

Filed on behalf of Cortex MCP, Inc.
By: Michelle E. Armond
Douglas R. Wilson
Patrick Maloney
Yue Han
ARMOND WILSON LLP
4685 MacArthur Court, Suite 390
Newport Beach, CA 92660
Telephone: (949) 932-0778
Email: ipr@armondwilson.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

VISA INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

CORTEX MCP, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2024-00487
U.S. Patent No. 9,251,531

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	BACKGROUND.....	7
A.	The Problems With Early Mobile Payment Systems.....	7
B.	The '531 Patent.....	8
C.	Cortex And Visa.....	10
D.	File History	11
E.	Osborne (EX1011).....	14
F.	Stafford (EX1012)	18
G.	Purves (EX1013).....	19
III.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.....	20
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	20
V.	GROUND 1-4 BASED ON OSBORNE ARE NOT REASONABLY LIKELY TO PREVAIL	21
A.	The Petition Fails To Establish Osborne Taught Or Suggested Verification By An Issuing Agency (All Claims)	22
1.	Osborne Did Not “Disclose” Verification	22
2.	The Petition Fails To Establish How, Or Demonstrate Any Motivation, To Modify Osborne To Include Verification By An Issuing Agency.....	25
B.	The Petition Cannot Meet Its Burden By Mapping Both The Claimed “Processor” And “Issuing Agency” On The Same Token Server In Osborne (All Claims).....	28

C.	Visa Does Not Meet Its Statutory Mandate By Proffering Grounds 1-4 Based On Claim Constructions It Refuses To Endorse (All Claims)	31
VI.	THE COMBINATION OF STAFFORD AND PURVES IN GROUNDS 5-6 DOES NOT ESTABLISH OBVIOUSNESS.....	33
A.	Stafford Did Not Disclose Verification Of Its Key Signatures	34
B.	Purves Did Not Teach Or Suggest Verification Of A Virtual Representation Of A Credential	36
C.	Visa Does Not Establish A Motivation To Modify Stafford’s Credential Release Platform With Card Images From Purves’ Wallet Enrollment System	39
VII.	INSTITUTION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE VISA’S PETITION IS CUMULATIVE OF ART THE EXAMINER CONSIDERED	40
A.	The Grounds Are Cumulative Over The Art Considered During Prosecution	42
1.	Factors (a)-(b): the “similarities and material differences” and “cumulative nature” of the asserted art and the prior art evaluated during examination	42
2.	Factor (d) the extent of the overlap between the arguments made during examination and the manner in which petitioner relies on the prior art	45
B.	Visa Shows No Material Error By The Office	45
VIII.	VISA NEEDLESSLY FILED TWO PETITIONS CHALLENGING THE SAME PATENT BASED ON THE SAME ART	47
IX.	CONCLUSION	52

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page No(s).
<i>Absolute Dental Servs. v. Watson Guide IP</i> , IPR2023-00177, 2023 WL 5047049 (P.T.A.B. May 4, 2023).....	39
<i>Advanced Bionics v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geräte</i> , IPR2019-01469, 2020 WL 740292 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 13, 2020).....	41, 42, 45, 46, 47
<i>Apple v. Seven Networks</i> , IPR2020-00157, 2020 WL 3249313 (P.T.A.B. June 15, 2020).....	51
<i>Apple v. Speir Techs.</i> , IPR2023-00543, 2023 WL 5153644 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 8, 2023)	48, 50, 51
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	26, 27
<i>Becton, Dickinson v. B. Braun Melsungen</i> , IPR2017-01586, 2017 WL 6405100 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 15, 2017).....	42
<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Grp.</i> , 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	29, 31
<i>BMW of N. Am. v. Stragent</i> , IPR2021-00419, 2021 WL 3039219 (P.T.A.B. July 19, 2021).....	42
<i>Boragen v. Syngenta Participations</i> , IPR2020-00124, 2020 WL 2206972 (P.T.A.B. May 5, 2020).....	46
<i>ByteDance v. Triller</i> , IPR2021-00774, 2021 WL 4864396 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 12, 2021).....	51
<i>Cisco Sys. v. Centripetal Networks</i> , IPR2018-01655, 2019 WL 2004230 (P.T.A.B. May 6, 2019).....	40
<i>Ebates Performance Mktg. v. IBM</i> , IPR2022-00439, 2022 WL 5048425 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 3, 2022).....	33

Visa v. Cortex MCP
Patent No. 9,251,531 – IPR2024-00487

<i>In re Google</i> , 56 F.4th 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2023).....	26
<i>Harmonic v. Avid Tech.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	36
<i>Hologic v. Enzo Life Scis.</i> , IPR2018-00019, 2018 WL 1897623 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 18, 2018).....	32
<i>Johnson & Johnson Surgical Vision v. Alcon</i> , IPR2021-01003, 2021 WL 6338373 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 23, 2021)	20
<i>Kyocera Senco v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 22 F.4th 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2022).....	29, 31
<i>LG Elecs. v. Constellation Designs</i> , IPR2022-01482, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 20, 2023)	36
<i>Litton Indus. v. Solid State Sys.</i> , 755 F.2d 158 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	39
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	31
<i>Metalcraft of Mayville v. Toro Co.</i> , 848 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	25, 27, 28, 39
<i>Microsoft v. Uniloc 2017</i> , IPR2019-01470, 2020 WL 698190 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 11, 2020)	50
<i>Nespresso USA, Inc. v. K-fee Sys. GmbH</i> , IPR2021-01221, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. May 6, 2022).....	46
<i>Novartis v. Genzyme</i> , IPR2023-01045, 2024 WL 186723 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 17, 2024).....	51
<i>Palo Alto Networks v. BT Ams.</i> , IPR2023-00888, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 1, 2024)	25, 28, 39
<i>Realtime Data v. Iancu</i> , 912 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	20, 21

Visa v. Cortex MCP
Patent No. 9,251,531 – IPR2024-00487

<i>Ruiz v. A.B. Chance</i> , 357 F.3d 1270 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	27
<i>Sandoz v. Acerta Pharma</i> , IPR2023-00478, 2023 WL 5167505 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 7, 2023)	41
<i>Virtek Vision Int’l v. Assembly Guidance Sys.</i> , 97 F.4th 882 (Fed. Cir. 2024)	27
<i>Whatfix v. WalkMe</i> , IPR2023-01443, 2024 WL 1199603 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 20, 2024)	49
<i>Xerox v. Bytemark</i> , IPR2022-00624, 2022 WL 3648989 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 24, 2022)	28, 38

OTHER AUTHORITIES

37 C.F.R. § 42.65	28, 38
37 C.F.R. § 42.104	32, 33
35 U.S.C. § 103	39
35 U.S.C. § 312	36
35 U.S.C. § 325	41, 45, 47

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	U.S. Patent No. 9,996,835 to Visa
2002	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2007/0208665 to Ohara (“Ohara”)
2003	U.S. Patent No. 8,540,149 to Chu (“Chu”)
2004	Defendant Visa Inc.’s Invalidity Contentions, <i>Cortex MCP, Inc. v. Visa Inc.</i> , Case No. 5:23-CV-05720 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 15, 2024)
2005	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2009/0307756 to Kang (“Kang”)
2006	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2012/0240204 to Bhatnagar et al., (“Bhatnagar”)
2007	Cortex’s Preliminary Claim Constructions and Extrinsic Evidence (Patent L.R. 4-2), <i>Cortex MCP, Inc. v. Visa Inc.</i> , Case No. 5:23-CV-05720 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 19, 2024)
2008	Visa Inc.’s Preliminary Claim Constructions and Evidence Pursuant to Patent L.R. 4-2, <i>Cortex MCP, Inc. v. Visa Inc.</i> , Case No. 5:23-CV-05720 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 19, 2024)

I. INTRODUCTION

During his many years in electronic payments, inventor Shaunt Sarkissian searched for a way to revolutionize mobile payments and unlock their potential. In 2012, he founded Cortex and devised a new platform that pioneered secure, seamless, and versatile digital transactions. Mr. Sarkissian's invention allowed two parties to conduct transactions with verified user credentials without either sharing their actual credentials or communicating directly with an issuing agency. For example, a customer could buy coffee at her local Starbucks on her phone without providing her actual Wells Fargo credit card number, and neither the customer nor Starbucks would need to contact Wells Fargo to complete the transaction:





Fig. 11

Cortex's '531 Patent

EX1001 at Fig. 11 (annotated).

