

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION**

PAYGEO, LLC,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD,  
AND SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS  
AMERICA, INC.,

*Defendants.*

Case No. 2:25-CV-00334-RWS-RSP

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**DEFENDANTS' INVALIDITY CONTENTIONS**

Pursuant to Local Patent Rules 3-3 and 3-4 and the Court's Second Amended Docket Control Order (Dkt. 52), Defendants Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. ("SEC") and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. ("SEA") (collectively, "Samsung" or "Defendants") provide these Invalidity Contentions and accompanying document production to Plaintiff PayGeo, LLC ("PayGeo").

**I. Overview**

In this action, Plaintiff asserted in its P.R. 3-1 and 3-2 Disclosures of August 25, 2025 ("Infringement Contentions") that Defendants allegedly infringe claims 1-3, 22, and 24 of U.S. Patent No. 8,554,671 (the "'671 patent"), claims 1-2, 4, 6-9, 11, and 13-14 of U.S. Patent No. 10,796,296 (the "'296 patent"), claims 1-2, 4, 6-9, 11, and 13-14 of U.S. Patent No. 10,937,018 (the "'018 patent"), claims 1-2, 4, 6-9, 11, and 13-14 of U.S. Patent No. 11,087,307 (the "'307 patent"), claims 1-3, 5-8, and 10 of U.S. Patent No. 12,014,347 (the "'347 patent") (collectively, the "Patents-in-Suit" and the "Asserted Claims").

been inherent in the disclosure and/or obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the claimed element to perform the invention as claimed in the '307 patent.

As described in the attached charts, all the elements of the Asserted Claims of the '307 patent were commonplace before the alleged date of inventions. For each element, there exists evidence from the cited prior art that it was well known in the art prior to the date of invention. To the extent it is argued that any of the cited prior art references, systems, and/or products do not anticipate the Asserted Claims, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the Asserted Claims are merely combinations of well-known methods and systems resulting in expected results.

Additionally, Defendants hereby incorporate by reference the motivations to combine references set forth during the prosecution of the Asserted Claims of the '307 patent, including the statements and reasoning set forth by the examiner, as to why it would have been obvious to modify or combine references to arrive at the limitations of the Asserted Claims of the '307 patent. Defendants also incorporate by reference the admissions made in the '307 patent and/or during prosecution regarding what was already known in the art.

## **5. '347 Patent**

**Table 8: Exemplary Anticipatory and Combinations  
for the Asserted Claims of the '347 Patent**

| <b>Chart</b> | <b>Prior Art References</b>                                                                                     |
|--------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| E1           | Grigg either alone or in combination with Carter, Tumminaro, Moy, Shenker, Garrett, and/or Banerjee             |
| E2           | Baghdasaryan alone or in combination with Carter, Tumminaro, Moy, Shenker, Garrett, and/or Banerjee             |
| E3           | Google alone or in combination with Carter, Moy, Shenker, Garrett, Banerjee, Vassilev, Owen, and/or Bhagavatula |

| <b>Chart</b> | <b>Prior Art References</b>                                                                                                   |
|--------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| E4           | Taveau alone or in combination with Carter, Tumminaro, Moy, Shenker, Garrett, and/or Banerjee                                 |
| E5           | Dominguez alone or in combination with Carter, Tumminaro, Moy, Shenker, Garrett, Banerjee, Vassilev, Owen, and/or Bhagavatula |
| E6           | PayPal Mobile alone or in combination with Carter, Moy, Shenker, Garrett, Banerjee, Vassilev, Owen, and/or Bhagavatula        |
| E7           | Alipay alone or in combination with Grigg, Carter, Moy, Shenker, Garrett, Banerjee, Vassilev, Owen, and/or Bhagavatula        |

The prior art identified above, and in the attached '347 charts, individually anticipate and/or can properly be combined in multiple ways to demonstrate the obviousness of the Asserted Claims of the '347 patent. Various combinations of the references would have naturally been considered as part of the exercise of ordinary skill by one skilled in the art. The references disclosed in the attached charts and herein are also directed to the same or similar features as the purported invention claimed in the Asserted Claims of the '347 patent. To the extent Plaintiff contends that any of these features solved a problem in the art, the references cited herein show that that problem was known to those of ordinary skill and had already been solved using obvious solutions.

To that end, the Asserted Claims of the '347 patent simply combine elements already disclosed and well known in the art and yield no more than what one skilled in the art would have expected from such a combination. For example, with respect to the '347 patent, when confronted with the alleged problems described in the '347 patent, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the alleged invention would have been motivated to consider the techniques taught by the prior art cited in these Invalidity Contentions. Consideration of the teachings of this prior art, both individually and in combination, would necessarily lead to the alleged invention claimed in the '347 patent. This is demonstrated by the cited prior art, which disclose all of the elements of the

Asserted Claims of the '347 patent, as well as motivations to modify or combine their individual teachings. One of skill in the art would have been motivated to either modify the prior art identified in the claim charts or to combine that prior art in the manner indicated by, for example, their background knowledge, design incentives, effects of demands known to the design community, or other market forces. Moreover, the cited prior art share commonalities. To the extent it is argued that any cited prior art does not expressly disclose a particular claim or element, it would have been inherent in the disclosure and/or obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the claimed element to perform the invention as claimed in the '347 patent.

