

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

UNIVERSAL SECURE REGISTRY, LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2018-00812 (Patent 8,856,539 B2)  
CBM2018-00024 (Patent 8,577,813 B2)  
CBM2018-00025 (Patent 8,577,813 B2)<sup>1</sup>

---

Before PATRICK R. SCANLON, GEORGIANNA W. BRADEN, and  
JASON W. MELVIN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MELVIN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER  
Conduct of the Proceeding  
37 C.F.R. § 42.5

---

<sup>1</sup> This Decision addresses issues pertaining to multiple proceedings. The Parties are not authorized to use this style heading for any subsequent papers.

IPR2018-00812 (Patent 8,856,539 B2)  
CBM2018-00024 (Patent 8,577,813 B2)  
CBM2018-00025 (Patent 8,577,813 B2)

Patent Owner, Universal Secure Registry, LLC, requested modified briefing page limits for Patent Owner's expected motion to amend. Patent Owner proposes swapping the page limits for its opening brief and reply brief, such that Patent Owner would file a 12-page opening brief and then file a 25-page reply brief following Petitioner's 25-page opposition brief. Patent Owner indicates that Petitioner does not oppose the requested modification. We conclude that the proposal is a reasonable approach to the burden allocation prescribed by *Aqua Products, Inc. v. Matal*, 872 F.3d 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (en banc). Accordingly, we grant Patent Owner's request.

Counsel for each party indicated familiarity with motions to amend. Additional guidance may be found in the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,766–48,767 (Aug. 14, 2012), the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, August 2018 Update (available at <https://go.usa.gov/xPCKP>), our guidance memorandum on motions to amend, titled "Guidance on Motions to Amend in view of *Aqua Products*," dated Nov. 21, 2017 (available at <https://go.usa.gov/xET3C>), and the guidance on motions to amend as set forth in *Western Digital Corp. v. SPEX Techs., Inc.*, Case IPR2018-00082, -00084 (PTAB Apr. 25, 2018) (Paper 13) (available at <https://go.usa.gov/xET32>).

A motion to amend claims may cancel claims and/or propose a reasonable number of substitute claims. 35 U.S.C. § 316(d)(1); 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a)(3). A request to cancel claims will not be treated as contingent, but a request to substitute claims will be treated as contingent, which means a proposed substitute claim will only be considered if the original patent claim it is meant to replace is deemed unpatentable. Proposed substitute claim amendments that result in no more than one substituted claim for each

IPR2018-00812 (Patent 8,856,539 B2)  
CBM2018-00024 (Patent 8,577,813 B2)  
CBM2018-00025 (Patent 8,577,813 B2)

challenged claim are a presumptively reasonable number of substitute claims. 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a)(3) (“A *reasonable number of substitute claims*. A motion to amend may cancel a challenged claim or propose a reasonable number of claims. The presumption is that only one substitute claim would be needed to replace each challenged claim, and it may be rebutted by a demonstration of need.”).

We reminded Patent Owner that any proposed amendments may not enlarge the scope of the claims of the patent or introduce new matter. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 316(d)(3), 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a)(2)(ii). Patent Owner must show written-description support in the original specification for each proposed substitute claim. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(b); *see MLB Advanced Media, L.P. v. Front Row Techs., LLC*, Case IPR2017-01127, slip op. at 2–4 (PTAB Jan. 16, 2018) (Paper 24). Citations should be made to the original disclosure of the as-filed application, rather than to the patent as issued. Patent Owner must show written-description support for the entire proposed substitute claim and not just the features added by amendment. This applies equally to independent and dependent claims, even if the only amendment to the dependent claims is in the identification of the claim from which it depends.

Our rules require a claim listing that reproduces each proposed substitute claim. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(b). Any claim with a changed scope subsequent to the amendment should be included in the claim listing as a proposed substitute claim and should have a new claim number. This includes any dependent claim Patent Owner intends as dependent from a proposed substitute independent claim. For each proposed substitute claim, the motion must clearly show the changes of the proposed substitute claim with respect to the original patent claim that it is intended to replace. No

IPR2018-00812 (Patent 8,856,539 B2)  
CBM2018-00024 (Patent 8,577,813 B2)  
CBM2018-00025 (Patent 8,577,813 B2)

particular form is required, but use of brackets to indicate deleted text and underlining to indicate inserted text is suggested. The required claim list may be contained in an appendix, which does not count toward the page limit for the motion. *See* 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.24(a)(1).

We further reminded the parties that “a motion to amend may be denied where . . . [t]he amendment does not respond to a ground of unpatentability involved in the trial.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a)(2)(i). In considering the motion, we will consider the entirety of the record to determine whether Patent Owner’s amendments respond to the grounds of unpatentability involved in this trial.

#### ORDER

In consideration of the foregoing, it is:

ORDERED that the following page limits apply: Patent Owner’s Motion to Amend, 12 pages; Petitioner’s Opposition to Patent Owner’s Motion to Amend, 25 pages; Patent Owner’s Reply to Petitioner’s Opposition, 25 pages; Petitioner’s Surreply to Patent Owner’s Reply, 12 pages.

FURTHER ORDERED that Patent Owner has satisfied the requirement of conferring with us prior to filing a motion to amend under 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a).

IPR2018-00812 (Patent 8,856,539 B2)  
CBM2018-00024 (Patent 8,577,813 B2)  
CBM2018-00025 (Patent 8,577,813 B2)

PETITIONER:

Monica Grewal  
Ben Fernandez  
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
HALE AND DORR LLP  
monica.grewal@wilmerhale.com  
ben.fernandez@wilmerhale.com

PATENT OWNER:

James M. Glass  
Tigran Guledjian  
Christopher A. Mathews  
Nima Hefazi  
Richard Lowry  
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART  
& SULLIVAN LLP  
jimglass@quinnemanuel.com  
tigranguledjian@quinnemanuel.com  
chrismathews@quinnemanuel.com  
nimahefazi@quinnemanuel.com  
richardlowry@quinnemanuel.com