

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

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

v.

UNIVERSAL SECURE REGISTRY, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00813¹
Patent 9,100,826 B2

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

SCANLON, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

JUDGMENT
Final Written Decision
Determining Some Claims Unpatentable
Granting In Part Patent Owner's Motion to Amend
35 U.S.C. § 318(a)
Denying Patent Owner's Motion to Strike
37 C.F.R. § 42.5

¹ Visa Inc. and Visa U.S.A. Inc., which filed a petition in IPR2019-00176, have been joined as parties to this proceeding.

I. INTRODUCTION

Apple Inc. filed a Petition (Paper 3, “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”). Universal Secure Registry, LLC (“Patent Owner”) did not file a Preliminary Response. The Board instituted a trial as to the challenged claims. Paper 9 (“Dec.”).

After institution of trial, Visa Inc. and Visa U.S.A. Inc. filed a petition and a Motion for Joinder to this proceeding. Case IPR2019-00176, Papers 2, 3. We granted the Motion for Joinder, and IPR2019-00176 was joined with this proceeding and dismissed. Paper 33, 5–6. Consequently, Apple Inc., Visa Inc., and Visa U.S.A. Inc. (collectively, “Petitioner”) are joined in this proceeding.

Patent Owner filed a Patent Owner Response (“PO Resp.”) to the Petition. Paper 18. Petitioner filed a Reply (“Reply”) to the Patent Owner Response. Paper 24. Patent Owner filed a Sur-Reply (“Sur-Reply”). Paper 30. In addition, Patent Owner filed a Conditional Motion to Amend (Paper 19, “Mot. Amend”), Petitioner filed an Opposition to Patent Owner’s Conditional Motion to Amend (Paper 25, “Opp. Amend”), Patent Owner filed a Reply to Petitioner’s Opposition (Paper 31, “Reply Amend”), and Petitioner filed a Sur-Reply to Patent Owner’s Reply (Paper 35, “Sur-Reply Amend”). Patent Owner also filed a Motion to Strike (Paper 34), Petitioner filed an Opposition to Patent Owner’s Motion to Strike (Paper 40), and Patent Owner filed a Reply to Petitioner’s Opposition (Paper 42).

Petitioner relies on the Declaration of Dr. Victor Shoup in Support of Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (Ex. 1102), the Declaration of Dr. Victor Shoup in Support of Petitioner’s Reply to Patent Owner’s Response

(Ex. 1118), the Declaration of Dr. Victor Shoup in Support of Petitioner's Opposition to Patent Owner's Conditional Motion to Amend (Ex. 1119), the Declaration of Ari Juels (Ex. 1120), and the Declaration of Dr. James L. Mullins (Ex. 1122) in support of its contentions. Patent Owner relies on the Declaration of Markus Jakobsson in Support of Patent Owner's Response (Ex. 2101), the Declaration of Markus Jakobsson in Support of Patent Owner's Conditional Motion to Amend (Ex. 2111), and the Declaration of Markus Jakobsson in Support of Patent Owner's Reply to Opposition of Conditional Motion to Amend (Ex. 2113) in support of its contentions.

An oral hearing was held on July 16, 2019, and the record contains a transcript of this hearing. Paper 45 ("Tr.").

We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6. This Final Written Decision is issued pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 318(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.73. For the reasons that follow, we determine that Petitioner has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that claims 1, 2, 8, 10, 11, 21, 22, 24, 27, 30, and 31 of the '826 patent are unpatentable, but has not shown by a preponderance of the evidence that claims 7, 14, 15, 26, and 34 are unpatentable. We grant Patent Owner's Motion to Amend with respect to proposed substitute claim 50, but deny Patent Owner's Motion to Amend with respect to proposed substitute claims 36, 37, 45, 46, 56, and 57. We deny Patent Owner's Motion to Strike.

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. 2–4; Paper 7, 2 (Patent Owner’s Updated Mandatory Notices).

B. The ’826 Patent

The ’826 patent, titled “METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR SECURE ACCESS PAYMENT AND IDENTIFICATION,” issued August 4, 2015, with claims 1–35. Ex. 1101, (54), (45), 44:24–48:34. The ’826 patent is directed to a secure database called a “Universal Secure Registry,” which can be used as “a universal identification system” and/or “to selectively provide information about a person to authorized users.” *Id.* at 3:63–67. The ’826 patent states that the USR database is designed to “take the place of multiple conventional forms of identification.” *Id.* at 4:10–12. The ’826 patent further states that various forms of information can be stored in the database to verify a user’s identity and prevent fraud: (1) algorithmically generated codes, such as a time-varying multi-character code or an “uncounterfeitable token,” (2) “secret information” like a PIN or password, and/or (3) a user’s “biometric information,” such as fingerprints, voice prints, an iris or facial scan, DNA analysis, or even a photograph. *See id.* at 13:52–58, 14:5–23, 43:52–59, Fig. 3.

The patent discloses a variety of embodiments including those in which a user is authenticated on a device using secret information (such a PIN code) and biometric information (such as a fingerprint), then the first device transmits information to a second device for further authentication. *See id.* at 28:52–29:7. The second device may verify the user’s information and return an enablement signal to the first device. *Id.* at 32:43–56. Accordingly, the ’826 patent discloses that the system can be used to selectively provide authorized users with access to perform transactions

involving various types of confidential information stored in a secure database. *See, e.g., id.* at 3:63–4:3.

C. Challenged Claims

As noted above, Petitioner challenges claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 30, 31, and 34 of the '826 patent. Claims 1, 10, 21, and 30 are independent. Independent claim 1 is illustrative of the claimed subject matter and is reproduced below:

1. A system for authenticating identities of a plurality of users, the system comprising:

a first handheld device including:

a first processor, the processor programmed to authenticate a user of the first handheld device based on authentication information and to retrieve or receive first biometric information of the user of the first handheld device; and

a first wireless transceiver coupled to the first processor and programmed to transmit via a network a first wireless signal including first authentication information of the user of the first handheld device; and

a second device including:

a second processor;

a second wireless transceiver coupled to the second processor, and

a second memory coupled to the second processor, and

wherein the second device is configured to retrieve or receive respective second authentication information for a first plurality of users, wherein the first plurality of users includes the user of the first handheld device;

wherein the first processor is programmed to determine the first authentication information derived from the first biometric information and to transmit the first authentication

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.