UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC., Petitioner

v.

CPC PATENT TECHNOLOGIES PTY, LTD., Patent Owner

CASE: IPR2022-00600 U.S. PATENT NO. 8,620,039

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

DOCKET A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| I. | Introduction1 | | | | |
|------|--|---|--|--|--|
| II. | '039 Patent Overview | | | | |
| III. | Level of Ordinary Skill | | | | |
| IV. | Clair | Claim Construction | | | |
| | А. | Prean | nble5 | | |
| | В. | "Dep | endent Upon"7 | | |
| V. | THE PRIOR ART FAILS TO RENDER THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OBVIOUS. A. The Prior Art Does Not Teach the "Defining, Dependent Upon the Received Card Information, a Memory Location in a Local Memory External to the Card" Limitation | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | 1. | <i>Bradford</i> in view of <i>Foss</i> Does Not Teach "Defining, Dependent Upon the Received Card Information, a Memory Location" | | |
| | | 2. | <i>Bradford</i> in view of <i>Foss</i> Does Not Teach "Defining, Dependent Upon the Received Card Information, a Memory Location" | | |
| | | 3. | <i>Bradford</i> in view of <i>Foss</i> Does Not Teach "Defining, Dependent Upon the Received Card Information, a Memory Location in a Local Memory External to the Card" | | |
| | | 4. | There is No Motivation to Combine Apple's Cited Prior Art to Arrive at the "Defining, Dependent Upon Received Card Information, a Memory Location" | | |
| | В. | <i>Bradford</i> in view of <i>Foss</i> in further view of <i>Yamane</i> Does Not Teach "Determining if the Defined Memory Location is Unoccupied; and Storing, if the Memory Location is Unoccupied, the Biometric Signature at the Defined Memory Location"19 | | | |
| | | 1. | <i>Bradford</i> in view of <i>Foss</i> in further view of <i>Yamane</i> Does Not Teach "Determining if the Defined Memory Location is Unoccupied" | | |

| | | 2. | <i>Bradford</i> in view of <i>Foss</i> in further view of <i>Yamane</i> Does Not Teach "Storing, if the Memory Location is Unoccupied, the | | |
|-----|-----|------------|--|----|--|
| | | | Biometric Signature at the Defined Memory Location" | | |
| | | 3. | There is No Motivation to Combine Bradford with Yamane | 23 | |
| | C. | Inde | Independent Claims 1 and 192 | | |
| | D. | Dep | endent Claims | 25 | |
| VI. | CON | CONCLUSION | | 26 | |

| Exhibit No. | Description |
|-------------|---|
| 2001 | Declaration of William C. Easttom II (Chuck Easttom) Ph.D., D.Sc. |
| 2002 | CV of Dr. Chuck Easttom |
| 2003 | Rough Deposition Transcript of Dr. Andrew Sears, dated January 13, 2023 |

LIST OF EXHIBITS

I. INTRODUCTION

The limitations of the independent claims of U.S. Patent No. 8,620,039 ("the '039 Patent") describes a method (claim 1) and a processor to execute a method (claim 19) of enrolling users in a biometric card pointer system, the method comprising the steps of receiving card information (representative clause [1a]);¹ receiving a biometric signature (representative clause [1b]); defining, dependent upon the received card information, a memory location in a local memory external to the card (representative clause [1c]); determining if the defined memory location is unoccupied (representative clause [1d]); and storing, if the memory location is unoccupied, the biometric signature at the defined memory location (representative clause [1e]). Apple cobbles together a single, three-reference challenge to the claims of the '039 Patent. Even with these three references in hand, Apple must ignore its own characterization of the prior art and its construction of the subject claims to mount an obviousness challenge.

¹ These clauses refer to the numbering system used by the Board to label the various claim limitations in claim 1 of the '039 Patent. Paper 8 at 7. As the Board noted, the only difference between claim 1 and claim 19 (the only other challenged independent claim) is that the method steps are recited "in the context of 'a processor to execute a method of enrolling in a biometric card pointer system." *Id.*

DOCKET A L A R M



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.