As shown above, the '531 Patent taught secure verification through an independent database called an “**OVER engine**” separate from the **user**, **merchant**, or **agency** (e.g., Wells Fargo) that issued the credential. This OVER engine generates virtual representations of credentials (rather than the credential itself) which can be used as a secure file format for the safe storage and verification of consumer credentials.

Initially Visa was particularly interested in Mr. Sarkissian's invention and held business meetings in 2013 and 2016 to discuss a potential business relationship and “synergies” with Cortex. Instead of partnering with Cortex, Visa launched the Visa Token Service and later pursued its own U.S. patents on a remarkably similar design to Cortex's platform, complete with an **issuing agency**:



Petitioner Visa's Later Patent

EX2001 (Visa '835 Pat) at Fig. 2 (annotated).

Cortex responded by filing suit, accusing Visa of stealing its patented technologies. Although the district court litigation is well underway, Visa waited until almost the 1-year deadline before filing five separate IPR petitions challenging Cortex's patents based on combinations of the same references: Osborne, Stafford, Purves, and Neafsey. Yet Visa is unwilling to give up any of its options, pressing the identical validity challenges in the district court and offering no *Sotera* stipulation:

5. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2012/0316992 to Timothy W. Osborne (“Osborne”), filed June 7, 2012, and published on December 13, 2012. VISA_00000555.
6. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2009/0271321 to Grant Stafford (“Stafford”), published on October 29, 2009. VISA_00000444.
7. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2013/0054454 to Thomas Purves et al. (“Purves”), filed September 21, 2012, and published on February 28, 2013. VISA_00000679.
8. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2013/0212248 to Jeffrey Scott Neafsey et al. (“Neafsey”), filed February 13, 2013 and published on August 15, 2013. Neafsey claims priority to U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 61/598,219, filed February 13, 2012. VISA_00000425.

EX2004 (Invalidity Contentions) at 3 (annotated).

This Petition challenges Claims 21-33 of the ’531 Patent, and another petition additionally challenges Claims 1-20 on similar grounds. *Compare* Pet. at 9-10 with IPR2024-00486 (“486 IPR”), Paper 2 at 9-11. Visa also challenges other Cortex patents in the same family in parallel IPRs. *See* IPR2024-00488, -00489, -00490. As with Visa’s concurrent challenge to Claims 1-20 in the 486 IPR, Visa’s Petition falls short of establishing a reasonable likelihood that Visa will prevail here. In fact, the Petition’s cited references are no better than what the Examiner identified during prosecution.

During examination, the Examiner thoroughly vetted Cortex’s application by conducting two rounds of searches, issuing two sets of rejections, and engaging in two interviews with Cortex. The Examiner urged Cortex to amend its claims to add a distinction between the “issuing agency” and the “third party” device in Cortex’s

platform. EX1007 at 53. Cortex amended its claims to obtain allowance. The Examiner explained that she allowed the claims because the “closest prior art of record, Ohara and Chu,” did not teach an OVER file with “a virtual representation of the credential that has been verified by an issuing agency.” *Id.* at 20. Indeed, neither Ohara nor Chu show any **issuing agency** at all:

Considered by Examiner




Fig. 1

Ohara
EX2002, Fig. 1 (annotated)





FIG. 1A

Chu
EX2003, Fig. 1A (annotated)

Visa’s Petition fares no better, relying on the Osborne and Stafford references that do not satisfy the claims or teach the same “issuing agency” limitation that the Examiner identified in her Notice of Allowability:

Visa's Petition




Oborne
EX1011, Fig. 4 (annotated)

Stafford
EX1012, Fig. 1 (annotated)

Grounds 1-4 rely on an antiquated mobile wallet patent to Osborne. Not only did Osborne lack any verification of the virtual representation of the credential by an issuing agency, but Osborne's mobile wallet was hardly a secure payment system. Because Osborne was flexible about operating the token server, its system was a fraudster's dream.

Indeed, Osborne sought to address its security shortcomings by contacting consumers, including by a video call, to authorize specific purchases. Osborne apparently did not appreciate that most people would not be quite that enthusiastic about a security-check video call (shown at right) first



thing in the morning before their Starbucks. EX1011 at Fig. 3A (excerpted and annotated).

Stafford is even more far afield. Unlike the '531 Patent that facilitates transactions with parties never exchanging actual credentials, there is no dispute that Stafford expressly “*distributes* sensitive credential information to third parties.” EX1005 ¶143; *see also* Pet. at 5.¹ Unsurprisingly, Stafford lacked any verification by an issuing agency of a virtual representation of a credential. Indeed, following Stafford’s teachings and handing over actual copies of a credit card and driver’s license to Starbucks to get that coffee is also a nonstarter, unless you would like to add inviting identity theft to your usual order.

The Petition fails to meet its burden here. Osborne and Stafford, the primary references that Visa presents, simply retread the same clunky, insecure systems the Examiner already considered the first time around. Trial is not warranted here.

II. BACKGROUND

A. The Problems With Early Mobile Payment Systems

Before the '531 Patent, numerous obstacles hampered the adoption of existing wallet technologies. Despite the rapid growth of smartphones, mobile payments and mobile wallet systems lagged behind. One issue with prior systems was data

¹ All emphasis added unless otherwise noted.

security. Existing payment systems were “highly fragmented and insecure,” creating the threat of stolen payment information, fraud, and identity theft during electronic transactions. EX1001 at 1:25-39.

These systems also failed to gain traction with consumers and merchants because existing payment methods such as credit cards proved ill-suited for storage on mobile devices. For example, early mobile-wallet applications required “secure element chips” to be physically embedded into user devices to ensure the security of the stored data. EX1018 ¶8. Most phones, including iPhones, did not include these chips, *id.*, and hardware manufacturers were not inclined to change their devices to include them. Because these applications required specialized hardware and/or substantial changes in both user and merchant behavior, they proved less user-friendly than the status quo of credit and debit cards. *Id.*

B. The ’531 Patent

Cortex’s ’531 Patent and related patents overcame these problems. The ’531 Patent describes a novel method for storing digital credentials and enabling secure digital transactions on mobile devices while protecting a user’s sensitive information. EX1001 at Abstract, 1:17-19, 3:50-4:6.

Cortex’s new OVER file system involves four primary parties, a **user/client**, an OVER file generation and verification engine (“**OVER engine**”), an **issuing agency**, and a **merchant/third party**:




Fig. 11

EX1001 at Fig. 11 (annotated).

The '531 Patent describes the generation of an electronic representation of a user credential, such as a credit card, that is verifiable through an independent database separate from the agency that issued the credential. *E.g.*, EX1001 at 3:50-57, 11:48-52, 14:12-17. This officially verifiable electronic representation, or OVER file, replaces the sensitive data (*i.e.*, a credit card account number or drivers' license number) in a user credential with a unique secondary credential that contains no such sensitive data. *E.g.*, *id.* at 9:48-53. OVER files can be stored on users' smartphones and scanned by third parties (such as merchants accepting payment) for

seamless transactions because they have been pre-verified by issuing agencies (such as banks or the DMV). *E.g., id.* at 3:59-64, 5:60-66. To increase security, each OVER file is specific to a user's device. *Id.* at 6:62-7:30.

The '531 Patent teaches an initial step where the user requests an OVER file representing the credential from an independent database, the OVER engine. *E.g.,* EX1001 at 4:25-28. The OVER file is verified by the agency that issued the credential and specific to the user's mobile device. *E.g., id.* at Fig. 2, 11:45-52, 6:52-7:20. Later when the user attempts to use the OVER file in a point-of-sale transaction, the verified credential in the OVER file is sent to the OVER engine and obviates the need for users or merchants to communicate with the issuing agency (card issuer or bank). *E.g., id.* at Fig. 3, 8:23-40. Conducting transactions with an OVER file—which has no exploitable meaning or value outside of the OVER file system and separate from the user's device—eliminates the risk of identity theft or fraud in electronic transactions, bolstering trust and heightening security. *E.g., id.* at 7:5-20.

C. Cortex And Visa

Cortex was founded in 2012 by inventor and payment industry veteran Shaunt M. Sarkissian. EX1018 ¶¶1, 11. After Cortex filed the '531 Patent, Visa initially was very interested in Mr. Sarkissian's invention. Cortex met with Visa subsidiary CyberSource Company in July 2013 to discuss a possible business relationship.

