

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

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 313 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. OVERVIEW OF THE '813 PATENT	4
A. The '813 Patent Specification	4
B. The '813 Patent Claims	7
C. Prosecution History of the '813 Patent	8
III. OVERVIEW OF THE ASSERTED PRIOR ART	9
A. Maes	9
B. Pare	10
C. Labrou.....	11
D. Burger	12
E. Pizarro.....	12
IV. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	12
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	13
VI. THE PETITION FAILS TO MEET ITS BURDEN OF PARTICULARITY AND SPECIFICITY	19
VII. THE PETITION FAILS TO ADDRESS EACH AND EVERY LIMITATION OF CLAIMS 7-10	23
VIII. GROUND 2 SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT RELIES ON IMPERMISSIBLY CONCLUSORY STATEMENTS TO SUPPORT OBVIOUSNESS.....	24
IX. PETITIONER FAILS TO MEET ITS BURDEN TO SHOW THAT PIZARRO DISCLOSES "SECURE REGISTRY"	27
X. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO EXPLAIN WHY GROUND 3 IS NOT REDUNDANT OF GROUND 1	28
XI. THE PETITION PRESENTS SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME PRIOR ART AND ARGUMENTS PREVIOUSLY BEFORE THE OFFICE.....	30
XII. CONCLUSION.....	32

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>Cases</u>	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>Apple Inc. v. Parthenon Unified Mem. Arch. LLC</i> , IPR2016-00923, Paper 2 (PTAB April 20, 2016)	29, 30
<i>Beachcombers Int’l v. Wildewood Creative Prods.</i> , 31 F.3d 1154 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	16
<i>Biscotti Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , No. 2:13-cv-01015-JRG-RSP, 2016 WL 6611487 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 9, 2016).....	14
<i>Cisco v. C-Cation Techs.</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (Aug. 29, 2014)	25
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	13
<i>Dominion Dealer Sol., LLC v. Autoalert, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00225, Paper 15	23
<i>EMC Corp. et al. v. Personal Web Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2013-00082, Paper 33 (PTAB Jun. 5, 2013)	27
<i>EPOS Technologies Ltd. v. Pegasus Technologies Ltd.</i> , 766 F.3d 1338 (2014).....	17
<i>Ex parte Benjamin Tang, et al</i> , 2014 WL 2968031 (BPAI 2014).....	16
<i>Halliburton Energy v. M-I LLC</i> , 514 F.3d 1244 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	17
<i>Harmonic v. Avid Technology</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	25, 26, 30
<i>Intellectual Ventures Mgmt., LLC v. Xilinx, Inc.</i> , No. IPR2012-00019, Paper 13 (Feb. 12, 2013)	27
<i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , IPR2013-00324, Paper 19 (PTAB Nov. 21, 2013).....	27
<i>Libel-Flarsheim co. v. Medrad, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 898 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	17

Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.,
CBM2012-00003 (JL), 2012 WL 9494791
(PTAB Oct. 25, 2012)..... 22, 29

In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l Ltd.,
829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....26

MyMail Ltd. v. Am. Online, Inc.,
476 F.3d 13762 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....16

In re Nuvasive, Inc.,
841 F.3d 966 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....22

O2 Micro Inter. v. Beyond Innovation,
521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 14, 15

Shire Dev. LLC v. Amneal Pharms. LLC,
No. 15-2865 (RBK/JS), 2016 WL 4119940 (D.N.J. Aug. 2, 2016)14

Superguide Corp. v. DirecTV Enterprises, Inc.,
358 F.3d 870 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....17

In re Swinehart,
439 F.2d 210 (C.C.P.A. 1971)17

In re Trans Texas Holdings Corp.,
498 F.3d 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....14

United Carbon Co. v. Binney & Smith Co.,
317 U.S. 228 (1942).....18

York Prods. v. Central Tractor Farm & Family,
99 F.3d 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....16

Statutory Authorities

5 U.S.C. §§ 554(b)-(c)19

5 U.S.C. § 556(d)19

5 U.S.C. § 557(c)19

35 U.S.C. § 21 1

35 U.S.C. § 102(b).....29

35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 6 18, 24

35 U.S.C. § 3144

35 U.S.C. § 314(a)27
35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....4, 30

Rules and Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b)..... 4, 19, 23
37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)(2)..... 19, 25
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) 13, 14
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3) 14, 18, 19
37 C.F.R. § 2.104(b)(4).....19
37 C.F.R. § 2.104(b)(5).....23
37 C.F.R. § 42.108.....4

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.