

**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 SUR-REPLY**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. Apple’s Arguments are Contradicted by Its Own Expert Dr. Sears.....1

**A.** Dr. Sears Conceded That the Challenged Claims Contain a  
    Temporal Requirement.....1

**B.** Dr. Sears Admits That *Bradford* Does Not Teach the Defining  
    Limitation .....3

**C.** Apple’s New Claim Construction Has No Support in the Intrinsic  
    Record and Defies the Basic Rules of Grammar .....5

II. *Bradford* Does Not Teach the “Defining” Limitation.....7

III. Apple’s Combinations Are Illogical.....8

**A.** Proprietary Software on Both Machines .....8

**B.** *Foss* Does Not Cure the Deficiencies of *Bradford* .....10

**C.** *Yamane* Also Fails to Remedy the Deficiencies of *Bradford*.....12

IV. CONCLUSION.....13

### LIST OF EXHIBITS

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
2004	Final Deposition Transcript of Dr. Andrew Sears, dated January 13, 2023

**I. APPLE’S ARGUMENTS ARE CONTRADICTED BY ITS OWN EXPERT DR. SEARS**

Apple’s expert, Dr. Andrew Sears, conceded that the principal reference upon which Apple relies, *Bradford*, lacks the claim limitation “defining, dependent upon the received card information, a memory location.” Paper No. 12 at 8-9, 13-14. Apple attempts to neutralize Dr. Sears’ admission by urging a new construction of this limitation whilst also claiming that CPC has improperly construed this limitation. Not only are Apple’s new arguments and constructions simply wrong, its new construction is improper at this stage of the proceeding. Apple loses on this basis alone.

Apple’s new construction, namely that “defining ... a memory location” means “pointing to” a memory location that has already been created, is precisely the opposite of Dr. Sears’ testimony. Dr. Sears admitted that, according to Claim 1, card information must first be obtained before the memory location is defined. Ex. 2004, 11:2-22. This testimony is consistent with CPC’s construction and is fatal to Apple’s Petition.

**A. Dr. Sears Conceded That the Challenged Claims Contain a Temporal Requirement**

Dr. Sears testified, consistent with CPC’s construction, that the method steps of Claim 1 of the ’039 Patent must be carried out in a specific order – the card information is obtained first, the memory location is defined by the card information

second, and the biometric signature is stored in the defined memory location third. Paper No. 12 at 8 (citing Ex. 2003, 15:21-16:6); *see also* Paper No. 1 at 26 (describing how “a player entry is created in the player ID database” followed by “[t]he casino attendant then provid[ing] the player with the first authenticator”); *see also* Ex. 1001, 12:29-38 (“the method comprising the steps of: [1] receiving card information; ... [2] defining, dependent upon the received card information, a memory location in a local memory external to the card; ... and [3] storing...the biometric signature at the defined memory location”).

Dr. Sears’ admission of the temporal nature of Claim 1 comports with the construction of the challenged claims put forth by Dr. Easttom, CPC’s expert. Dr. Easttom opined that the term “defining” means “setting” or “establishing,” citing to the specification of the ’039 Patent for support. Ex. 2001, ¶41 (*citing* Ex. 1001, 2:64-67, 7:47-49).<sup>1</sup> By first obtaining card data, and then defining the memory location, the memory location cannot already exist, as contemplated by Apple’s new construction. *See* Ex. 2004, 12:17-13:1. Apple’s attempt to twist the meaning of

---

<sup>1</sup> Given Dr. Easttom’s citation to the specification to support his construction, his declaration is distinct from the declaration in *Xerox Corp. v. Bytemark, Inc.*, IPR2022-00624, Ex. 1003, ¶54 (PTAB Aug. 24, 2022), cited by Apple, in which the declarant pointed to nothing.

# 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.