

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.
Petitioner,

v.

UNIVERSAL SECURE REGISTRY LLC
Patent Owner

Case IPR2018-00813
U.S. Patent No. 9,100,826

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. OVERVIEW OF THE '826 PATENT	8
A. The '826 Patent Specification	8
B. The '826 Patent Claims	11
C. Prosecution History of the '826 Patent	12
III. OVERVIEW OF THE ASSERTED PRIOR ART	12
A. Jakobsson (Ex. 1104)	12
B. Maritzen (Ex. 1105)	13
C. Gullman (Ex. 1106).....	15
D. Verbauwhede (Ex. 1107).....	16
IV. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	17
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	18
A. “Authentication Information”	19
B. “To [...] enable or disable use of the first handheld device based on a result of the comparison”	23
VI. STANDARD OF REVIEW.....	28
VII. PETITIONER FAILS TO PROVE JAKOBSSON DISCLOSES “RETRIEVES OR RECEIVES” SECOND AUTHENTICATION INFORMATION (CLAIMS 1-20).....	28
VIII. PETITIONER FAILS TO PROVE CLAIMS 7, 14, 26 AND 34 ARE INVALID.....	31
A. The Petition Fails To Prove Jakobsson In View Of Maritzen Disclose Enabling Or Disabling.....	31
1. The Petition fails to prove Jakobsson Discloses Enabling Or Disabling.....	32
2. The Petition fails to prove Maritzen Discloses Enabling Or Disabling.....	33
3. The Petition fails to prove a POSITA would combine Jakobsson with Maritzen.....	36

B.	The Petition Fails To Prove A POSITA Would Combine Jakobsson With Verbauwhede	44
1.	The Petition fails to prove Jakobsson Discloses Comparing.....	44
2.	The Petition fails to prove a POSITA would combine Jakobsson with Verbauwhede.....	45
IX.	PETITIONER FAILS TO PROVE CLAIMS 8 AND 15 ARE INVALID.....	49
A.	The Petition Fails To Prove Gullman Discloses Storage For Multiple Distinguishable Users.....	49
B.	The Petition Fails To Prove a POSITA Would Be Motivated To Combine Jakobsson With Gullman.....	51
X.	PETITIONER AND ITS EXPERT FAILED TO CONSIDER THE STRONG EVIDENCE OF SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS.....	55
A.	Long-felt Need and Failure of Others	56
B.	Commercial Success.....	60
XI.	CONCLUSION.....	61

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>Cases</u>	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>Ameranth, Inc. v. Menusoft Systems Corp.</i> , 2010 WL 1610079 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 21, 2010).....	26
<i>Apple Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	56
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co. Ltd.</i> , 816 F.3d 788 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	56
<i>Augme Technologies, Inc. v. Yahoo! Inc.</i> , 755 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	20, 22
<i>Cheese Sys. v. Tetra Pak Cheese & Powder Sys.</i> , 725 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	38
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	55
<i>Cyrix Corp. v. Intel Corp.</i> , 846 F. Supp. 522 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 21, 1994), <i>aff’d</i> , 42 F.3d 1411 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	26
<i>Digital Biometrics, Inc. v. Identix, Inc.</i> , 149 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	20
<i>General Electric Co. v. United Technologies Corp.</i> , IPR2016-00531 (Paper 42) (PTAB June 26, 2017).....	36
<i>Halliburton Energy Servs., Inc. v. M-I LLC</i> , 514 F.3d 1244 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	19
<i>Heidelberger Druckmaschinen AG v. Hantscho Commercial Prods., Inc.</i> , 21 F.3d 1068 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	56
<i>Interactive Gift Exp., Inc. v. Compuserve Inc.</i> , 256 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	20
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	38
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	38

Microsoft Corp. v. Koninklijke Philips N.V.,
IPR2018-00185 (Paper 7) (PTAB May 22, 2018).....37

Nevro Corp. v. Boston Scientific Neuromodulation Corp.,
IPR2018-00143 (Paper 7) (PTAB May 2, 2018).....49

Omega Engineering, Inc. v. Raytek Corp.,
334 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003)19

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005),
cert. denied, 546 U.S. 1170 (2006) (*en banc*)21

Polaris Industries, Inc. v. Arctic Cat, Inc.,
882 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2018)45

In re Rijckaert,
9 F.3d 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993)..... 32, 33, 45

Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Infobridge Pte. Ltd.,
IPR2017-00100 (Paper 30) (PTAB Apr. 23, 2018).....28

*Securus Technologies, Inc. v. Global Tel*Link Corp.*,
701 Fed. Appx. 971 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... 43, 48, 51

Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.,
713 F.2d 1530 (Fed. Cir. 1983)56

TALtech Ltd. v. Esquel Apparel, Inc.,
2008 WL 2165996 (Fed. Cir. May 22, 2008)21

Trivascular, Inc. v. Samuels,
812 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2016)28

Wi-LAN, Inc. v. Apple, Inc.,
811 F.3d 455 (Fed. Cir. 2016)21

Z4 Technologies, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.,
507 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2007)23

ZTE Corp. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.,
IPR2013-00137 (Paper 58) (PTAB July 1, 2014) 33, 45

Statutory Authorities

35 U.S.C. § 314(a)28

35 U.S.C. § 316(e)1, 28

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.