

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

APPLE INC.  
*Petitioner,*

v.

UNIVERSAL SECURE REGISTRY LLC  
*Patent Owner*

---

Case IPR2018-00810  
U.S. Patent No. 9,100,826

---

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. OVERVIEW OF THE '826 PATENT .....	3
A. The '826 Patent Specification.....	3
B. The '826 Patent Claims.....	6
C. Prosecution History of the '826 Patent.....	7
III. OVERVIEW OF THE ASSERTED PRIOR ART.....	7
A. Maritzen.....	7
B. Jakobsson.....	9
C. Niwa .....	10
IV. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.....	10
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	11
A. "Authentication Information" .....	11
B. "To [...] enable or disable use of the first handheld device based on a result of the comparison".....	15
VI. STANDARD OF REVIEW.....	20
VII. MARITZEN IN VIEW OF JAKOBSSON AND NIWA DOES NOT RENDER THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OBVIOUS .....	20
A. Petitioner Fails To Show That Independent Claims 1, 10, 21, And 30 Would Have Been Obvious.....	21
1. Petitioner fails to establish "first authentication information" (limitations 1[h], 10[c], 21[g], 30[b]).....	21
(a) <i>Maritzen does not disclose the recited "first                 authentication information"</i> .....	22
(b) <i>A POSITA would not have combined Maritzen and                 Jakobsson to arrive at the recited "first                 authentication information"</i> .....	25
2. Petitioner fails to establish authentication of a user based on "authentication information" (limitations 1[a], 10[a]).....	36

3.	Petitioner fails to establish retrieving or receiving "second biometric [information/data]" (limitations 21[i], 30[d]).....	38
4.	Petitioner fails to establish receiving "first authentication information" (limitation 21[h]) .....	40
5.	Petitioner fails to establish authentication based on "second biometric information" (limitation 30[e]) .....	41
6.	Petitioner fails to establish a "first handheld device" (limitations 1[a], 10[a], 21[a], 30[a]).....	43
B.	Petitioner Fails To Show That Dependent Claims 2 And 11 Would Have Been Obvious.....	45
C.	Petitioner Fails To Show That Dependent Claims 7, 14, 26, And 34 Would Have Been Obvious.....	48
D.	Petitioner Fails To Show That Dependent Claim 15 Would Have Been Obvious.....	51
VIII.	PETITIONER AND ITS EXPERT FAILED TO CONSIDER THE STRONG EVIDENCE OF SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS.....	52
A.	Long-felt Need and Failure of Others .....	53
B.	Commercial Success.....	56
IX.	CONCLUSION.....	57

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

<u>Cases</u>	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>Ameranth, Inc. v. Menusoft Systems Corp.</i> , 2010 WL 1610079 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 21, 2010).....	18
<i>Apple Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	52
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co. Ltd.</i> , 816 F.3d 788 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	53
<i>Apple v. Uniloc Luxembourg S.A.</i> , IPR2018-00420 (Paper 7), slip op. (August 6, 2018).....	33
<i>Augme Technologies, Inc. v. Yahoo! Inc.</i> , 755 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	13, 15
<i>Cheese Sys. v. Tetra Pak Cheese &amp; Powder Sys.</i> , 725 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	31
<i>Cyrrix Corp. v. Intel Corp.</i> , 846 F. Supp. 522 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 21, 1994) .....	18
<i>General Electric Co. v. United Technologies Corp.</i> , IPR2016-00531 (Paper 42), slip op. (June 26, 2017) .....	33
<i>Halliburton Energy Servs., Inc. v. M-I LLC</i> , 514 F.3d 1244 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	12
<i>Heidelberger Druckmaschinen AG v. Hantscho Commercial Prods., Inc.</i> , 21 F.3d 1068 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	53
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	52
<i>Interactive Gift Exp., Inc. v. Compuserve Inc.</i> , 256 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	12
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	32
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	31
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Koninklijke Philips N.V.</i> , IPR2018-00185 (Paper 7), slip op. (May 22, 2018) .....	33

*Personal Web Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.*,  
848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....32

*Phillips v. AWH Corp.*,  
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (*en banc*) .....14

*Polaris Industries, Inc. v. Arctic Cat, Inc.*,  
882 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....26

*Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Infobridge Pte. Ltd.*,  
IPR2017-00100 (Paper 30), slip op. (Apr. 23, 2018) .....20

*Securus Technologies, Inc. v. Global Tel\*Link Corp.*,  
701 Fed. Appx. 971 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... 26, 36

*Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.*,  
713 F.2d 1530 (Fed. Cir. 1983) .....52

*TALtech Ltd. v. Esquel Apparel, Inc.*,  
279 Fed. Appx. 974 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....13

*Trivascular, Inc. v. Samuels*,  
812 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....20

*Wi-Lan, Inc. v. Apple, Inc.*,  
811 F.3d 455 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....13

*Z4 Technologies, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.*,  
507 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....15

**Statutory Authorities**

35 U.S.C. § 314.....20

35 U.S.C. § 316.....1, 20

# 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.