Id. ¶10. Under NDA, Cortex gave a detailed presentation of its platform and described the OVER file technology. *Id.* Cortex told CyberSource it had filed the '531 Patent that would be useful for Visa's mobile commerce business. *Id.*

Visa reached out again in 2016 through its head of innovation, seeking more information about Cortex's technologies to explore potential "synergies" between the two companies. EX1018 ¶11. But rather than partnering with Cortex, Visa launched the Visa Token Service and obtained its own U.S. patents on a remarkably similar design to Cortex's platform:




Fig. 11

**Cortex's Patent
'531 Patent, Fig. 11 (annotated)**




FIG. 2

**Visa's Later Patent
EX2001, Fig. 2 (annotated)**

D. File History

After Cortex filed the '531 Patent application, the Examiner issued an office action rejecting all pending claims as obvious over Ohara (EX2002) and U.S. Patent No. 7,290,146 to Ekers. EX1007 at 127-51; *see* Pet. at 4. In response, Cortex amended the claims and requested allowance. EX1007 at 114. During an interview,

the Examiner “communicated that additional searching would be performed.” *Id.*; *see also id.* at 102-03.

The Examiner rejected all pending claims again as obvious over Ohara (EX2002) in view of a different secondary reference Chu (EX2003). EX1007 at 60-91; *see Pet.* at 4. As shown below, the Examiner mapped Ohara’s process server together with the directory service, policy management server, authentication server to the OVER engine, and Ohara’s client to the claimed client. EX1007 at 62-64; *see also id.* at 79-82 (Examiner mapping for application Claim 26 that issued as Claim 21).





Fig. 1

EX2002 (Ohara) at Fig. 1 (annotated). The Examiner relied on Chu to satisfy other limitations, mapping Chu's barcode device to the claimed third-party verifying device and the portable device to the client/user, as shown below. EX1007 at 64-65, 79-82 (Examiner mapping for application Claim 26 that issued as Claim 21).



EX2003 (Chu) at Fig. 1A (annotated).

At another interview, the Examiner suggested adding a limitation specifying the “difference between issuing agency and third party verifying device[] in claim 1 to get rid of any ambiguity.” EX1007 at 53.

Cortex amended the claims again, specifying the “OVER file comprising a virtual representation of the credential that has been verified by an issuing agency to

be an official representation of the credential.” EX1007 at 30, 34-35 (amendment to application Claim 26 that issued as Claim 21).

The Examiner then allowed the claims. EX1007 at 19-21. In her Notice of Allowability, the Examiner provided her reasons for allowance over Ohara and Chu, which she described as “[t]he closest prior art of record”:

Allowable Subject Matter

1. The following is an examiner’s statement of reasons for allowance:

The closest prior art of record, Ohara and Chu does not teach “generating an OVER file comprising a virtual representation of the credential that has been verified by an issuing agency to be an official representation of the credential based on the information associated with the credential of the user”.

Similar reasoning is applied to independent claims 17 & 26.

EX1007 at 20; *see also* Pet. at 4-5, 75-76.

E. Osborne (EX1011)

Grounds 1-4 of the Petition are principally based on U.S. Patent Publication 2012/0316992 to Osborne. Pet. at 14-48.

Osborne described a rudimentary payment system for token-based purchase orders that it called the “PPT.” EX1011 at Abstract, ¶22. As shown in Figure 1A below, Osborne’s “PPT is capable of routing requests” locally so “that the user’s identifying information is not sent abroad unnecessarily.” *Id.* ¶24. Osborne also taught ensuring that payments were processed in “an appropriate locality” if “a

payment request originates from a country (e.g., European Union) requiring that the highest levels of privacy be maintained.” *Id.*





FIGURE 1A

Example: Payment Tokenization

EX1011 at Fig. 1A (annotated).

Osborne taught enrolling in its PPT involved three main entities: a “user” (purple), a “merchant” (orange), and a “token server” (blue), as shown in Figure 4 below:



EX1011 at Fig. 4 (annotated).

Osborne’s Figure 5 below showed the role played by each of them in creating tokens. EX1011 ¶45, Fig. 5. When the user wanted to make a purchase, it “generated [a] purchase order message to the merchant server” who communicated with the “token server” and generated a “tokenization invitation request.” *Id.* ¶45.





FIGURE 5

Example: Token-Based Purchase Enrollment ("TPE") component 500

EX1011 at Fig. 5 (annotated).

As shown at right, Osborne also taught that “the token server may be part of the merchant system (e.g., a merchant process), or part of the payment network (e.g., a pay network server), or an independent server operating in conjunction” with them. EX1011 ¶53, Fig. 4 (excerpted).




Because tokens could be generated by different entities, Osborne taught users being “queried for authentication” of the token. EX1011

¶54. A user would be contacted using “a ‘VerifyChat’ feature for fraud prevention.” *Id.* This involved messaging, “voice chat,” or “video chat.” *Id.* As shown at right, Osborne’s video chat required the user to “present him/her-self via a video chat” so a

“customer service representative” could “manually determine the authenticity of the user.” *Id.* ¶54, Fig. 3A (excerpted and annotated).

F. Stafford (EX1012)

Grounds 5-6 rely on U.S. Patent Publication 2009/0271321 to Stafford. Pet. at 48-75. Unlike the ’531 Patent, there is no dispute that Stafford taught a system for “distribut[ing] sensitive credential information.” Pet. at 5; EX1012 at Abstract. These credentials included an individual’s “credit history, employment history, club memberships, [and] educational history.” EX1012 ¶53. Stafford mentioned



Osborne Fig. 3A

“tokens,” but there’s no dispute that Stafford’s “tokens” are physical devices (USB keys). EX1005 ¶144; *see also* EX1012 ¶96.

First, an individual (or “entity” in Stafford’s parlance) “submits their credential information or documentation to the system.” EX1012 ¶64. The actual credential was stored securely. *Id.* ¶¶67-70. When the individual wanted to release their credentials to a third party, she “logs on to the website and elects to ‘release’ information.” *Id.* ¶74. Sensitive information “can only be released after confirmation by the entity as well as the generation (and purchase) of key signatures” which were “hash value[s].” *Id.* ¶75. Stafford explained these key signatures were single-use “one-time pads.” *Id.*; *see also id.* ¶124 (“Used IdSecPads... are removed from the system after use to prevent signature re-use.”). After the key signatures were purchased and created, Stafford’s system moved the credential to a staging zone for release. *Id.* ¶¶92-93. After the third-party was given a key signature, it could retrieve a copy of the individual’s credential. *Id.* ¶¶115-26.

G. Purves (EX1013)

Grounds 2, 4, 5-6 also rely on U.S. Patent Publication 2013/0054454 to Purves. Pet. at 34-45, 47-75. Purves taught “facilitat[ing] the enrollment of payment accounts in a consumer’s virtual wallet” using what it termed a Wallet Service Enrollment Platform or WSEP. EX1013 at Abstract. Users provided their account information to a wallet service provider for enrollment. *Id.* ¶35, Fig. 20b; *see also*

id. at Fig. 20a, ¶¶102-04. Purves showed credit card images to assist the user in enrolling accounts into Purves’ virtual wallet. *Id.* ¶¶102-04.

III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART

Visa proposes that a person of ordinary skill:

would typically have a bachelor’s degree in computer science, computer engineering, or a related field, with at least two years of work involving electronic payment systems, network authentication systems, or related areas.

Pet. at 9 (citing EX1005 ¶¶89-94).

The Board need not determine the level of ordinary skill in the art to deny institution here. *Johnson & Johnson Surgical Vision v. Alcon*, IPR2021-01003, 2021 WL 6338373, at *4 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 23, 2021). If trial is ordered, Cortex reserves the right to address the level of ordinary skill.

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

The Petition proposed constructions for the terms “OVER file,” “scan,” and “verified by an issuing agency.” Pet. at 11-14. The parties already have exchanged claim constructions in the district court. EX2007-EX2008.

For purposes of denying institution and finding that Visa has not met its burden to show a reasonable likelihood of prevailing, Cortex submits that the Board does not need to construe any terms of the Challenged Claims. *Realtime Data v. Iancu*, 912 F.3d 1368, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2019) (“The Board is required to construe

‘only those terms... that are in controversy, and only to the extent necessary to resolve the controversy.’” (alteration in original) (quoting *Vivid Techs. v. Am. Sci. & Eng’g*, 200 F.3d 795, 803 (Fed. Cir. 1999)). Cortex reserves the right to assert claim construction positions if trial is ordered.

