UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

EVDEDIAN DIEODMATION GOLUTIONG

EXPERIAN INFORMATION SOLUTIONS, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

DYNAPASS IP HOLDINGS, LLC

Patent Owner.

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2023-01406

Patent No. 6,993,658

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO THE PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,993,658 PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107

Filed on behalf of Patent Owner by:

John Wittenzellner (Reg. No. 61,662) 1735 Market Street, Suite A #453 Philadelphia, PA 19103

Mark McCarthy (Reg. No. 69,575) 601 Congress Ave., Suite 600 Austin, TX 78701

WILLIAMS SIMONS & LANDIS PLLC



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INT	RODU	CTIC	N	1		
II.	STA	TEME	NT C	OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	3		
III.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT DOES NO ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS OF ANY CHALLENEGED CLAIM.						
	A.	The '6	658 P	atent	4		
	B.	Level	of O	rdinary Skill in the Art	11		
	C.	Claim	Con	struction	11		
	D.			The Combination of <i>Sormunen</i> and <i>Perlman</i> Does Not vious Claims 1-7 of the '658 Patent	12		
		1.	Inde	ependent Claim 1	17		
			i.	[1.c] "receiving a request for a token over the second network"	17		
			ii.	[1.d] "generating a new password based at least upon the token and a passcode"	20		
			iii.	[1.f] "activating access the user account on the first secure computer network"	27		
			iv.	[1.h] "receiving the password from the user via the first secure computer network"	30		
			v.	[1.i] "deactivating access to the user account within a predetermined amount of time after said activating"	31		
		2.	Der	pendent Claims 2-4			
			-				
		3.	Indo	ependent Claim 5	35		



			i. [5.d] "a control module configured to create a new password based at least upon a token and a passcode "	35
			ii. [5.f] "an authentication module configured to receive the password from the user wherein the authentication module activates access to the account in response to the password and deactivates the account within a predetermined amount of time after activating the account"	36
		4.	Dependent Claims 6 and 7	40
IV.			RD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION TO DENY THE	
	A.		Soard Should Exercise Its Discretion to Deny the Petition Under S.C. § 314(a)	
		1.	General Plastic Factor One	44
		2.	General Plastic Factor Two	47
		3.	General Plastic Factor Three	48
		4.	General Plastic Factors Four and Five	49
		5.	General Plastic Factor Six and Seven	50
	В.		Board Should Exercise Its Discretion to Deny the Petition Under S.C. § 325(d)	
		1.	The First Part of the Framework is Satisfied by Every Reference Asserted in the Petition.	52
		2.	The Second Part of the Framework is Satisfied, So Institution Should be Denied.	
V.			ITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE THE BOARD THAVE JURISDICTION OVER EXPIRED PATENTS	
VI.	CON	ICLUS	SION	55



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	
Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH, IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 13, 2020) (precedential)	52
Apple Inc. v. Uniloc 2017 LLC, IPR2020-00854, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 28, 2020) (precedential)	48
Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee, 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016)	43
Ericsson Inc. v. Uniloc 2017, LLC, IPR2019-01550, Paper 8 (Mar. 17, 2020)	5, 46
General Plastic Indus. Co. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha, IPR2016-01357, Paper 19 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 6, 2017) (precedential) pa	assim
In re Ratti, 270 F.2d 810 (CCPA 1959)	26
Meiresonne v. Google, Inc., 849 F.3d 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	25
NetApp Inc. v. Realtime Data LLC, IPR2017- 01195, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 12, 2017)	45
Oil States Energy Servs., LLC v. Greene's Energy Grp., LLC, 138 S. Ct. 1365 (2018)	53
Valve Corp. v. Electronic Scripting Products, Inc., IPR2019-00064, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. May 1, 2019) (precedential)	50
Valve Corporation v. Electronic Scripting Products, Inc., IPR2019-00062, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. April 2, 2019) (precedential)	5, 51
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 314	3, 55
35 U.S.C. § 325	3, 55
Other Authorities	
MPEP § 2143	26
Rules	
37 C F R 8 42 100	39



EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit	Description
2001	Google Patents webpage for U.S. Patent No. 6,993,658,
	https://patents.google.com/patent/US6993658B1/
2002	Claim Construction Order, Dynapass Holdings LLC v. JPMorgan
	Chase & Co., et al., Case No. 2:22-cv-00212-JRG-RSP, Dkt. 120
	(E.D. Tex. Oct. 31, 2023).
2003	Proof of Service of Summons in Civil Action, Dynapass IP
	Holdings LLC v. Experian Information Services, Inc., Case No.
	2:23-cv-00066 (E.D. Tex.).



DOCKET

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.

