

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK
OFFICE

Before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board

Unified Patents Inc., Petitioner,

v.

William Grecia, Patent Owner.

U.S. Patent No. 8,402,555

Filing Date: February 15, 2012

Issue Date: March 19, 2013

Title: Personalized Digital Media Access System (PDMAS)

Preliminary Response by Patent Owner William Grecia

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	3
<i>THE '555 PATENT.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>DEMELLO</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>PESTONI.....</i>	<i>17</i>
ARGUMENT.....	19
I. UPI CANNOT PREVAIL WITH DEMELLO OR PESTONI AS ANTICIPATING REFERENCES BECAUSE NEITHER REFERENCE TEACHES ESTABLISHING A CONNECTION WITH A VERIFIED WEB SERVICE IN THE MANNER CLAIMED IN THE '555 PATENT.	19
<i>A. UPI's arguments are based on a misrepresentation of the claimed function of the "verified web service."</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>B. DeMello and Pestoni would not invalidate even accepting UPI's description of the '555 patent.....</i>	<i>21</i>
1. DeMello lacks an apparatus that connects with a verified web service to complete a verification process.....	21
2. Pestoni lacks a verified web service.....	24
II. UPI IS UNLIKELY TO PREVAIL ON THE ASSERTED OBVIOUSNESS GROUNDS BECAUSE NONE OF THE PROFFERED COMBINATIONS CURE THE FAILURE OF THE PRIOR ART TO ESTABLISH A CONNECTION WITH A VERIFIED WEB SERVICE AS CLAIMED IN THE '555 INVENTION.	25
CONCLUSION	26

Exhibit List

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	2013-02-04 Notice of Allowability (PTOL-37)
2002	U.S. Pub. No. 2011/0288946 to Baiya <i>et al.</i>
2003	U.S. 7,526,650 to Wimmer
2004	IDS and Article (6 of 15) dated Feb. 24, 2012.

INTRODUCTION

William Grecia is the owner and inventor of U.S. Patent No. 8,402,555 (hereinafter, the “‘555 patent”). The Examiner allowed the ‘555 patent claims over two references that, while teaching some steps of the ‘555 claims, did not establish a connection between the apparatus that had received and authenticated a verification token and a database related to a verified web service: “[N]either Baiya nor Wimmer . . . suggests . . . establishing connection with the at least one communications console . . . wherein the API is [related to] a verified web service” (Ex. 2001 (Reasons for Allowance).) The prior art references did not use this API connection “to complete the verification process . . . wherein the electronic identification reference comprises a verified web service account identifier of the first user” (*Id.*)

Mr. Grecia respectfully requests that the Board decline to institute *inter partes* review here for three reasons. *First*, Petitioner Unified Patents Inc. (“UPI”) mischaracterizes the Examiner’s reason for allowance: “[T]he Examiner found no reference where a user’s membership was used to brand digital content so it could be used on multiple devices.” (Petition at 10.) That does not approach an accurate representation of the file history. The ‘555 patent itself identifies prior art that had branded

digital content with membership data: “DRM schemes for e-books include embedding credit card information and other personal information inside the metadata area of a delivered file format and restricting the compatibility of the file with a limited number of reader devices and computer applications.” (Petition Ex. 1001 (‘555 patent) col. 2:18-22.)

Second, because UPI’s primary references (DeMello and Pestoni) lack teaching an apparatus that establishes an API connection between it and a secondary apparatus, UPI cannot present a coherent invalidity theory. For example, UPI argues that DeMello’s bookstore server is the apparatus that authenticates the verification token received from the e-book reader. Then, however, UPI changes to the e-book reader establishing an API connection with the activation server. In short, UPI fails to point to the singular apparatus that “receives,” “authenticates,” “establishes,” “requests,” “receives (a second time),” and then “writes,” as claimed in the ‘555 patent. Instead, UPI points to an incoherent mix of devices, databases, and servers in an attempt to force DeMello and Pestoni into the ‘555 patent’s scope.

Third, even if one gave UPI the ability to simply ignore the order of functions performed by the apparatus of the ‘555 patent, the invalidity

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.