V. GROUNDS 1-4 BASED ON OBOURNE ARE NOT REASONABLY LIKELY TO PREVAIL

As in the sister 486 IPR also challenging the ’531 Patent, Visa again maps Osborne’s token server as “corresponding to the apparatus and processor recited in Claim 21.” Pet. at 3. It also argues Osborne’s token server satisfies all limitations of Claims 21. *See id.* at 16-33. Likewise in this Petition, Visa does not sustain its burden on Grounds 1-4 for any of the following independent reasons:

First, it fails to show that Osborne taught or suggested verification of an issuing agency as required by all Challenged Claims 21-33. Visa points to nothing in Osborne showing the issuer provided any verification of Osborne’s tokens. Its Petition also fails to establish how or why one of skill would modify Osborne to fill in the gap, let alone with a reasonable expectation of success. Its argument that modifying Osborne would be “routine” reeks of hindsight.

Second, lacking verification by an issuing agency, Visa improperly maps the separate claim requirements of a “processor” and “issuing agency” on the same

thing—Oborne’s token server. Because it fails to show that Oborne met these separate requirements, its challenge further fails.

Third, Visa fails to meet its burden to show unpatentability based on a construction of “OVER file” it refuses to endorse.

A. The Petition Fails To Establish Oborne Taught Or Suggested Verification By An Issuing Agency (All Claims)

Challenged Claims 21-33 all require verification by “an issuing agency.” EX1001 at 23:39-43 (Claim 21). Visa asserts “Oborne teaches or at least suggests” verification by an issuing agency. Pet. at 23, 45. Oborne did neither, and Visa simply has not sustained its burden for these grounds.

1. Oborne Did Not “Disclose” Verification

Oborne did not disclose verification by an issuing agency. Visa asserts Oborne’s “token is a virtual representation of a credential” as claimed in the ’531 Patent. Pet. at 22. It argues that Oborne satisfied verification by an issuing agency because “any entity can operate as the token server” so it speculates the “token may be provided by... the agency that issued the credential.” *Id.* at 23-24 (citing EX1011 ¶¶29, 47-48, 53, 58).

This falls short of meeting Visa’s burden. The Petition string-cites five paragraphs from Oborne to claim “the agency that issued the credential” in Oborne provided the token. *See* Pet. at 23-24 (citing EX1011 ¶¶29, 47-48, 53, 58). It then

argues that Osborne taught verification when the issuing agency purportedly “generat[ed] the token and provid[ed] it to the user to represent the credential it has issued.” *Id.* at 24. But none of these five paragraphs show an issuing agency providing tokens, let alone issuer verification as claimed in the ’531 Patent. *See id.* at 23-24 (citing EX1011 ¶¶29, 47-48, 53, 58).


Paragraph 29 provides examples of how “a user may be able to control the attributes of each token” via “a web interface” in Figures 2A-2B. EX1011 ¶29. It says nothing about verification by an issuing agency. *See id.*

Paragraphs 47-48 generally discussed Osborne’s “token server” in Figure 5. EX1011 ¶¶47-48. These paragraphs do not describe an issuing agency (for example, a bank) that issued a credential, but refer instead to the entity that issued the token, explaining: “[f]or example, *the source of the token (e.g., issuer, acquirer, independent token arbitrator)* may first obtain assurance that funds” are available. *Id.* ¶47. This is consistent with Osborne’s other teachings that its “issuer” was the entity that issued the token, not the bank issuing the credential itself. *E.g., id.* ¶25 (“In such implementations, *the issuer of the token* may be the only entity other than the user to know the actual personal and/or financial information of the user.”).

Paragraph 53 says that “[i]n various implementations, the token server may be part of the merchant system” or “part of the payment network” or “an independent server operating in conjunction with the merchant, issuer, acquirer, and payment

network.” EX1011 ¶53. Like the Petition’s other citations, this paragraph simply explains that the “token server may *issue*, e.g., 619, a user issuer query to a database, e.g., token database 606, using the payment token as [a] search term in the query.” *Id.* Osborne’s query was a simple lookup carried out by the token server itself, not any verification by a bank or independent issuing agency. *Id.* Likewise, Osborne taught the token database’s “issuer data response” merely “includ[ed] instructions... on how to proceed with payment processing for the transaction.” *Id.* Payment processing at the back end is distinct from Claim 21’s requirements that an issuing agency verify the virtual representation when it is created. EX1001 at 23:39-43. Whether the token server is run by the merchant system, payment network, or independently, this paragraph says nothing about a bank or independent agency that issued the credential verifying the token. EX1011 ¶53.

Finally, the Petition cites to Osborne’s paragraph 58 description of Figures 6A-6E stating “the pay network server may generate a query, e.g., 635, for issuer server(s) corresponding to the payment token” because “the user’s payment token may be linked to one or more issuer financial institutions” that issued the user’s accounts. EX1011 ¶58. First, this request in Osborne was issued by a “pay network server” 607 in Figure 6C (shown at right), not Osborne’s token server



605 in Figures 6A-6B that the Petition maps to the claimed processor. *Id.* ¶57 (“[T]he token server may provide the token data... to a pay network server...”), Fig. 6C (excerpted). Second, this paragraph just describes a “query”—Oborne never said the issuer servers provided any initial verification of a token, let alone to Oborne’s token server. *See* EX1011 ¶58.

None of these five paragraphs support the Petition’s contention that a bank or issuing agency provided tokens in Oborne, let alone that Oborne “teaches” or renders obvious the verification by an issuing agency required by Claims 21-33. Pet. at 24. The Petition’s theory that Oborne “teaches” verification is plainly unsupported.

2. The Petition Fails To Establish How, Or Demonstrate Any Motivation, To Modify Oborne To Include Verification By An Issuing Agency

Because Oborne never expressly taught verification of Oborne’s tokens by an issuing agency, *supra* § V.A.1, Visa alternately argues that this limitation is obvious over Oborne alone, Pet. at 24. But Visa fails to meet its burden to show either “how or why” one of skill would have modified Oborne to teach this aspect of the claimed invention. *See, e.g., Metalcraft of Mayville v. Toro Co.*, 848 F.3d 1358, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (“Without any explanation as to how or why the references would be combined to arrive at the claimed invention, we are left with only hindsight bias that *KSR* warns against.”); *Palo Alto Networks v. BT Ams.*, IPR2023-00888, Paper 12 at 5-6 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 1, 2024) (Petitioner bears “burden to articulate both a *reason why*

[and] explain[] *how* [the art] would be modified to render the limitation obvious.”
(emphasis in original)).

Because the Petition never establishes that Osborne taught verification by an issuing agency, Visa was required to explain *how* to modify Osborne to supply the claimed verification. Citing only Dr. Shamos, Visa offers only the conclusory assertion that it would be “obvious for an issuer, upon generating the token, to verify” it. Pet. at 24 (citing EX1005 ¶¶240-42). The Petition provides nothing about how issuer verification would work in Osborne, and cannot meet its burden. *See id.*; *In re Google*, 56 F.4th 1363, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2023) (remanding obviousness finding for lacking “any discussion of *how* such a modification would be accomplished” (emphasis in original)). “[R]easoned analysis and evidentiary support” are “especially [important] when dealing with a limitation missing from the prior art references specified.” *Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple*, 832 F.3d 1355, 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2016).

Visa further fails to show *why* one of skill would have been motivated to modify Osborne to include the missing limitation of “a virtual representation of the credential that has been verified by an issuing agency to be an official representation” of the credential. EX1001 at 23:39-43. The Petition offers only the conclusory assertion, without any supporting explanation or citation, that verification was “a routine step.” *See* Pet. at 24 (citing EX1005 ¶¶240-42); EX1005

¶241 (Shamos: “It would be a routine step to verify... the token....”). Just because something is routine, or known, does not meet Visa’s burden to show a motivation to modify Osborne. *Virtek Vision Int’l v. Assembly Guidance Sys.*, 97 F.4th 882, 888 (Fed. Cir. 2024) (reversing obviousness finding: “It does not suffice to simply be known. A reason for combining must exist.”); *Metalcraft*, 848 F.3d at 1367; *Arendi*, 832 F.3d at 1366 (rejecting “conclusory generalizations” to supply “a key limitation of the ’843 patent... missing from the prior art reference”).

Visa also asserts that adding verification “would increase confidence that the token legitimately represented the credential.” Pet. at 24 (citing EX1005 ¶¶240-42); EX1005 ¶241 (same). Dr. Shamos states the obvious: that “forged or altered tokens in the marketplace would create problems.” EX1005 ¶241. Indeed, that is exactly the problem the ’531 Patent sought to address: “Current platforms are insecure and carrying digital credentials increases the risk of identity theft or fraud in transactions. What is needed is [a] secure system” for “generating and *verifying*” credentials. EX1001 at 1:35-45. Visa’s hindsight approach of using the ’531 Patent as a roadmap does not show a motivation to combine. *Ruiz v. A.B. Chance*, 357 F.3d 1270, 1275 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (“This form of hindsight reasoning, using the invention as a roadmap to find its prior art components, would discount the value of combining various existing features or principles in a new way to achieve a new result—often the very definition of invention.”).

