

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

PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction	1
II. Argument.....	1
A. USR Fails To Overcome Petitioner’s Showing That The Challenged Claims Are Obvious.	1
1. The Petition Shows That Reber And Franklin Both Disclose The “Wherein The Account Identifying Information Is Not Provided To The Provider...” Limitation	1
2. The Petition Shows That Reber And Franklin Both Disclose The “Access Restrictions For The Provider To [Secure Data / At Least One Portion of Secure Data].”	6
3. The Petition Shows That Reber And Franklin Both Disclose The “Third Party” Limitation.....	14
4. The Petition Shows That Reber And Franklin Both Disclose The “Receive a Transaction Request” Limitations Of Claims 1 And 22.	19
5. The Petition Shows That Reber And Franklin Both Disclose Claims 3 And 24.	24
III. Conclusion	26
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	31

I. Introduction

Universal Secure Registry LLC's ("USR") Patent Owner's Response ("POR") fails to rebut the obviousness showing set forth regarding U.S. Patent No. 8,856,539 ("539 patent") in Apple's Petition because, where it does not simply repeat arguments that the Board already rejected, it relies on unsupported claim constructions or overly-narrow reads of the claims and the prior art. Because USR's arguments are inconsistent with the factual record, the testimony of both parties' experts, and the law, they should be rejected.

II. Argument

A. USR Fails To Overcome Petitioner's Showing That The Challenged Claims Are Obvious.

1. The Petition Shows That Reber And Franklin Both Disclose The "Wherein The Account Identifying Information Is Not Provided To The Provider...." Limitation

As the Petition demonstrated, Reber and Franklin disclose the "the account identifying information is not provided to the provider" limitations of claims 1, 22, 37, and 38. *See* Pet., 39-42, 60, 69, 71. In response USR merely reiterates its Patent Owner Preliminary Response's ("POPR") argument – already rejected by the Board (DI, 8-10, 17-18) – that the Petition fails to adequately map the limitation. POR, 27-35. Reber and Franklin disclose this limitation because both references teach that account identifying information (such as names, addresses,

and account numbers) should not be provided to the provider when such information is deemed sensitive. Pet., 19-23, 39-42. Ex-1135, Shoup-Decl., ¶18.

a) *USR's Argument Fails to Apply the Broadest Reasonable Interpretation of "Account Identifying Information."*

USR's argument relies on the faulty premise that the challenged claims of the '539 patent exclude any system where a user's name or address is provided to a merchant. POR, 28. But that interpretation improperly narrows the claims and is inconsistent with the specification. **First**, claim 4 of the '539 patent explicitly *requires* the secure registry to transmit address information to the provider. Ex-1101, '539 patent, cl. 4. Thus, at least independent claim 1 must be construed broadly enough to encompass transmission of address information to the provider.¹ Shoup-Decl., ¶19.

Second, USR's position is inconsistent with the '539 specification because the secure registry, in at least some embodiments, must send personal information, such as a user's name or address. For instance, in some embodiments, name and address information is made available publicly or provided along with the

¹ USR's expert has offered no opinion to the contrary. Ex-1137, Jakobsson-Dep., 343:8-17 ("Q. So you do not have an opinion one way or the other whether the '539 patent claims are or are not limited to anonymous systems, correct? A. So as I said, this is not something I believe that I have opined on.").

transaction. *Id.*, 17:34-38 (“[Users] can also indicate whether they wish their name given out in response to such an inquiry....”), 13:66-14:1 (“Having the USR system 10 provide the address ... to the on-line merchant enables the user to purchase items....”), 12:57-62 (“In the embodiment of Fig. 9, the user initiates a purchase and writes a check to the merchant (900). The check may be a conventional check containing identifying information....”). The specification also states that the claimed invention can be used “to identify the person in many situations, and ... take the place of multiple conventional forms of identification” and to “selectively provide personal ... information about a person to authorized users.” *Id.*, 3:5-9, 3:21-24. In other embodiments, personal information is withheld. The '539 patent explains that this is sometimes necessary to prevent fraud. Ex-1101, '539 patent, 3:47-54 (“... Enabling anonymous identification *may* be particularly advantageous in an unsecured environment, such as the Internet, where it has been found to be relatively trivial to intercept such credit card information.”)². As such, the '539 specification is clear that the types of “account identifying information” that are withheld from the provider can vary. Ex-2111, Shoup-Dep., 74:16-78:12; Shoup-Decl., ¶20.

² Emphasis added unless otherwise specified.

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.