

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

VISA INC. and VISA U.S.A. INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

UNIVERSAL SECURE REGISTRY, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2019-00176
Patent 9,100,826 B2

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

SCANLON, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Granting Motion for Joinder
35 U.S.C §§ 314, 315(c); 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b)

I. INTRODUCTION

Visa Inc. and Visa U.S.A. Inc. (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition (Paper 2, “Pet.”) requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 30, 31, and 34 of U.S. Patent No. 9,100,826 B2 (Ex. 1101, “the ’826 patent”). Petitioner also filed a Motion for Joinder with *Apple Inc. v. Universal Secure Registry, LLC*, Case IPR2018-00813. Paper 3 (“Mot.”). Universal Secure Registry, LLC (“Patent Owner”) did not file a Preliminary Response; nor did Patent Owner file an opposition to the Motion for Joinder. We have authority under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a), which provides that an *inter partes* review may not be instituted “unless . . . there is a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition.”

II. BACKGROUND

A. Related Matters

As required by 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2), each party identifies various judicial or administrative matters that would affect or be affected by a decision in this proceeding. Pet. 3–4; Paper 6, 2 (Patent Owner’s Mandatory Notices).

B. IPR2018-00813

In IPR2018-00813, Apple, Inc., challenged claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 30, 31, and 34 of the ’826 patent, and the Board instituted an *inter partes* review of the challenged claims on the following grounds of unpatentability:

Reference(s)	Basis	Claims Challenged
Jakobsson ¹	§ 102	1, 2, 10, 11, 21, 22, 24, 27, 30, and 31
Jakobsson, Verbauwhede, ² and Maritzen ³	§ 103	7, 14, 26, and 34
Jakobsson and Gullman ⁴	§ 103	8 and 15

Apple, Inc. v. Universal Secure Registry LLC, Case IPR2018-00813, slip op. at 5–6, 21 (PTAB Oct. 9, 2018) (Paper 9) (“Apple Inst.”).

III. *INTER PARTES* REVIEW

The Petition in this proceeding asserts the same single ground of unpatentability as the one on which we instituted review in IPR2018-00813. *Compare* Pet. 20–75, with Apple Inst. 5–6, 21. Indeed, Petitioner states “the Petition is limited to the same grounds proposed in the IPR2018-00813 petition,” and it “relies on the same prior art analysis and identical expert testimony to that submitted by Apple.” Mot. 4. Petitioner also states the “Petition does not raise any new ground that is not raised in the IPR2018-00813 petition.” *Id.* Thus, for the same reasons stated in our Decision on Institution in IPR2018-00813, we determine institution is warranted here. *See generally* Apple Inst.

¹ International Patent Application Publication No. WO 2004/051585 A2, published June 17, 2004 (Ex. 1104).

² International Patent Application Publication No. WO 2005/001751 A1, published January 6, 2005 (Ex. 1107).

³ U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0236632 A1, published November 25, 2004 (Ex. 1105).

⁴ U.S. Patent No. 5,280,527, issued January 18, 1994 (Ex. 1106).

IV. MOTION FOR JOINDER

Having determined that institution is warranted, we consider Petitioner's Motion for Joinder. Section 315(c) provides, in relevant part, that "[i]f the Director institutes an inter partes review, the Director, in his or her discretion, may join as a party to that inter partes review any person who properly files a petition under section 311." When determining whether to grant a motion for joinder, we consider factors such as timing and impact of joinder on the trial schedule, cost, discovery, and potential simplification of briefing. *Kyocera Corp. v. SoftView, LLC*, Case IPR2013-00004, slip op. at 4 (PTAB Apr. 24, 2013) (Paper 15).

The Board instituted an *inter partes* review in IPR2018-00813 on October 9, 2018. Petitioner's Motion for Joinder was filed November 2, 2018. Paper 3. Thus, Petitioner's Motion for Joinder is timely because joinder was requested no later than one month after the date of institution in IPR2018-00813. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b).

The Petition in this case asserts the same unpatentability grounds on which we instituted review in IPR2018-00813. *See* Mot. 4. Petitioner further explains that it relies on the same prior art analysis and expert testimony submitted in IPR2018-00813. *Id.* Thus, the Petition does not present any ground or matter not already at issue in IPR2018-00813, and it will have minimal impact on that proceeding.

If joinder is granted, Petitioner anticipates participating in the proceeding in a limited capacity absent termination of Apple as a party to the proceeding, and it is agreeable to the schedule set forth for IPR2018-00813. *Id.* at 2. Petitioner agrees that it "will not submit any separate filings unless

it disagrees with Apple's position, and in the event of such disagreement, it will request authorization from the Board to submit a short separate filing directed only to points of disagreement with Apple." *Id.* at 6. Because Petitioner relies on the same expert declaration as Apple, no additional depositions will be required. *Id.* at 6–7.

Under these circumstances, we agree with Petitioner that joinder is appropriate and will not unduly impact the ongoing trial in IPR2018-00813. We limit Petitioner's participation in the joined proceeding, such that (1) Apple alone is responsible for all petitioner filings in the joined proceeding until such time that it is no longer an entity in the joined proceeding, and (2) Petitioner is bound by all filings by Apple in the joined proceeding, except for (a) filings regarding termination or settlement and (b) filings where Petitioner receives permission to file an independent paper. Petitioner must obtain prior Board authorization to file any paper or to take any action on its own in the joined proceeding, so long as Apple remains as a non-terminated petitioner in the joined proceeding. This arrangement promotes the just and efficient administration of the ongoing trial in IPR2018-00813 and protects the interests of Apple, as original petitioner in IPR2018-00813, and of Patent Owner.

For the foregoing reasons, and with the limitations discussed above, Petitioner's Motion for Joinder is *granted*.

V. ORDER

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby:

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.