Visa’s citations to Dr. Shamos add nothing because he essentially repeats the Petition. *Compare* Pet. at 23-24 with EX1005 ¶¶240-42; *Xerox v. Bytemark*, IPR2022-00624, 2022 WL 3648989, at *6 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 24, 2022) (precedential) (“verbatim” declaration testimony is “entitled to little weight”); 37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a).

Finally, Visa concludes with a two-sentence argument, asserting it would be obvious to modify Osborne “as a matter of course” if Cortex argues “the claim requires that the credential, rather than the token, be verified by the issuer.” Pet. at 24. Cortex has not proffered that, or any, claim construction in this brief. *Supra* § IV. Nor has Visa or Dr. Shamos met their burden to provide a supported explanation of how or why one of skill would modify Osborne to include this feature. *See, e.g., Metalcraft*, 848 F.3d at 1367; *Palo Alto*, IPR2023-00888, Paper 12 at 5-6.

B. The Petition Cannot Meet Its Burden By Mapping Both The Claimed “Processor” And “Issuing Agency” On The Same Token Server In Osborne (All Claims)

Challenged Claims 21-33 separately require a “processor” and an “issuing agency” that verifies “an OVER file comprising a virtual representation of the credential.” EX1001 at 23:28-43. Visa asserts that the “apparatus and processor recited in claim 21” correspond to the “OVER file engine” recited in Claim 1. Pet. at 3. This Petition has the same mapping error identified for Claims 1-20 in Visa’s sister petition in the 486 IPR.

“Where a claim lists elements separately, ‘the clear implication of the claim language’ is that those elements are ‘distinct component[s]’ of the patented invention.” *Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Grp.*, 616 F.3d 1249, 1254 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (alteration in original) (citation omitted); *Kyocera Senco v. Int’l Trade Comm’n*, 22 F.4th 1369, 1382 (Fed. Cir. 2022). Yet the Petition blithely ignores the claim language, improperly mapping both the claimed “processor” and “issuing agency” onto the same token server in Osborne. *See* Pet. at 14-24 (Grounds 1-2), 45-47 (Grounds 3-4).

Processor mapping. The Petition asserts that the “OVER file engine” in Claim 1 “correspond[s] to the apparatus and processor recited in claim 21.” Pet. at 3. Similar to the mapping of Osborne’s token server to the claimed “OVER engine” in Claim 1 challenged in the 486 IPR, this Petition maps Osborne’s token server onto the apparatus and processor limitations in Claim 21. *See, e.g.*, Pet. at 16-17 (limitations 21.1-21.2 mapping Osborne’s “token server” onto processor limitations); *Id.* at 28 (“Osborne thus teaches that the apparatus (token server) receives the recited” request.).

Again and again, the Petition points to Osborne’s “token server” to satisfy Claim 21’s steps:

- “receive... a[] generation request” limitation 21.3: user sending a “token application to the *token server*.” Pet. at 20.

- “generate” limitation 21.4: met by “Oborne[’s]... *token server*” creating “a token data record and associated token.” Pet. at 22.
- “transmit... the OVER file” limitation 21.5: identifying “Fig. 5... step 517,” which is performed by “*Token Server(s)*” in Figure 5. Pet. at 25-26 (reproducing EX1011 at Fig. 5).
- “receive... a verifying request” limitation 21.6: “Oborne thus teaches that the apparatus (*token server*) receives the recited verifying request....” Pet. at 28.
- “verify” limitation 21.7: performed by “*token server*.” Pet. at 29-30.
- “transmit... an authentication message” limitation 21.8: performed by “*token server*.” Pet. at 31; *see also id.* at 32-33.

Issuing agency mapping. Claim 21 requires another entity: “a virtual representation of the credential that has been verified by an *issuing agency* to be an official representation” of the credential. EX1001 at 23:39-43. The Petition tries to gloss over this distinction. Instead of identifying a separate issuing agency to meet the “verified” claim limitation, Visa again points to Osborne’s token server that it already identified as satisfying the “processor” limitations, arguing “the token would be verified by the issuing agency” because “Oborne teaches that any entity can operate as the token server.” Pet. at 23.

The claims requiring the distinct “processor” and “issuing agency” create a presumption that they are distinct components of the invention. *Becton*, 616 F.3d at 1254; *Kyocera*, 22 F.4th at 1382. The Petition never acknowledges, let alone justifies, its mapping of the separately claimed “processor” and “issuing agency” onto the same “token server” in Osborne. Pet. at 23-24. Nor does it attempt to overcome the presumption by pointing to anything in the claims or written description showing the claimed “processor” and “issuing agency” are one and the same. *Kyocera*, 22 F.4th at 1382 (presumption not overcome). Visa admits that the ’531 Patent “involves interactions between three parties.” Pet. at 2. Assigning Osborne’s token server every role in what Visa admits is a multi-actor play does not meet its burden to show unpatentability here.

C. Visa Does Not Meet Its Statutory Mandate By Proffering Grounds 1-4 Based On Claim Constructions It Refuses To Endorse (All Claims)

The Petition does not meet its burden on Grounds 1-4 by proffering claim constructions that neither Visa nor Dr. Shamos assert are correct.

“In an *inter partes* review, the burden of persuasion is on the petitioner to prove unpatentability by a preponderance of the evidence, and that burden never shifts to the patentee.” *In re Magnum Oil Tools*, 829 F.3d 1364, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (cleaned up). Visa must establish “[h]ow the challenged claim is to be

construed” and “[h]ow the construed claim is unpatentable.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3)-(4).

The Petition exclusively asserts unpatentability in Grounds 1-4 based on a construction of “OVER file” as “encompassing a file comprising a token.” Pet. at 12; *see also id.* at 14-15 (applying construction in Ground 1). However, Visa and Dr. Shamos assert this construction is unsupported. *Id.* at 12 (arguing the “’531 patent does not describe that tokens may be either an OVER file or a part of one”); EX1005 ¶101 (Shamos: “The ’531 patent does not discuss tokens or describe that tokens may be either an OVER file or a part of an OVER file...”).

Grounds 1-2 also exclusively rely on a construction of “scan” as “encompassing an NFC interaction.” Pet. at 13-14. Visa again says that this construction is wrong, arguing that the ’531 Patent’s disclosure of NFC “does not specify” it constitutes a scan and asserting the patent describes these disclosures as “alternatives to other embodiments that use scans.” *Id.* at 13. Dr. Shamos follows suit, asserting that the ’531 Patent only teaches “an optical scan” and distinguishes the patent’s teachings on NFC. EX1005 ¶¶104-09. Again, Visa and Dr. Shamos do not present arguments in Grounds 1-2 on a construction of “scan” that they endorse.

Visa cannot demonstrate a reasonable likelihood of success here by proffering claim constructions that it asserts are incorrect. *See, e.g., Hologic v. Enzo Life Scis.*, IPR2018-00019, 2018 WL 1897623, at *3-4 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 18, 2018) (denying

institution: grounds “based on a different construction that Petitioner considers to be erroneous” insufficient under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104); *Ebates Performance Mktg. v. IBM*, IPR2022-00439, 2022 WL 5048425, at *5 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 3, 2022).

VI. THE COMBINATION OF STAFFORD AND PURVES IN GROUNDS 5-6 DOES NOT ESTABLISH OBVIOUSNESS

As with Grounds 1-4, the Stafford grounds also do not satisfy an “OVER file comprising a virtual representation of the credential that has been verified by an issuing agency to be an official representation” of the credential required by all Challenged Claims 21-33. EX1001 at 23:39-43 (independent Claim 21). Visa predicates Grounds 5-6 on its proposed construction of “‘OVER file’... encompassing a file comprising an image of (or associated with) the credential.” Pet. at 12 (adopting this construction for “grounds 5-6”). Even under Visa’s own construction, the combination of Stafford and Purves does not establish unpatentability of any claim.

Despite asserting that both Stafford and Purves “teach[]” this limitation, the Petition fails to meet its burden to show that either one does. Pet. at 58. The Petition points to nothing in Stafford showing verification of the key signature or hash value, which it points to as the claimed “virtual representation of the credential.” It also references card images in Purves’ wallet enrollment system, but the Petition never establishes that Purves’ card images were the claimed OVER file. Unlike the

claimed “OVER file,” the Petition never shows that Purves’ card images were shared with a third-party merchant. Visa also fails to muster a reason to combine Stafford’s credential release platform with Purves’ wallet enrollment system, particularly when Stafford’s key signature hash values were used once and then discarded. Because the combination of Stafford and Purves does not render obvious the claim as a whole, the Petition does not meet its burden.

