

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

InAuth, Inc.

Petitioner

v.

mSIGNIA, Inc.

Patent Owner

Case No. Unassigned

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 9,559,852
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.1-9-, 42.100-.123**

Claims 1-25

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED AND THE REASONS THEREFOR (37 C.F.R. §42.22(A))	1
II.	OVERVIEW	1
III.	IDENTIFICATION OF THE CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. §42.104(B)) AND RELIEF REQUESTED	4
A.	Prior Art.....	4
B.	Grounds for Challenge	5
IV.	THE '852 PATENT.....	6
A.	Overview: The '852 Patent Purported Invention Is a Method for Recognizing the Identity of a Computer or User Using Minutia That Is Subject to Change.....	6
B.	Prosecution History: The “Closest” Prior Art Before the Examiner Was Limited to Identity Recognition Systems Using <i>Only Static Minutia</i> , Not Minutia That Is Subject to Change.....	8
V.	SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART: Identity Recognition Systems Using Minutia That Is Subject to Change Were Actually Well-Known and Disclosed in Multiple Reference That Were Not Cited to the Examiner	9
A.	<i>Etchegoyen</i>	9
B.	<i>Varghese</i>	11
VI.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	12
VII.	PROPOSED CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS.....	12
A.	“generating a challenge” (Claims 1, 24, 25)	13
VIII.	GROUND 1: CLAIMS 1-5, 7, 14-21, AND 24-25 ARE ANTICIPATED BY <i>ETCHEGOYEN</i>	14
A.	Independent Claim 1	14

B. Independent Claim 2423

C. Independent Claim 2526

D. Dependent Claim 228

E. Dependent Claim 329

F. Dependent Claims 4-529

G. Dependent Claim 731

H. Dependent Claims 14-1632

I. Dependent Claims 17-1933

J. Dependent Claim 2035

K. Dependent Claim 2136

IX. GROUND 2: CLAIMS 1-5, 7, 14-21, AND 24-25 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF *ETCHEGOYEN*36

X. GROUND 3: DEPENDENT CLAIMS 6 AND 8-12 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF *ETCHEGOYEN* AND *JAKOBSSON*.....38

A. Dependent Claim 639

B. Dependent Claims 8-1242

XI. GROUND 4: DEPENDENT CLAIMS 13, 22, AND 23 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF *ETCHEGOYEN* AND *VARGHESE*45

XII. GROUND 5: CLAIMS 1-23, 25 ARE ANTICIPATED BY *VARGHESE*47

A. Independent Claim 147

B. Independent Claim 2555

C. Dependent Claim 256

D. Dependent Claim 356

E. Dependent Claims 4-6.....57

F. Dependent Claim 7.....59

G. Dependent Claims 8-12.....60

H. Dependent Claims 13, 22, and 2362

I. Dependent Claims 14-16.....64

J. Dependent Claims 17-1965

K. Dependent Claim 20.....68

L. Dependent Claim 2168

XIII. GROUND 6: CLAIM 24 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS IN
VIEW OF *VARGHESE*.....69

XIV. NO OBJECTIVE INDICIA.....70

XV. MANDATORY NOTICES70

A. Real Party-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(1)).....70

B. Related Matters.....71

C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel, and Service Information71

XVI. CERTIFICATION OF GROUNDS FOR STANDING71

XVII. CONCLUSION.....72

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description
IA1001	U.S. Patent No. 9,559,852 to <i>Miller et al.</i>
IA1002	Prosecution File History of U.S. Patent No. 9,559,852
IA1003	Declaration of Professor Patrick Traynor
IA1004	U.S. Patent No. 8,316,421 to <i>Etchegoyen</i>
IA1005	U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2006/0282660 to <i>Varghese et al.</i>
IA1006	U.S. Patent No. 8,312,157 to <i>Jakobsson et al.</i>
IA1007	U.S. Patent No. 6,185,316 to <i>Buffam et al.</i>
IA1008	U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2011/0007177 to <i>Kang et al.</i>
IA1009	Provisional Patent Application No. 61/462,474
IA1010	U.S. Patent No. 9,294,448 to <i>Miller et al.</i>
IA1011	Prosecution File History of U.S. Patent No. 9,294,448
IA1012	U.S. Patent No. 8,817,984 to <i>Miller et al.</i>
IA1013	Prosecution File History of U.S. Patent No. 8,817,984
IA1014	Provisional Patent Application No. 61/252,960 to <i>Etchegoyen</i>
IA1015	Patent Application No. 12/903,948 to <i>Etchegoyen</i>
IA1016	Patent Application No. 12/504,159 to <i>Jakobsson et al.</i>
IA1017	Kohno <i>et al.</i> , “Remote Physical Device Fingerprinting” (Apr. 2005)
IA1018	Pang <i>et al.</i> , “802.11 User Fingerprinting” (2007)
IA1019	“Race Is On To ‘Fingerprint’ Phones, PCs”, WALL STREET JOURNAL (Nov. 30, 2010)
IA1020	Denning & MacDoran, “Location-Based Authentication: Grounding Cyberspace for Better Security” (Feb. 1996)
IA1021	Cortes <i>et al.</i> , “Communities of Interest” (2001)
IA1022	Johansen <i>et al.</i> , “Email Communities of Interest” (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.