

**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 PRELIMINARY RESPONSE  
PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 313 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. OVERVIEW OF THE '539 PATENT .....	6
A. The '539 Patent Specification .....	6
B. The '539 Patent Claims .....	12
C. Prosecution History of the '539 Patent .....	16
III. OVERVIEW OF THE CITED ART .....	18
A. Brener (Ex. 1005).....	18
B. Weiss (Ex. 1006) .....	19
C. Desai (Ex. 1007).....	20
IV. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	21
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	21
A. "Entity" .....	21
B. "Based at least in part on the indication of the provider and the time-varying multicharacter code of the transaction request" .....	22
C. "Provider" .....	25
D. "Access restrictions for the provider" .....	27
VI. THE PETITION FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT ANY CLAIM IS INVALID BASED ON BRENER, WEISS AND DESAI (GROUND 1) .....	29
A. A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Not Combine Brener and Weiss to Obtain a Time-varying Multicharacter Code.....	30
1. A time-varying customer object would defeat a primary objective of Brener that allows a vendor to keep track of returning customers based on the customer object. ....	31
2. A time-varying digital signature renders Brener inoperable.....	34
3. Brener's public key cryptographic system teaches away from the '539 patent's claims. ....	36

- 4. Whether Brener’s customer object could have been made time-varying through a smart card or at the user’s computer is irrelevant. ....37
- B. A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Not Combine Brener and Desai to Obtain “Access Restrictions” .....38
- C. The Petition Has Failed To Prove Brener Discloses Limitation 1.6 .....42
- D. Petitioner Fails to Show that Brener and Desai Disclose “To Store an Appropriate Code With Each Such Portion of Secure Data” .....45
- VII. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 325(D).....46
  - A. The First Four Factors: The Prior Art And Arguments In The Current Petition Are Substantially The Same As Those That The Office Considered During Examination .....48
  - B. Fifth & Sixth Factors: There Is No Reason To Revisit The Office’s Decision During Examination.....50
- VIII. CONCLUSION.....51

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page**

**CASES**

*Becton Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG*,  
IPR2017-01586 (PTAB Dec. 15, 2017) (Paper 8) .....48

*C&D Zodiac, Inc. v. B/E Aerospace, Inc.*,  
IPR2014-00727 (PTAB. Oct. 29, 2014) (Paper 15) .....42

*Canon, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures, LLC*,  
IPR2014-00535 (PTAB Sept. 24, 2014) (Paper 9).....50

*Commvault Systems, Inc. v. Realtime Data LLC*,  
IPR2017-02006 (PTAB Mar. 29, 2018) (Paper 11) .....42

*Conopco, Inc. v. The Procter & Gamble Co.*,  
IPR2014-00507 (PTAB July 7, 2014) (Paper 17) .....51

*Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee*,  
136 S. Ct. 2131, 2142 (2016).....21

*Dorco Co. Ltd. v. Gillette Co., LLC*,  
IPR2017-0500 (PTAB June 21, 2017) (Paper 7) .....50

*Facebook, Inc. v. Skky, Inc.*,  
IPR2017-00691 (PTAB Aug. 2, 2017) (Paper 9).....51

*Google LLC v. Uniloc Lux. S.A.*  
IPR2017-02081 (PTAB Mar. 29, 2018) (Paper 10) .....47

*Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.*,  
815 F.3d 1356, 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....45

*Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.*,  
No. 2015-1693, 2016 WL 2620512 (Fed. Cir. May 9, 2016) .....45

*SAS Inst. Inc. v. Complementsoft, LLC*,  
IPR2013-00581 (Dec. 30, 2013) (Paper 15),  
*reh'g denied*, Paper 17 (Feb. 24, 2014)..... 50-51

*Securus Technologies, Inc. v. Global Tel\*Link Corp.*,  
701 Fed. Appx. 971 (Fed. Cir. July 14, 2017).....40

*Sketchers USA, Inc., v. Adidas, AG.*,  
IPR2017-00322 (PTAB May 30, 2017) (Paper 9) .....46

*Toyota Motor Co., v. Adaptive Headlamp Technologies, Inc.*,  
IPR2016-01740 (PTAB Mar. 10, 2017) (Paper 7) .....47

*W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*,  
721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983),  
*cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 851 (1984).....31

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

35 U.S.C. § 103 .....1  
35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3).....45  
35 U.S.C. § 325(d) ..... *passim*

RULES AND REGULATIONS

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....21

LEGISLATIVE MATERIALS

157 Cong. Rec. S1041–42 (daily ed. Mar. 1, 2011) .....45

# 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.