

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

FINTIV, INC.,

Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2022-00976
U.S. Patent No. 9,892,386

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	OVERVIEW OF THE '386 Patent	1
III.	The '386 PATENT SPECIFICATION AND CLAIMS	3
	A. Overview Of Monetary Transaction System	3
	B. Architecture Of Monetary Transaction System.....	7
	C. Staged Commitment Process Used By The Monetary Transaction System.....	9
	D. Details Of Business Process Services Component	11
	E. The Claims Of The '386 Patent	13
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	15
	A. “Committing” A Pending Transaction.....	16
	B. “ <i>At Least One Of</i> Executing Financial Transactions, Auditing Financial Transactions, Invoking Third-Party Services, Handling Errors, <i>And</i> Logging Platform Objects” (Claims 1-3)	19
	C. “Auditing Financial Transactions”	21
	D. “Error Handling”	22
	E. “Logging” Platform Objects	23
V.	DESCRIPTION OF DILL.....	24
VI.	THE PETITION HAS NOT MET ITS BURDEN FOR GROUND 1.....	26
	A. Dill Fails To Teach The Deposit Transaction Recited In Claim 1	26
	B. Dill Fails To Teach Or Suggest A Monetary Transaction System That Receives “A Communication Message From The Mobile Device ... Indicating That The Subscriber Desires To Deposit A Specified Amount Of Funds Into The Subscriber’s Account”	30

C.	Dill Fails To Teach The Staged Commitment Process Recited In Claim 1	33
D.	Dill Fails To Teach The Claimed Business Process Services	38
1.	The Petition Fails To Map Dill To Auditing A Financial Transaction	38
2.	The Petition Fails To Map Dill To Handling Errors	40
3.	The Petition Fails To Map Dill To Logging Platform Objects	41
VII.	THE PETITION HAS NOT MET ITS BURDEN FOR GROUND 2.....	43
A.	Dill Fails To Contemplate The Withdrawal Transaction In Claim 2	43
B.	Dill Fails To Teach The Staged Commitment Process In Claims 2-3	44
C.	Dill Fails To Teach The Claimed Business Process Services	44
VIII.	CONCLUSION	45

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Federal Cases

<i>Fintiv, Inc. v. Paypal Holding, Inc.</i> , 6:22-CV-00288-ADA (W.D. Tex. 2022), Dkt. 60	24
<i>Nevro Corp. v. Boston Sci. Corp.</i> , 955 F.3d 35 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	12
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	15
<i>Renishaw Pub. Ltd. Co. v. Marposs Societa' Per Azioni</i> , 158 F.3d 1243 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	15
<i>SuperGuide Corp. v. DirecTV Enters.</i> , 358 F.3d 870 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	19

PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST

Ex. 2001	Declaration of Dr. Michael I. Shamos, Ph.D., dated August 24, 2022
Ex. 2002	First Amended Complaint for Patent Infringement, Dkt. 20, Fintiv, Inc. v. PayPal Holdings, Inc, Civil Action No. 6:22-cv00288-ADA, dated June 24, 2022 (“FAC”)
Ex. 2003	Plaintiff Fintiv, Inc.’s Initial Disclosure of Asserted Claims, Accused Instrumentalities, and Infringement Contentions, dated June 23, 2022 (“Fintiv’s Preliminary Infringement Contentions”)
Ex. 2004	Fintiv’s Preliminary Infringement Chart for U.S. Patent No. 9,892,386 – Exhibit C to Plaintiff Fintiv, Inc.’s Initial Disclosure of Asserted Claims, Accused Instrumentalities, and Infringement Contentions, dated June 23, 2022
Ex. 2005	Resume of Michael Ian Shamos
Ex. 2006	U.S. Court, Statistics and Reports, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Judicial Caseload Profile (March 2022), available at https://www.uscourts.gov/statisticsreports/federal-court-management-statistics-march-2022
Ex. 2007	Joint Motion to Enter Agreed Scheduling Order, Dkt. 28, Fintiv, Inc. v. PayPal Holdings, Inc, Civil Action No. 6:22-cv-00288- ADA, dated August 17, 2022
Ex. 2008	U.S. Patent No. 9,892,386 Claims Appendix
Ex. 2009	Declaration of Dr. Michael I. Shamos, Ph.D., dated February 10, 2023
Ex. 2010	Definition of “commitment”, “rollback” and “transaction” from “ <i>Distributed Transaction Processing: Reference Model, Version 3</i> , United Kingdom, Open Company Ltd, 1996.
Ex. 2011	Definition of auditing from <i>Auditing: Principles and Techniques</i> , Pearson Education, 2006
Ex. 2012	Definition of error handling from Kingsley-Hughes, Adrian, et al., <i>VBScript Programmer’s Reference</i> , United Kingdom, Wiley, 2007

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.