A. Stafford Did Not Disclose Verification Of Its Key Signatures

The Petition asserts that Stafford expressly taught the claimed “OVER file comprising a virtual representation of the credential that has been verified by an issuing agency.” Pet. at 56-57. Citing three paragraphs in Stafford, Visa argues that “Stafford teaches that its encrypted credentials may be verified by the issuer...” *Id.* at 56 (citing EX1012 ¶¶62, 65, 67).

But that is not what the claims require. Instead, the claims recite verification of an OVER file which comprises “a *virtual representation* of the credential.” EX1001 at 23:39-43 (Claim 21). The Petition asserts that Stafford’s “hash value” was the virtual representation of the credential, yet presents no argument or evidence showing that Stafford’s hash value was verified by an issuing agency. *See* Pet. at 56 (Stafford’s “hash value thus acts as a virtual credential representation of the stored credential...”). The Petition essentially concedes that the hash value was not verified

in Stafford, pivoting in the very next sentence to assert that Stafford’s “encrypted credentials” themselves “may be verified.” *Id.*

Indeed, none of the three paragraphs cited by Visa discuss hash values, let alone show verification of Stafford’s hash value. *See* Pet. at 56 (citing EX1012 ¶¶62, 65, 67).

- Stafford’s paragraph 62 says nothing about hash values, instead discussing Stafford’s “administration sub-system” for scanning or uploading hardcopy credential documents. EX1012 ¶62. Its reference to the subsystem performing “verification” of “stored information” says nothing about hash values or what information is specifically verified. *Id.*
- Paragraph 65 in Stafford generally discusses “verification” including “verification of individual documents.” EX1012 ¶65. This paragraph also never mentions hash values, and Visa concedes it only teaches verifying an actual “credential,” not a virtual representation of the credential. Pet. at 58 (citing EX1012 ¶65).
- Paragraph 67 fares no better with nothing about hash values, instead discussing what happens after a document is “verified as authentic.” EX1012 ¶67.

Visa asserts that Stafford also taught this limitation to the extent that Cortex argues “the credential itself be verified by the issuer.” Pet. at 58. Cortex has not

taken that position in this brief, pointing out that claim construction is not necessary to confirm patentability of all claims. *Supra* § IV.

B. Purves Did Not Teach Or Suggest Verification Of A Virtual Representation Of A Credential

The Petition points to Purves to satisfy this limitation, but Purves also comes up short. Pet. at 56-57.

The Petition claims that Purves “teaches” an OVER file. Pet. at 57. Grounds 5-6 are premised on Visa’s proposed claim construction of “OVER file” as “encompassing a file comprising an image of (or associated with) the credential.” *Id.* at 12 (adopting this “interpretation of ‘OVER file’” for “grounds 5-6”). Purves did not satisfy this requirement even under Visa’s own construction.

Visa solely bears the burden of proof to specifically identify where the art purportedly teaches all limitations of the claimed invention. *Harmonic v. Avid Tech.*, 815 F.3d 1356, 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (Petitioner bears “the burden from the onset to show with particularity why the patent it challenges is unpatentable.”); 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3); *LG Elecs. v. Constellation Designs*, IPR2022-01482, Paper 8 at 14 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 20, 2023) (denying institution because “the Petition does not sufficiently identify how [the reference] teaches the ‘optimized’ limitation in the independent claims”). Yet the Petition identifies nothing in Purves purportedly satisfying the “OVER file” claim limitation. *See* Pet. at 57. Instead, Visa argues that


Purves taught a user device being “sent an image of a credential such as a credit card, to conveniently represent a real credential.” *Id.*

Even under Visa’s construction, Purves’ card image cannot satisfy the claimed “OVER file” because Purves only taught using card images to assist a consumer in enrolling or using a virtual wallet. All challenged claims have other requirements for the OVER file, including receiving a third-party “verifying request” based on a “scan associated with the OVER file.” EX1001 at 23:47-51 (Claim 21). The Petition points to nothing in Purves showing that its credit card images were used for that.

The Petition cites seven paragraphs from Purves, but none of those showed Purves’ card images satisfying the claim requirements of an OVER file. Pet. at 57 (citing EX1013 ¶¶85, 102, 108-09, 111-12, 122). Instead, the card images were merely shown to a consumer to assist in enrolling in, or using, a virtual wallet. *See id.* Paragraph 102 simply discusses a “window 2001 for linking payment accounts to a virtual wallet.” EX1013 ¶102. As shown below, unlike the ’531 Patent which sought to protect the actual credential, Purves taught sending the actual credit card account number(s) to the virtual wallet:

Visa v. Cortex MCP
Patent No. 9,251,531 – IPR2024-00487

```
Host: www.merchant.com
Content-Type: Application/XML
Content-Length: 667
<?XML version = "1.0" encoding = "UTF-8"?>
<reference_creation_request>
  <timestamp>2013-02-22 15:22:43</timestamp>
  <user_details>
    <user_name>JDoe@gmail.com</user_name>
    <password>Tomcat123</password>
  </user_details>
  <new_reference>
    <refname>New Business Card</refname>
    <type>reference_payment</type>
    <card_num>1234123412341234</card_num>
    <contract_trms>234.99,immediate|40.00,permonth</contract_trms>
  </new_reference>
</reference_creation_request>
```



EX1013 ¶¶99 (excerpted and annotated); *see also id.* ¶¶102.

Paragraph 108 provided more description, with paragraphs 109 and 111-12 referencing embodiments where Purves “retrieve[d] an image for the card” to assist the consumer with enrolling in a virtual wallet. EX1013 ¶¶108-09, 111-12. Paragraph 85 discussed the “control panel” which “may display an image of the card” but never taught that the card image is shared with anyone except the customer. *Id.* ¶85.

Visa again cites to Dr. Shamos’ declaration, Pet. at 57 (citing EX1005 ¶366), but he offers nothing more. His testimony should be given no weight because he merely repeats Visa’s attorney argument without any further explanation or evidence. *Compare* EX1005 ¶366 with Pet. at 57; *Xerox*, 2022 WL 3648989, at *6 (“conclusory and unsupported” declaration testimony “is entitled to little weight”); 37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a).

C. Visa Does Not Establish A Motivation To Modify Stafford's Credential Release Platform With Card Images From Purves' Wallet Enrollment System

As explained, neither Stafford nor Purves taught an “OVER file comprising a virtual representation of the credential that has been verified by an issuing agency.” *Supra* § VI.A-B. Because this limitation is not taught or suggested by the combination of Stafford and Purves, Petitioner has failed to show “the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious.” 35 U.S.C. § 103; *Litton Indus. v. Solid State Sys.*, 755 F.2d 158, 164 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (“It is elementary that the claimed invention must be considered as a *whole* in deciding the question of obviousness.” (emphasis in original)); *Absolute Dental Servs. v. Watson Guide IP*, IPR2023-00177, 2023 WL 5047049, at *4 (P.T.A.B. May 4, 2023) (citing *Litton*, 755 F.2d at 164).

Because the Petition again fails to show how or why one of skill would have modified Stafford and Purves to supply the missing limitation, it also fails to meet its burden as to Grounds 5-6. *See, e.g., Metalcraft*, 848 F.3d at 1367; *Palo Alto*, IPR2023-00888, Paper 12 at 5-6.

Visa argues it would have been obvious to use Purves’ “images representing a credential” in Stafford “to remind users which credential the key signature represents” and allow “quick selection” among them. Pet. at 57. This purported combination is nonsensical. Purves taught a virtual wallet containing different

payment methods that could be selected among. EX1013 ¶85. The Petition has not shown that Stafford’s one-time key signatures also worked that way.

Instead, Stafford only created the key signatures *after* the user had “select[ed] files or information for release” and “determin[ed] who pays for the service,” either the user or recipient. EX1012 ¶84, Fig. 2. Stafford’s key signatures were single-use, with a paid “one time pad” used to release information to a specific recipient. *Id.* ¶88 (“For sensitive files, a highly secure symmetric or similar encryption process e.g. *a one time pad*, is used...”); *see also id.* ¶¶93, 95. Because the Petition has not established that Stafford used its key signatures repeatedly, Visa’s statement that it would ease selection of a key signature that is never reused withstands no scrutiny.

Because Visa never establishes that Stafford’s system ever selected between its one-time-use key signatures, it fails to show any motivation to combine it with Purves. *Cisco Sys. v. Centripetal Networks*, IPR2018-01655, 2019 WL 2004230, at *8 (P.T.A.B. May 6, 2019) (rejecting motivation when “it is unclear why or how” the proposed benefit “would be useful or advantageous”).

