

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.
Petitioner,

v.

UNIVERSAL SECURE REGISTRY LLC
Patent Owner

Case IPR2018-00812
U.S. Patent No. 8,856,539

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	2
II. OVERVIEW OF THE '539 PATENT	7
A. The '539 Patent Specification	7
B. The '539 Patent Claims	12
C. Prosecution History of the '539 Patent	12
III. OVERVIEW OF THE ASSERTED PRIOR ART	13
A. Reber (Ex. 1131)	13
B. Franklin (Ex. 1132)	16
IV. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	17
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	18
A. “The Provider Requesting The Transaction” (Claims 1 And 22)	19
B. “Access Restrictions For The Provider To [Secure Data / At Least One Portion Of Secure Data]” (Claims 1, 22 And 37)	21
C. “Third Party” (All Challenged Claims)	23
VI. STANDARD OF REVIEW	26
VII. THE PETITION FAILS TO PROVE REBER IN VIEW OF FRANKLIN RENDERS THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OBVIOUS	26
A. Reber And Franklin Fail To Disclose That Account Identifying Information Is Not Provided To A Provider	27
1. Reber And Franklin Do Not Disclose Or Render Obvious The No Account Identifying Information Limitations	27
2. The Petition Fails To Prove A POSITA Would Be Motivated To Combine Reber And Franklin—Neither Of Which Discloses The Account Identifying Information Limitations	33
B. Access Restrictions: Reber and Franklin Fail To Disclose Determining Compliance With Any Access Restrictions For The Provider (Limitations 1[d], 22[c][d], and 37[e])	35

1.	Reber And Franklin Do Not Disclose Or Render Obvious The Access Restrictions For The Provider Limitations.....	36
2.	Reber And Franklin Do Not Disclose Or Render Obvious The Determining Compliance With Access Restrictions For The Provider Based On The Indication Of The Provider And The Time-Varying Multicharacter Code Limitations	39
3.	The Petition Fails To Prove A POSITA Would Be Motivated To Combine Reber And Franklin—Neither Of Which Discloses The Access Restrictions Limitations	42
C.	Petitioner Fails To Show That Reber Alone Or In Combination With Franklin Discloses Account Identifying Information Provided To A Third Party To Enable Or Deny The Transaction With The Provider Without Providing The Account Identifying Information To The Provider	45
1.	Reber And Franklin Do Not Disclose Or Render Obvious The Third Party Limitation	45
2.	The Petition Fails To Prove A POSITA Would Be Motivated To Combine Reber And Franklin—Neither Of Which Discloses The Third Party Limitations	48
D.	The Petition Fails To Prove Reber Disclosures That A Secure Registry Receives A Transaction Request That Includes Time- Varying Multicharacter Code And Indication Of A Provider From The Provider Requesting The Transaction.	55
E.	The Petition Fails To Prove Claims 3 and 24 Are Invalid.....	62
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	64

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<u>Cases</u>	
<i>Abiomed, Inc. v. Maquet Cardiovascular, LLC</i> , IPR2017-01204 Paper 8 at 11	55
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	40
<i>Biodelivery Sciences International, Inc. v. Aquetive Therapeutics, Inc.</i> , Case No. IPR2015-00169 (PTAB February 7, 2019) (Paper No. 89).....	35
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	17
<i>Cutsforth Inc. v. MotivePower, Inc.</i> , 636 F. App'x 575 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	40
<i>Facebook, Inc. v. Skky, LLC</i> , Case CBM2016-00091, Paper 12 (PTAB Sept. 28, 2017)	1
<i>Genomics, Inc. v. Bio-Rad Labs., Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00302, (Paper 17) (P.T.A.B. June 15, 2018).....	47
<i>Guinn v. Kopf</i> , 96 F.3d 1419 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	1
<i>HTC Corp., ZTE (USA), Inc.</i> , 877 F.3d at 1368-1369	35
<i>Jackel Int'l Ltd. v. Admar Int'l, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00979 Paper 21	55
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	40
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	50
<i>Merck & Co., Inc. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	24
<i>Metalcraft of Mayville, Inc. v. The Toro Company</i> , 848 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	50

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)19

Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Infobridge Pte. Ltd.,
IPR2017-00100 (Paper 30) (PTAB Apr. 23, 2018)25

In re: Stepan Company,
868 F.3d. 1342 54, 56, 59

Stryker Corp. v. Karl Storz Endoscopy America, Inc.,
IPR2015-00764, (Paper 13), slip47

Toyota Motor Corp. v. Blitzsafe Texas, LLC,
Case No. IPR2016-00422, Paper 12 (PTAB July 6, 2016)26

Trivascular, Inc. v. Samuels,
812 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2016)25

TRW Automotive U.S. LLC v. Magna Electronics, Inc.,
IPR2015-00972, (Paper 9) (P.T.A.B. Sept. 16, 2015) 47, 48

Statutory Authorities

35 U.S.C. § 314(a)25

35 U.S.C. § 316(e)1, 25

Rules and Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)17

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3)–(4)26

MPEP § 2143.I.D.41

Additional Authorities

U.S. Patent No. 5,930,767 1

U.S. Patent No. 6,000,832 1

U.S. Patent No. 7,237,11710

U.S. Patent No. 8,856,539 passim

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.