

Paper No. _____
Filed: August 12, 2019

Filed on behalf of: Visa Inc. and Visa USA Inc.
By: Matthew A. Argenti
Michael T. Rosato
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
650 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050

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 No. IPR2018-01350
Patent No. 8,856,539

**PETITIONERS' OPPOSITION TO PATENT OWNER'S
CONDITIONAL MOTION TO AMEND**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. PO SEEKS TO DOUBLE THE NUMBER OF SUBSTITUTE CLAIMS AND PRESENTS IRRECONCILABLE CONFLICT WITH A PARALLEL IPR PROCEEDING	1
II. PO IMPROPERLY REINTRODUCES DISCLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER TO AMEND SUBSTITUTE CLAIM 52.....	2
III. PO'S PROPOSED SUBSTITUTE CLAIMS LACK WRITTEN DESCRIPTION SUPPORT	3
A. PO's proposed limitations 39[c], 48[a], 51[d], and 52[pre] lack written description support for a lack of communication between the secure registry system and the entity	3
B. PO's proposed limitations 46[b] and 52[c] lack written description support for an entity having been verified using a biometric.....	5
C. PO's proposed limitations 40[b] and 46[d] lack written description support for mapping the time-varying multicharacter code to an identity of the entity using the time value	7
D. PO's proposed limitation 51[b] lack written description support for a training process involving multiple entities.....	7
IV. THE SUBSTITUTE CLAIMS ARE OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF THE PRIOR ART	8
A. Brener discloses claim limitations 39[b], 46[a], 51[c], and 52[b]	8
B. Brener and Desai disclose claim limitations 39[c], 48[a], 51[d], and 52[pre]	9
C. Desai and Pare disclose claim limitations 39[e] and 47[b].....	10
D. Pare discloses claim limitations 39[h], 46[b], and 52[c].....	11
E. The combination of Brener and Schneier discloses claim limitations 40[b] and 46[c].....	11

F.	The combination of Brener and Schneier discloses claim limitations 40[b] and 46[d].....	13
G.	Brener discloses claim limitation 51[b]	14
H.	Brener discloses claim limitation 52[f] and 52[g]	14
I.	Substitute claim 51 is obvious in view of Brener, Desai, and Weiss	15
J.	Substitute claims 39, 41-45, and 52 are obvious in view of Brener, Desai, Weiss, and Pare	17
K.	Substitute claims 39, 40 and 46-50 are obvious in view of Brener, Desai, Schneier, and Pare	19
V.	THE SUBSTITUTE CLAIMS DO NOT RECITE PATENT-ELIGIBLE SUBJECT MATTER	21
A.	<i>Alice</i> Step 1: The substitute claims are directed to an abstract idea	21
B.	<i>Alice</i> Step 2: The remaining limitations of the substitute claims add nothing inventive to the abstract idea.....	23
VI.	THE PROPOSED SUBSTITUTE CLAIMS ARE INDEFINITE	24
A.	The phrase “for providing information to a provider...without providing account identifying information to the provider” is indefinite.....	24
B.	The added limitations “validate” and “verify” are indefinite	25
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	25
VIII.	APPENDIX – LIST OF EXHIBITS	26

Visa Inc. and Visa U.S.A. Inc., (together, “Petitioner”) hereby oppose Patent Owner Universal Secure Registry LLC’s (“PO”) Conditional Motion to Amend (“CMTA,” Paper 13). PO fails to meet its burden to show that it proposes a reasonable number of substitute claims and that the proposed amendments are supported by the specification, and fails to satisfy its duty of candor in seeking to recapture disclaimed subject matter. Moreover, PO’s amendments do not avoid unpatentability. The substitute claims are obvious, directed to ineligible subject matter, and indefinite.

I. PO SEEKS TO DOUBLE THE NUMBER OF SUBSTITUTE CLAIMS AND PRESENTS IRRECONCILABLE CONFLICT WITH A PARALLEL IPR PROCEEDING

PO’s CMTA proposes an unreasonable number of substitute claims in light of PO’s pending Conditional Motion to Amend in IPR2018-00812, initiated by Apple Inc. (“Apple CMTA,” Paper 21), in which PO requests substitutes for original claims 1-3, 16, 21-24, and 38. PO must limit amendments to “a reasonable number of substitute claims.” 35 U.S.C. §316(d); 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a)(3). Yet PO’s present CMTA requests substitutes for original claims 1-4, 9, 16, 21-25, 31, 37, and 38, resulting in at least two substitute claims for original claims 1-3, 16, 21-24, and 38. Petitioner is prejudiced by PO’s attempt to circumvent this proceeding by requesting amendment of challenged claims in another proceeding in which Petitioner is unable to respond.

PO's CMTA entirely disregards its proposed amendments in the Apple CMTA, failing to explain how the Board can resolve this motion in PO's favor without creating an irreconcilable conflict with the parallel proceeding. If the Board *grants* PO's Apple CMTA prior to a decision on PO's present CMTA, then PO's present CMTA must be denied as moot, and Visa will have had no opportunity to be heard. However, if the Board *denies* PO's Apple CMTA, PO will be precluded from obtaining "a claim that is not patentably distinct." 37 C.F.R. § 42.73(d)(3)(i). PO's motion makes no effort to explain whether the requested amendments are patentably distinct from those sought in the Apple CMTA.

II. PO IMPROPERLY REINTRODUCES DISCLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER TO AMEND SUBSTITUTE CLAIM 52

"[W]here a party assumes a certain position in a legal proceeding, ... he may not thereafter, simply because his interests have changed, assume a contrary position." *New Hampshire v. Maine*, 532 U.S. 742, 749 (2001) (citation omitted). In CBM2018-00023, PO avoided institution by disclaiming claims 5-8, 17-20, and 26-30 of the '539 patent. *Apple Inc. v. USR, LLC*, CBM2018-00023, Paper 10, (Sept. 13, 2018). Yet now PO improperly seeks to reintroduce subject matter plainly directed to covered business methods it disclaimed in CBM2018-00023. PO's substitute limitations 52[f] and 52[g] recite "a public ID code that identifies a *financial account number*" and that can be used "to obtain the *financial account number* associated with the entity." PO also disclaimed a nearly identical "public

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.