The Petition fails to meet its burden for Grounds 5-6.

VII. INSTITUTION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE VISA’S PETITION IS CUMULATIVE OF ART THE EXAMINER CONSIDERED

The Petition should be discretionarily denied because it provides nothing beyond the art already considered by the Examiner during multiple rounds of prior

art searching and rejections. At the end of this process, the Examiner correctly concluded that the “closest prior art” did not include the claimed “virtual representation of the credential that has been verified by an issuing agency....” EX1007 at 20.

The Petition presents nothing contradicting the Examiner’s finding. Visa’s references also fail to render obvious the ’531 Patent, including because they do not teach or suggest verification of the “virtual representation” of a credential by an issuing agency. *Supra* §§ V.A, VI.A-VI.B. Contrary to Visa’s cursory argument, Pet. at 75-76, because the Osborne and Stafford grounds are merely cumulative of what the Examiner already considered, the Board should exercise its discretion to deny institution, *see, e.g., Sandoz v. Acerta Pharma*, IPR2023-00478, 2023 WL 5167505, at *6 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 7, 2023) (denying institution under *Advanced Bionics* and finding the petition reference “cumulative to the teaching in Smyth and Evarts relied on by the Examiner” during prosecution).

In determining whether it should decline institution under Section 325(d), the Board applies a two-part framework: (1) “whether the same or substantially the same art previously was presented to the Office,” and (2) “whether the petitioner has demonstrated that the Office erred in a manner material to the patentability of challenged claims.” *Advanced Bionics v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geräte*, IPR2019-01469, 2020 WL 740292, at *3 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 13, 2020) (precedential).

A. The Grounds Are Cumulative Over The Art Considered During Prosecution

In the first part of *Advanced Bionics*, the Board considers “the similarities and material differences between the asserted art and the prior art involved during examination, the cumulative nature of the art, and the overlap of the arguments presented.” *BMW of N. Am. v. Stragent*, IPR2021-00419, 2021 WL 3039219, at *5 (P.T.A.B. July 19, 2021) (citing *Advanced Bionics*, 2020 WL 740292, at *4). In doing so, the Board has found *Becton Dickinson* factors (a), (b), and (d) useful. *Advanced Bionics*, 2020 WL 740292, at *4 (citing *Becton, Dickinson v. B. Braun Melsungen*, IPR2017-01586, 2017 WL 6405100, at *6 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 15, 2017) (precedential)). Each of the *Becton Dickinson* factors demonstrate that Visa’s grounds are cumulative over the art already considered by the Office.

1. Factors (a)-(b): the “similarities and material differences” and “cumulative nature” of the asserted art and the prior art evaluated during examination

Visa relies on art that is both materially similar and cumulative of the art already considered during prosecution. Visa tries to side-step *Advanced Bionics* by asserting that the Petition’s references were not “raised during prosecution.” Pet. at 4. Visa carefully omits that the Petition’s art is no better than what the Examiner already considered. Like the Examiner’s cited art, none of the Petition’s references disclose including an “issuing agency” to verify a “virtual representation.”

Visa acknowledges that “the Examiner allowed the claims on the basis that no asserted prior art taught... a ‘virtual representation of the credential that has been verified by an issuing agency to be an official representation’ based on information associated with the credential.” Pet. at 75-76 (citing EX1007 at 20). Yet Visa’s Petition does not disclose that limitation either.

As explained, none of its Osborne or Stafford grounds teach verification of a “virtual representation” of a credential by an issuing agency. *Supra* §§ V.A, VI.A-B. That is the same deficiency that the Examiner found in the Ohara and Chu references she identified after multiple rounds of searching. EX1007 at 20; *see also id.* at 114, 93-99, 152-57.

As shown below, *none* of the references cited in either the file history or Visa’s petition taught an **issuing agency** that provided verification as claimed in the ’531 Patent.

References Considered by Examiner




Fig. 1

Ohara

EX2002, Fig. 1 (annotated)




FIG.1A

Chu

EX2003, Fig. 1A (annotated)

References In Visa's Petition




FIGURE 4

Oborne

EX1011, Fig. 4 (annotated)




FIGURE 1

Stafford

EX1012, Fig. 1 (annotated)

Because the Petition's references are merely cumulative of what the Examiner already considered, undertaking another trial based on cumulative art is unwarranted here.

2. Factor (d) the extent of the overlap between the arguments made during examination and the manner in which petitioner relies on the prior art

The Examiner found that the claims were allowable because the prior art did not teach “generating an OVER file comprising a virtual representation of the credential that has been verified by an issuing agency to be an official representation of the credential...” EX1007 at 20. The Petition does not fill in the gap or present any new reference that shows this claimed feature. *Supra* §§ V.A, VI.A-B. Because Visa’s arguments overlap with the disclosure of the references already considered during prosecution, this further supports discretionary denial under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).

B. Visa Shows No Material Error By The Office

Under part two of *Advanced Bionics*, Visa has the burden “to make a showing of material error” in the Petition; otherwise, “the Director generally will exercise discretion not to institute *inter partes* review.” 2020 WL 740292, at *3. The Petition’s single sentence on material error does not seriously argue that the Examiner improperly allowed the claims. *See* Pet. at 75-76.

Visa knows exactly why the Examiner allowed the claims. In fact, it quotes the Notice of Allowability in its Petition. Pet. at 4-5, 76 (quoting EX1007 at 20). Despite acknowledging the Examiner’s own statement that the “closest prior art” lacked a “virtual representation of the credential that has been verified by an issuing

agency to be an official representation of the credential,” EX1007 at 20, Visa’s petition presents no art that teaches or suggests the invention of the ’531 Patent, including this very claim limitation. *Supra* §§ V.A, VI.A-B.

Instead, Visa offers only a single sentence asserting that the Examiner’s “allowance constituted material error” based on “the discussion in the grounds” of its Petition. Pet. at 76. Its sentence is facially inadequate: “[t]o the extent Petitioner argues that its discussion of the grounds itself demonstrated error by the Office, ... we find that argument insufficient to establish reversible error” under *Advanced Bionics. Nespresso USA, Inc. v. K-fee Sys. GmbH*, IPR2021-01221, Paper 11 at 22 (P.T.A.B. May 6, 2022).

Merely disagreeing with the Examiner’s allowance is also insufficient to establish material error. “If reasonable minds can disagree regarding the purported treatment of the art or arguments, it cannot be said that the Office erred in a manner material to patentability.” *Advanced Bionics*, 2020 WL 740292, at *3. Instead, Visa must go much further to show the Examiner erred so significantly it “rises to the level of a clear and material error about which reasonable minds could not disagree.” *Boragen v. Syngenta Participations*, IPR2020-00124, 2020 WL 2206972, at *13 (P.T.A.B. May 5, 2020). It hasn’t.

Recognizing the Examiner allowed the claims for a specific reason and then filing a Petition that presents no art contradicting the Examiner’s finding only

confirms that the Examiner got it right the first time. *See, e.g., Advanced Bionics*, 2020 WL 740292, at *3 (“At bottom, this framework reflects a commitment to defer to previous Office evaluations of the evidence of record unless material error is shown.”).

Because the Petition presents references that are cumulative of the art the Examiner already considered, the Board should exercise its discretion under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) to deny trial here.

VIII. VISA NEEDLESSLY FILED TWO PETITIONS CHALLENGING THE SAME PATENT BASED ON THE SAME ART

Board rules provide that “one petition should be sufficient to challenge the claims of a patent in most situations” because multiple petitions “may place a substantial and unnecessary burden on the Board and the patent owner.” Consolidated Trial Practice Guide at 59 (Nov. 2019) (“CTPG”) (citing 35 U.S.C. § 316(b)).

