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

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

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) *Maritzen does not disclose the recited "first authentication information"* 22
(b) *A POSITA would not have combined Maritzen and Jakobsson to arrive at the recited "first authentication information"* 25
2. Petitioner fails to establish authentication of a user based on "authentication information" (limitations 1[a], 10[a]) 36

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

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

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Ameranth, Inc. v. Menusoft Systems Corp.,
2010 WL 1610079 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 21, 2010).....18

Apple Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n,
725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 52

Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co. Ltd.,
816 F.3d 788 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....53

Apple v. Uniloc Luxembourg S.A.,
IPR2018-00420 (Paper 7), slip op. (August 6, 2018).....33

Augme Technologies, Inc. v. Yahoo! Inc.,
755 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014) 13, 15

Cheese Sys. v. Tetra Pak Cheese & Powder Sys.,
725 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 31

Cyrix Corp. v. Intel Corp.,
846 F. Supp. 522 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 21, 1994) 18

General Electric Co. v. United Technologies Corp.,
IPR2016-00531 (Paper 42), slip op. (June 26, 2017) 33

Halliburton Energy Servs., Inc. v. M-I LLC,
514 F.3d 1244 (Fed. Cir. 2008) 12

Heidelberger Druckmaschinen AG v. Hantscho Commercial Prods., Inc.,
21 F.3d 1068 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....53

In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.,
676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 52

Interactive Gift Exp., Inc. v. Compuserve Inc.,
256 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2001) 12

Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.,
688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 32

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....31

Microsoft Corp. v. Koninklijke Philips N.V.,
IPR2018-00185 (Paper 7), slip op. (May 22, 2018) 33

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

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

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.