Petitioner’s Modifications Change <i>Maes</i> ’s Principles Of Operation And Render It Inoperable For Its Intended Purpose.....	26
4. Petitioner Fails To Articulate A Valid Reason For Combining <i>Maes</i> And <i>Pare</i> To Arrive At These Claims .....	30
B. Petitioner Has Failed To Show Claim 2 Is Invalid. ....	35

**PUBLIC VERSION**

1. The Universal Card Number Does Not Satisfy Claim 2 Because It Is Not Associated With The Electronic ID Device .....35

2. The Account Number Does Not Satisfy Claim 2 Because It Is Not Associated With The Electronic ID Device. ....37

VIII. GROUND 2—*MAES* AND *LABROU* DO NOT RENDER THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OBVIOUS .....38

A. A POSITA Would Not Combine *Maes* And *Labrou* To Arrive At The Independent Claims Of The ‘813 Patent.....39

1. There Is No Motivation To Modify *Labrou* To Generate The Claimed Encrypted Authentication Information .....40

2. The Claims Are Not Obvious Because Petitioner Has Not Explained How Its Combination Would Work .....45

3. There Is No Motivation To Combine *Maes* And *Labrou* For The Same Reasons Already Discussed With *Pare* .....46

B. Petitioner Has Failed To Show Claims 12 and 21 Are Obvious.....48

1. *Labrou* Does Not Disclose Account Identifying Information.....49

2. There Is No Motivation To Combine Because The Combination Conflicts With *Maes*’ Purpose And Principles Of Operation .....51

3. Petitioner Fails To Show How Or Why A POSITA Would Combine *Maes* And *Labrou* To Arrive At Claims 12 And 21 .....53

C. Petitioner Has Failed To Show Claim 19 Is Obvious .....55

1. Petitioner Fails To Show *Labrou* Teaches Claim 19. ....55

2. Petitioner Fails To Provide Any Reason Why A POSITA Would Combine *Maes* and *Labrou* To Arrive At Claim 19.....56

IX. GROUND 3 – *MAES*, *PARE*, AND *LABROU* DO NOT RENDER THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OBVIOUS.....59

X. GROUND 4 – *MAES*, *PARE*, AND *BURGER* DO NOT RENDER THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OBVIOUS.....59

**PUBLIC VERSION**

XI. GROUND 5 – *MAES, LABROU, AND BURGER* DO NOT RENDER THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OBVIOUS.....60

    A. *Labrou* Does Not Disclose The Type Of Seed Recited In Claim 10 .....60

    B. The Board Correctly Found No Motivation To Combine *Labrou* To Arrive At Claim 10 .....63

XII. GROUND 6 – *MAES, PARE, BURGER AND LABROU* DO NOT RENDER THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OBVIOUS .....63

XIII. GROUND 7 – *PIZARRO AND PARE* DO NOT RENDER THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OBVIOUS .....64

    A. A POSITA Would Not Combine *Pizarro* And *Pare* To Arrive At The Independent Claims.....64

XIV. THE BOARD SHOULD DISMISS THE PETITION FOR FAILURE TO IDENTIFY AN RPI. ....68

XV. CONCLUSION.....71

**PUBLIC VERSION**

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b><u>Page(s)</u></b>
	<b><u>Cases</u></b>
<i>Abiomed, Inc. v. Maquet Cardiovascular, LLC</i> , IPR2017-01204, -01205 (PTAB Oct. 23, 2017).....	67
<i>Apple v. Uniloc Luxembourg S.A.</i> , IPR2018-00420 (August 6, 2018).....	44
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	31
<i>Cutsforth Inc. v. MotivePower, Inc.</i> , 636 F. App'x 575 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	31
<i>General Electric Company v. United Technologies Corp.</i> , IPR2016-00531 (June 26, 2017).....	27
<i>Google Inc. v. ART+COM Innovationpool GmbH</i> , Case IPR2015-00788 (PTAB Sept. 2, 2015).....	57
<i>Harmonic v. Avid Technology</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	53
<i>Hewlett-Packard Co. v. U.S. Philips Corp. et al.</i> , IPR2015-01505 (PTAB January 19, 2016) .....	57
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	31
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	34
<i>KSR Int'l. Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	56
<i>LG Elecs., Inc. v. Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2015-00329 (PTAB July 10, 2015) .....	56
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Koninklijke Philips N.V.</i> , IPR2018-00185 (May 22, 2018).....	27

# 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.