As described in the attached charts, all the elements of the Asserted Claims of the '347 patent were commonplace before the alleged date of inventions. For each element, there exists evidence from the cited prior art that it was well known in the art prior to the date of invention. To the extent it is argued that any of the cited prior art references, systems, and/or products do not anticipate the Asserted Claims, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the Asserted Claims are merely combinations of well-known methods and systems resulting in expected results.

Additionally, Defendants hereby incorporate by reference the motivations to combine references set forth during the prosecution of the Asserted Claims of the '347 patent, including the statements and reasoning set forth by the examiner, as to why it would have been obvious to modify or combine references to arrive at the limitations of the Asserted Claims of the '347 patent. Defendants also incorporate by reference the admissions made in the '347 patent and/or during prosecution regarding what was already known in the art.

### **III. Invalidity Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Defendants contend that one or more of the Asserted Claims are invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 112. As explained below, these claims lack priority, are indefinite, and/or fail to satisfy the

desired security level configuration setting is set to a plurality of security levels.”  
(claim 6).

Accordingly, these claims—and any claim(s) depending directly or indirectly therefrom—may be invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, or 35 U.S.C. § 112(b) as indefinite.

**IV. P.R. 3-4: Document Production Accompanying Invalidity Contentions**

Defendants have produced documents, including SamPay\_00061731 – SamPay\_00068036, pursuant to P.R. 3-4(a) and P.R. 3-4(b). In addition, pursuant to P.R. 3-4(a) and under the Protective Order in this action, Defendants are making source code available in the Washington, D.C. office of their counsel.

**V. Invalidity Under 53 U.S.C. § 101 and Defendants’ Subject Matter Eligibility Contentions**

The Asserted Claims of the Patents-in-Suit are invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for failing to recite patent-eligible subject matter. Defendants incorporate by reference herein their Subject Matter Eligibility Contentions concurrently served with these Invalidity Contentions.

Dated: November 3, 2025

/s/ Christopher T. Blackford  
Melissa R. Smith  
Texas State Bar No. 24001351  
**GILLAM & SMITH LLP**  
303 S. Washington Ave.  
Marshall, TX 75670  
Tel: (903) 934-8450  
Fax: (903) 934-9257  
melissa@gillamsmithlaw.com

Gerald F. Ivey  
Parmanand K. Sharma (*pro hac vice*)  
Christopher T. Blackford (*pro hac vice*)  
Nicholas A. Cerulli (*pro hac vice*)  
Christina Ji-Hye Yang (*pro hac vice*)  
Connor M. McGregor (*pro hac vice*)  
**FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP**

901 New York Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20001-4413  
Tel: (202) 408-4000  
Fax: (202) 408-4400  
gerald.ivey@finnegan.com  
parmanand.sharma@finnegan.com  
christopher.blackford@finnegan.com  
nicholas.cerulli@finnegan.com  
christina.yang@finnegan.com  
connor.mcgregor@finnegan.com

Charles H. Suh (*pro hac vice*)  
**FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP**  
1875 Explorer Street, 8th Floor  
Reston, VA 20190-6023  
Telephone: (571) 203-2700  
Facsimile: (202) 408-4400  
charles.suh@finnegan.com

Benjamin R. Schlesinger (*pro hac vice*)  
Benjamin A. Saidman (*pro hac vice*)  
Wyatt L. Bazrod (*pro hac vice*)  
**FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP**  
271 17<sup>th</sup> St. NW Suite 1400  
Atlanta, GA 30363-6209  
Telephone: (404) 653-6400  
Facsimile: (202) 408-4400  
benjamin.schlesinger@finnegan.com  
benjamin.saidman@finnegan.com  
wyatt.bazrod@finnegan.com

Sneha Nyshadham (*pro hac vice*)  
**FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP**  
3300 Hillview Ave., 2nd Floor  
Palo Alto, CA 94304  
Tel: (650) 849-6600  
Fax: (650) 849-6666  
sneha.nyshadham@finnegan.com

*Attorneys for Defendants  
Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. &  
Samsung Electronics America, Inc.*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that on November 3, 2025, copies of the foregoing Defendants' Invalidity Contentions and Exhibits have been served to Plaintiff through its counsel of record via email.

/s/ Seth D. Katz  
Seth D. Katz  
Case Manager