Here Visa unnecessarily places a “substantial and unnecessary burden on the Board” and Cortex, *see* CTPG at 59, by simultaneously filing two petitions (IPR2024-00486 and IPR2024-00487) asserting unpatentability of the same ’531 Patent. There is no dispute that Visa “presents two petitions, each of which applies the same core prior art references” and “grounds,” Paper 3 at 1, as is evident from a simple comparison of both petitions (shown below):

Visa v. Cortex MCP
Patent No. 9,251,531 – IPR2024-00487

Description	Grounds	Description
35 U.S.C. §103: obvious over Osborne ¹	1	35 U.S.C. §103: obvious over Osborne ¹
35 U.S.C. §103: obvious over Osborne and Purves ²	2	35 U.S.C. §103: obvious over Osborne and Purves ²
35 U.S.C. §103: obvious over Osborne and Neafsey ³	3	35 U.S.C. §103: obvious over Osborne and Neafsey ³
35 U.S.C. §103: obvious over Osborne, Neafsey, and Purves	4	35 U.S.C. §103: obvious over Osborne, Neafsey, and Purves
35 U.S.C. §103: obvious over Stafford ⁴ and Purves	5	35 U.S.C. §103: obvious over Stafford ⁴ and Purves
35 U.S.C. §103: obvious over Stafford, Purves, and Neafsey	6	35 U.S.C. §103: obvious over Stafford, Purves, and Neafsey

IPR2024-00486
challenging claims 1-20

IPR2024-00487
challenging claims 21-33

Compare Pet. at 9-10 *with* IPR2024-00486 (486 IPR), Paper 2 at 10-11 (both excerpted and annotated). This “high degree of overlap between the grounds in each petition” relying on the combination of the same references merits denial. *See, e.g., Apple v. Speir Techs.*, IPR2023-00543, 2023 WL 5153644, at *4 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 8, 2023) (denying institution).

Visa’s argument that its twin petitions “present materially different challenges” does not withstand scrutiny. Paper 3 at 1. Visa requests consideration of its second petition for three reasons: (1) “the word count limit for petitions,” (2) “the number of claims,” and (3) “to address each challenged claim in sufficient detail.” *Id.* at 2. None of these have merit.

First, the Board’s word count is not a basis to avoid the one-petition presumption. *See* CTPG at 59. Visa complains that that for the ’531 Patent “the

total number of words in all claims is 1,691.” Paper 3 at 1-2. Yet Visa managed to file a single petition for each of Cortex’s related patents with the same or higher word counts. *See, e.g.*, IPR2024-00488 (’854 Patent claims word count: 1,671), IPR2024-00489 (’859 Patent claims word count: 2,430), IPR2024-00490 (’973 Patent claims word count: 1,833).

Second, Visa asserts the quantity of claims it challenges in the ’531 Patent necessitated a second petition. Paper 3 at 1-2. But number of claims alone is not dispositive. *See, e.g., Whatfix v. WalkMe*, IPR2023-01443, 2024 WL 1199603, at *4-5 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 20, 2024) (“Petitioner does not persuasively explain... why these arguments could not have been provided in a single petition” where Petitioner challenged 29 claims but “provides all of the same contentions.”). Visa ignores the considerable overlap between the independent claims challenged in its two petitions, shown below:

IPR2024-00486 Claim 1	IPR2024-00487 Claim 21
1. A computer-implemented method comprising: storing, in a memory of an officially verifiable electronic representation (OVER) generation and verification engine, information associated with a credential of a user for proving the user's identity or qualifications; receiving, from an OVER file storage client device of the user, an OVER file generation request to provide authentication of the user based on the information associated with the credential; generating, by a processor of the OVER engine, an OVER file comprising a virtual representation of the credential that has been verified by an issuing agency to be an official representation of the credential, based on the information associated with the credential of the user; transmitting, to the OVER file storage client device of the user, the OVER file in response to the OVER file generation request; receiving, from an OVER file third-party client verifying device, a verifying request to verify that the OVER file transmitted to the user authenticates the user based on a scan associated with the OVER file on the OVER file store client device of the user; verifying that the scan associated with the OVER file corresponds with the information associated with the credential of the user that is stored in the OVER engine, in response to the verifying request; and transmitting, to the OVER file third-party client verifying device, an authentication message comprising an indication of whether the scan associated with the OVER file on the device of the user corresponds to the information associated with the credential of the user that is stored in the OVER engine.	21. An apparatus comprising: a processor; a memory unit operatively coupled to the processor, the memory unit configured to store information associated with a credential of a user and a plurality of instructions, wherein the instructions are configured to program the processor to: receive, from an officially verifiable electronic representation (OVER) file storage client device of the user, an OVER file generation request to provide authentication of the user based on the information associated with the credential; generate an OVER file comprising a virtual representation of the credential that has been verified by an issuing agency to be an official representation the credential, based on the information associated with the credential of the user; transmit, to the OVER file storage client device of the user, the OVER file in response to the first OVER file generation request; receive, from an OVER file third-party client verifying device, a verifying request to verify that the OVER file transmitted to the device of the user authenticates the user based on a scan associated with the OVER file on the device of the user; verify that the scan associated with the OVER file corresponds with the information associated with the credential of the user, in response to the verifying request; and transmit, to the OVER file third-party client verifying device, an authentication message comprising a status indicator indicating whether the OVER file corresponds to the credential of the user.

Compare EX1001 at Claim 1 with *id.* at Claim 21; *see, e.g., Apple*, 2023 WL 5153644, at *4-5 (denying institution of second petition challenging same patent because “the claims are more similar than Petitioner suggests”).

Petitioner’s claim that “[t]here are no overlapping claims challenged” is misdirection. Paper 3 at 1. Petitioner ignores the similarities between the claims it challenges in both petitions. *See, e.g., Microsoft v. Uniloc 2017*, IPR2019-01470, 2020 WL 698190, at *6 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 11, 2020) (finding unpersuasive “Petitioner’s argument that ‘no claim is being challenged in both petitions’” where Petitioner filed

two petitions challenging claims 1-9 and 10-20 of the same patent); *ByteDance v. Triller*, IPR2021-00774, 2021 WL 4864396, at *2-3 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 12, 2021) (denying institution where “[t]he distinct claim sets challenged in the two petitions have overlapping claimed subject matter”).

Third, Petitioner cannot sustain its purported “need to address each challenged claim in sufficient detail.” Paper 3 at 2. Again, Visa apparently had no difficulty filing a single petition on the continuation applications. *See* IPR2024-00488, -00489, -00490. The few distinctions between Visa’s unpatentability theories between the method claims challenged in IPR2024-00486 and the apparatus claims challenged in IPR2024-00487 do not merit multiple challenges. *See id.*; *Apple*, 2023 WL 5153644, at *4-5 (denying institution of second petition because of similar “‘method’ claims here versus ‘system’ claims in the [first] petition”).

Finally, Petitioner’s citations are inapposite. Paper 3 at 2. Unlike the three independent claims here, *Novartis v. Genzyme* involved seven independent claims “necessitat[ing] filing two separate petitions.” IPR2023-01045, 2024 WL 186723, at *1-2 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 17, 2024). *Apple v. Seven Networks* allowed another petition because of distinct prior art asserted in the second petition, IPR2020-00157, 2020 WL 3249313, at *10-12 (P.T.A.B. June 15, 2020), which Visa does not present here.

Visa v. Cortex MCP
Patent No. 9,251,531 – IPR2024-00487

The Board should exercise its discretion to deny institution of both petitions challenging the '531 Patent.

IX. CONCLUSION

For any of these reasons, the Board should deny institution of the Petition.

ARMOND WILSON LLP

Dated: May 6, 2024

By: /Michelle E. Armond/
Michelle E. Armond (Reg. No. 53,954)
Douglas R. Wilson (Reg. No. 54,542)
Patrick Maloney (Reg. No. 67,247)
Yue Han (Reg. No. 80,950)
Attorneys for Cortex MCP, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(d), the undersigned certifies that foregoing **PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE** exclusive of the parts exempted as provided in 37 C.F.R. § 42.24, contains 9,074 words and therefore complies with the type-volume limitations of 37 C.F.R. § 42.24.

ARMOND WILSON LLP

Dated: May 6, 2024

By: /Michelle E. Armond/
Michelle E. Armond (Reg. No. 53,954)
Douglas R. Wilson (Reg. No. 54,542)
Patrick Maloney (Reg. No. 67,247)
Yue Han (Reg. No. 80,950)
Attorneys for Cortex MCP, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e), a true copy of the foregoing **PATENT OWNER’S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE** and **EXHIBITS 2001-2008** are being served electronically on May 6, 2024 to the following lead and backup counsel for Petitioner to the following email addresses:

Matthew A. Argenti
margenti@wsgr.com

Michael T. Rosato
mrosato@wsgr.com

Patrick M. Medley
pmedley@wsgr.com

Joseph M. Baillargeon
jbailargeon@wsgr.com

ARMOND WILSON LLP

Dated: May 6, 2024

By: /Michelle E. Armond/
Michelle E. Armond (Reg. No. 53,954)
Douglas R. Wilson (Reg. No. 54,542)
Patrick Maloney (Reg. No. 67,247)
Yue Han (Reg. No. 80,950)
Attorneys for Cortex MCP, Inc.