

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

PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

Contents

I. Introduction	1
II. Argument.....	1
A. USR’s Proposed Claim Constructions Are Overly Narrow And Contravene BRI.	1
1. “Biometric Information” Is An Example Of “Authentication Information.”	1
2. USR’s Construction For “Enabling Or Disabling” A Device Is Unduly Narrow.....	4
B. USR Fails To Overcome Petitioner’s Showing That Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 21, 22, 24, 27, 30, And 31 Are Anticipated By Jakobsson.	5
1. Jakobsson Discloses A Second Processor Configured To “Receive Or Retrieve” Second Authentication Information.....	5
C. USR Fails To Overcome Petitioner’s Showing That Claims 7, 14, 26, And 34 Are Obvious Over Jakobsson In View of Verbauwheide and Maritzen.	9
1. Jakobsson In View Of Maritzen Discloses “Enabling Or Disabling” A Device.....	9
2. It Would Have Been Obvious To Combine Jakobsson With Maritzen’s Teachings On “Enabling or Disabling” A Device.	10
3. The Superficial Differences Identified By USR Would Not Have Dissuaded A POSITA From Combining Jakobsson With Maritzen.	11
4. Jakobsson In View Of Verbauwheide Discloses Comparing Information To Conduct An Authentication.	15
5. It Would Have Been Obvious To Combine Jakobsson With Verbauwheide.....	17
D. USR Fails To Overcome Petitioner’s Showing That Claims 8 and 15 Are Obvious In View Of Jakobsson And Gullman.....	19
1. Gullman Discloses A First Device Configured To Store Biometric Information For A Second Plurality Of Users.	19
2. It Would Have Been Obvious To Combine Jakobsson With Gullman. ..	20
E. USR Fails To Demonstrate Secondary Considerations Of Non-Obviousness.....	21
III. Conclusion	25

..

I. Introduction

USR's Patent Owner Response ("POR") repeats arguments that the Board already rejected, and fails to rebut Petitioner's showing that the challenged claims are unpatentable. First, USR proposes improperly narrow constructions that not only contravene the broadest reasonable interpretation standard but also are inconsistent with plain meaning and the intrinsic evidence. Second, USR mischaracterizes the express teachings of Jakobsson, Maritzen, and Gullman, and the testimony of Petitioner's expert, Dr. Shoup. Finally, USR fails to demonstrate any secondary considerations of non-obviousness whatsoever.

II. Argument

A. USR's Proposed Claim Constructions Are Overly Narrow And Contravene BRI.

1. "Biometric Information" Is An Example Of "Authentication Information."

Claiming that "biometric information" must be different from "authentication information," as USR does (POR, 19-20), is inconsistent with the intrinsic evidence and the BRI standard. "Authentication information" is a set of

information items that can be used to authenticate a user, and can include pins, passwords, and biometric information.¹ Ex-1118, Shoup-Decl., ¶12.

First, nothing in the claims requires that “authentication information” and “first biometric information” are mutually exclusive.² Ex-1118, Shoup-Decl., ¶13. Moreover, the claims recite two different elements that should not be conflated, as USR does: “authentication information” (with no modifier) and “first authentication information.” These are independent elements with no recited relationship. USR argues that “authentication information” (with no modifier) cannot be biometric information because the claims require determining “first authentication information” from the biometric information. POR, 14. However,

¹ Petitioner notes that Jakobsson discloses authenticating a user based on a PIN, a password, and biometric information, all of which are examples of “authentication information.” Pet., 21; Ex-1104, Jakobsson, [0059] (“a first authentication of user 110 is performed by the user authentication device 120 based on information supplied to the authentication device 120 by the user 110. For example, the information supplied by the user may be a PIN, a password or biometric information”).

² For example, a dependent claim could have read: “wherein the authentication information comprises the first biometric information.”

the claims require that “*first* authentication information” be determined from “biometric information.” They do not require that “authentication information” (with no modifier) be determined from “biometric information.” Because “first authentication information” and “authentication information” (with no modifier) are not related, there is no restriction on the relationship between “authentication information” (with no modifier) and “biometric information.” Ex-1118, Shoup-Decl., ¶14.

The order of the claim steps does not support USR either, as it erroneously suggests. POR, 20-21. For example, system claim 1 only requires a processor that is configured to (a) “authenticate a user of the first handheld device based on authentication information,” and (b) “retrieve or receive first biometric information of the user of the first handheld device.” The claim does not require the processor to perform these steps in any particular sequence. Ex-1118, Shoup-Decl., ¶15.

Moreover, method claims do not require any specific order of operations unless expressly set forth in the claim. *Interactive Gift Exp., Inc. v. Compuserve Inc.*, 256 F.3d 1323, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2001) Here, method claims 10 and 30 do not require any specific sequence because they do not expressly recite one.

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.