

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

**EXPEDIA, INC., FANDANGO, LLC, HOTEL TONIGHT INC., HOTWIRE, INC., HOTELS.COM, L.P., KAYAK SOFTWARE CORP., LIVE NATION ENTERTAINMENT, INC., MICROS SYSTEMS, INC., ORBITZ, LLC, OPENTABLE, INC., PAPA JOHN'S USA, INC., STUBHUB, INC., TICKETMASTER, LLC, TRAVELOCITY.COM LP, WANDERSPOT LLC, PIZZA HUT, INC., PIZZA HUT OF AMERICA, INC., DOMINO'S PIZZA, INC., DOMINO'S PIZZA, LLC, GRUBHUB, INC., SEAMLESS NORTH AMERICA, LLC, ORDR.IN, INC., MOBO SYSTEMS, INC., STARBUCKS CORPORATION, EVENTBRITE, INC., BEST WESTERN INTERNATIONAL, INC., HILTON RESORTS CORP., HILTON WORLDWIDE, INC., HILTON INTERNATIONAL CO., HYATT CORPORATION, MARRIOTT INTERNATIONAL, INC., STARWOOD HOTELS & RESORTS WORLDWIDE, INC., AGILYSYS, INC., USABLENET, INC., AND APPLE INC.**

**Petitioners**

**v.**

**AMERANTH, INC.**

**Patent Owner**

**U.S. Patent No. 8,146,077  
Issue date: March 27, 2012**

**Title: Information Management and Synchronous Communications System with Menu Generation, and Handwriting and Voice Modification of Orders**

**CBM: Unassigned**

**PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD REVIEW  
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,146,077 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 321  
AND § 18 OF THE LEAHY-SMITH AMERICA INVENTS ACT**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
A.	The Challenged Claims Fail to Satisfy the Written Description and Definiteness Requirement of § 112 .....	4
B.	The Challenged Claims Fail to Claim Patentable Subject Matter under § 101 .....	9
II.	REQUIRED DISCLOSURES .....	12
A.	Mandatory Notices .....	12
1.	Real Parties-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)).....	12
2.	Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)) .....	14
3.	Lead and Back-Up Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)) .....	19
4.	Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4)).....	21
B.	Filing Date Requirements.....	22
1.	Compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.304 .....	22
2.	Certificate of Service on Patent Owner (37 C.F.R. § 42.205(a)).....	23
3.	The Filing Fee (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.15(b) and 42.203(a)).....	23
C.	Additional Disclosures .....	23
1.	At Least One Challenged Claim Is Unpatentable (37 C.F.R. § 42.208(c)) .....	23
2.	Eligibility Based on Time of Filing (37 C.F.R. § 42.303).....	24
3.	Power of Attorney (37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b)).....	24
4.	A Legible Copy of Every Exhibit in the Exhibit List (37 C.F.R. § 42.63).....	24
III.	FOUNDATIONS FOR STANDING.....	24

A.	Eligibility Based on Infringement Suit (37 C.F.R. § 42.302(a)).....	25
B.	Eligibility Based on Lack of Estoppel (37 C.F.R. § 42.302(b)) .....	26
C.	The ‘077 Patent Is a CBM Patent (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(a)).....	26
1.	Claims 1-18 Meet the Definition of a CBM .....	27
2.	Claims 1-18 Are Not Directed to a “Technological Invention”.....	32
IV.	STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED FOR EACH CLAIM CHALLENGED .....	37
A.	Claims for Which Review Is Requested (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(1)) .....	38
B.	Statutory Grounds of Challenge (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(2)).....	38
C.	Claim Construction (37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(3)).....	38
1.	Broadest Reasonable Interpretation .....	38
V.	THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE INVALID UNDER § 112.....	40
A.	The Challenged Claims Do Not Satisfy the Written Description Requirement. ....	40
1.	The ‘077 Patent Does Not Provide a Written Description of “Cascaded Sets of Linked Graphical User Interface Screens” Recited in the Challenged Claims .....	42
2.	The ‘077 Patent Does Not Provide a Written Description of a “Customized Display Layout Unique to the Wireless Handheld Computing Device” as Recited in the Challenged Claims .....	43
3.	The ‘077 Patent Does Not Provide a Written Description of “Customized Display Layout of at Least Two Different Wireless Handheld Computing Device Display Sizes” or “A Different Number of User Interface Screens From at Least One Other Wireless Handheld Computing Device” Recited in the Challenged Claims.....	45

4.	The ‘077 Patent Does Not Provide a Written Description Sufficient to Describe the Later Presented Continuation Claims Directed to a “Synchronous Communications System” When Only Use of a Local Database is Described in the Original Specification.....	47
B.	The Challenged Claims Are Indefinite for Mixing Apparatus and Method Elements.....	55
VI.	THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE INVALID UNDER § 101.....	59
A.	Section 101 Analysis.....	59
B.	The Challenged Claims Impermissibly Claim an Abstract Idea.....	62
C.	The Challenged Claims Also Fail the “Machine or Transformation Test” .....	71
D.	The Challenged Claims Are Invalid Under <i>Mayo</i> .....	75
E.	The Challenged Claims Are Distinguishable From <i>Ulramercial</i> .....	77
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	78

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Accenture Global Servs., GMBH v. Guidewire Software, Inc.</i> , No. 2011-1486, 2013 WL 4749919 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 5, 2013).....	11, 82
<i>In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech Ctr.</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	40
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc.</i> , 314 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	57
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly and Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) ( <i>en banc</i> ) .....	42
<i>Bancorp Servs., LLC v Sun Life Assurance Co. of Canada</i> , 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	63, 67, 69, 71, 75
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 130 S. Ct. 3218 (2010) (“ <i>Bilski II</i> ”).....	passim
<i>CLS Bank International v. Alice Corporation Pty. Ltd.</i> , 717 F.3d 1269 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	62, 63, 65, 70, 74
<i>Collaboration Props., Inc. v. Tandberg ASA</i> , No. 05-cv-1940-MHP, 2006 WL 1752140 (N.D. Cal. June 23, 2006) .....	62
<i>Compression Tech. Solutions LLC v. EMC Corp.</i> , 2013 WL 2368039 (N.D. Cal. May 29, 2013).....	62, 63, 78
<i>CyberSource Corp. v Retail Decisions, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	passim
<i>Dealertrack, Inc. v. Huber</i> , 674 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	63, 70, 76, 77
<i>Diamond v. Diehr</i> , 450 U.S. 175 (1981).....	11, 64

# 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.