

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

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

v.

UNIVERSAL SECURE REGISTRY LLC,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2018-01350
U.S. Patent No. 8,856,539

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. OVERVIEW OF THE '539 PATENT	3
A. The '539 Patent Specification	3
B. The '539 Patent Claims	8
C. Prosecution History of the '539 Patent	8
II. OVERVIEW OF THE CITED ART	9
A. Brener (Ex-1005).....	9
B. Weiss (Ex-1006).....	10
C. Desai (Ex-1007)	11
III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.....	11
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	12
A. “Entity”	13
B. “Based at least in part on the indication of the provider and the time-varying multicharacter code of the transaction request”	13
C. “Third party”	16
D. “The Provider Requesting The Transaction” (Claims 1 and 22)	18
V. STANDARD OF REVIEW	21
VI. THE PETITION FAILS TO PROVE BRENER IN VIEW OF WEISS AND DESAI RENDERS THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OBVIOUS.....	22
A. The Petition Has Failed To Prove Brener Discloses Limitation 1.6	22
B. A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Not Combine Brener and Weiss to Obtain a Time-varying Multicharacter Code	25
1. Petitioner’s Proposed Modification to Brener’s PKI-based Authentication Scheme Renders the Combination Unsatisfactory for Its Intended Purpose and/or Changes Brener’s Principle of Operation	27
2. Time-Varying Public-Private Key Pairs Would Render Brener’s Intended Purpose of Recognizing Returning Customers Inoperable.	38

3.	Whether Brener's customer object could have been made time-varying through a smart card or at the user's computer is irrelevant.	40
C.	A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Not Combine Brener and Desai to Obtain "Access Restrictions" (Limitation 1.4).....	42
1.	Petitioner's Proposed Combination is Based on Features of Brener and Desai that Both Teach Away or Contradict the Invention as Claimed	43
2.	A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art at the Time of the Invention Would Not Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success of Implementing Desai's Information Exchange System into Brener's Anonymous Transaction System.....	46
D.	Petitioner Fails to Show Claims 3 and 24 are Obvious.....	49
VII.	STRONG EVIDENCE OF SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS.....	51
A.	Long-felt Need and Failure of Others	51
B.	Commercial Success.....	55
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	57

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page</u>
<u>CASES</u>	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n,</i> 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	51
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co. Ltd.,</i> 816 F.3d 788 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	51
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee,</i> 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016)	12
<i>DyStar Textilfarben GmbH & Co. Deutschland KG v. C.H. Patrick Co.,</i> 464 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	45, 46
<i>Guinn v. Kopf,</i> 96 F.3d 1419 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	1
<i>Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.,</i> 676 F.3d 1080 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	50
<i>Heidelberger Druckmaschinen AG v. Hantscho Commercial Prods., Inc.,</i> 21 F.3d 1068 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	51
<i>In re Gordon,</i> 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	27
<i>In re Ratti,</i> 270 F.2d 810 (CCPA 1959)	27
<i>In re Stepan Co.,</i> 868 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	36, 46
<i>Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.,</i> 512 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	40
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.,</i> 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	36, 46
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.,</i> 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	40
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,</i> 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	40
<i>Merck & Co., Inc. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.,</i> 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	17

<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	1
<i>Plas-Plak Industries, Inc. v. Sulzer Mixpac AG</i> , 600 Fed. Appx. 755 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	27
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Infobridge Pte. Ltd.</i> , IPR2017-00100 (Paper 30) (PTAB Apr. 23, 2018).....	21
<i>Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.</i> , 713 F.3d 1538 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	51
<i>Trivascular, Inc. v. Samuels</i> , 812 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	21

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

35 U.S.C. § 253	1
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	1
35 U.S.C. § 316(e)	1

RULES AND REGULATIONS

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)	12
-----------------------------	----

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.