

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AMAZON.COM, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

DYNAPASS IP HOLDINGS, LLC,
Patent Owner.

***Inter Partes* Review No. IPR2024-00283
Patent No. 6,993,658**

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

Filed on behalf of Patent Owner by:

John Wittenzellner (Reg. No. 61,662)
1735 Market Street, Suite 125, #453
Philadelphia, PA 19103

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

Michael J. Fagan, Jr.
2633 McKinney Ave., Suite 130
Dallas, TX 75204

WILLIAMS SIMONS & LANDIS PLLC

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	2
II.	STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	3
III.	THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION TO DENY THE PETITION.	4
A.	The Board Should Deny the Petition Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).	4
1.	The First Part of the Framework is Satisfied.	4
2.	The Second Part of the Framework is Also Satisfied.	7
B.	The Board Should Deny the Petition Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).	7
1.	<i>General Plastic</i> Factor One	8
2.	<i>General Plastic</i> Factor Two	10
3.	<i>General Plastic</i> Factor Three	11
4.	<i>General Plastic</i> Factors Four and Five	12
5.	<i>General Plastic</i> Factor Six and Seven	13
IV.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT DOES NOT ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS ON ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM.....	14
A.	The '658 Patent.....	14
B.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	22
C.	Claim Construction.....	22

D. Cited Art23

E. Ground 1 – The Combination of *Veneklase, Jonsson*, and
Sormunen Does Not Render Obvious Dependent Claim 7.....31

1. Independent Claim 531

i. 5[c] “a control module . . . configured to create a new
password based at least upon a token and a passcode” ..31

ii. 5[d] “a communication module configured to transmit
the token to the personal communication device
through the cell phone network”37

iii. 5[e] “an authentication module configured to receive the
password from the user through a secure computer
network”41

iv. 5[f] “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”43

2. Dependent Claim 6.....49

3. Dependent Claim 7.....51

F. Ground 2 – The Combination of *Veneklase, Jonsson, Sormunen*,
and *Kaufman* Does Not Render Obvious Dependent Claim 2.....54

1.	Independent Claim 1	54
2.	Dependent Claim 2.....	55
G.	Ground 3 – The Combination of <i>Kew</i> and <i>Sormunen</i> Does Not Render Obvious Dependent Claim 7.....	58
1.	Independent Claim 5	58
i.	5[c] “a control module . . . configured to create a new password based at least upon a token and a passcode, wherein the token is not known to the user and wherein the passcode is known to the user”	58
ii.	5[f] “wherein the authentication module . . . deactivates the account within a predetermined amount of time after activating the account”	63
2.	Dependent Claim 7.....	65
H.	Ground 4 – The Combination of <i>Kew</i> , <i>Sormunen</i> , and <i>Kaufman</i> Does Not Render Obvious Dependent Claim 2.	69
1.	Independent Claim 1	69
2.	Dependent Claim 2.....	70

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH</i> , IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 13, 2020) (precedential).....	4, 7
<i>Code200, UAB v. Bright Data Ltd.</i> , IPR2022-00861, Paper 18 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 23, 2022) (precedential).....	12
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016)	7
<i>Ericsson Inc. v. Uniloc 2017, LLC</i> , IPR2019-01550, Paper 8 (Mar. 17, 2020).....	8
<i>General Plastic Indus. Co. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , IPR2016-01357, Paper 19 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 6, 2017) (precedential).....	8
<i>In re Ratti</i> , 270 F.2d 810 (CCPA 1959).....	33, 66
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	67
<i>McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc.</i> , 262 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	39
<i>Meiresonne v. Google, Inc.</i> , 849 F.3d 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	56
<i>Valve Corp. v. Electronic Scripting Products, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00064, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. May 1, 2019) (precedential).....	13
<i>Valve Corporation v. Electronic Scripting Products, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00062, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. April 2, 2019) (precedential)	8, 14

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 112.....	31, 54, 58, 69
35 U.S.C. § 314.....	2, 7

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.