

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE, INC., EVENTBRITE INC., STARWOOD HOTELS & RESORTS  
WORLDWIDE, INC., EXPEDIA, INC., FANDANGO, LLC,  
HOTELS.COM, L.P., HOTEL TONIGHT, INC., HOTWIRE, INC.,  
KAYAK SOFTWARE CORP., OPENTABLE, INC., ORBITZ, LLC, PAPA  
JOHN'S USA, INC., STUBHUB, INC., TICKETMASTER, LLC, LIVE  
NATION ENTERTAINMENT, INC., TRAVELOCITY.COM LP,  
WANDERSPOT LLC, AGILYSYS, INC., DOMINO'S PIZZA, INC.,  
DOMINO'S PIZZA, LLC, HILTON RESORTS CORPORATION,  
HILTON WORLDWIDE, INC., HILTON INTERNATIONAL CO., MOBO  
SYSTEMS, INC., PIZZA HUT OF AMERICA, INC., PIZZA HUT, INC.,  
and USABLENET, INC.,  
Petitioner

v.

AMERANTH, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case CBM2015-00080<sup>1</sup>  
Patent No. 6,384,850

---

**PATENT OWNER'S OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE SUBMITTED**  
**WITH PETITIONER'S REPLY BRIEF**

---

<sup>1</sup> CBM2015-00096 has been consolidated with this proceeding.

Per 37 C.F.R. § 42.64, Patent Owner Ameranth, Inc. ("Patent Owner")

hereby objects to the exhibits and other evidence submitted by Petitioner with its Reply Brief as indicated below. The grounds for objection are as follows:

| Petitioner's Evidence | Grounds for Objection  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Exhibit 1069          | Outside the Scope Permitted with a Reply. The exhibit is not permitted to be submitted with a reply, because it could have been presented in a prior filing. 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b); Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756-48773, at 48767.   |
| Exhibit 1070          | <p>Outside the Scope Permitted with a Reply. The declaration included many new arguments and theories that are not permitted to be submitted with a reply, because they could have been presented in a prior filing. 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b); Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756-48773, at 48767; <i>see also Intri-Plex Technologies, Inc., et al. v. Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Rencol Limited</i>, IPR2014-00309, Paper 83, pgs 12 – 14.</p> <p>Relevance. Because the declaration is not discussed in Petitioner's Reply Brief and is merely incorporated by reference in violation of 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3), it is not relevant to any issue in this proceeding and any probative value of the declaration is substantially outweighed by unfair prejudice and waste of time. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403; <i>see also Conopco, Inc. dba Unilever v. The Procter &amp; Gamble Company</i>, IPR2013-00510, Paper 9, pgs 8 - 9; <i>Juniper Networks, Inc. v. Brixham Solutions, Ltd.</i>, IPR2014-00425, Paper 16, at Footnote 1; <i>Cisco Systems, Inc. v. C-Cation Technologies, LLC</i>, IPR2014-00454, Paper 12, pgs 7 – 10.</p> |
| Exhibit 1071          | Outside the Scope Permitted with a Reply. The  |

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
|              | <p>exhibit is not permitted to be submitted with a reply, because it could have been presented in a prior filing. 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b); Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756-48773, at 48767.</p> <p>Hearsay. The statements in the exhibit used by Petitioner to prove the truth of matters described therein are hearsay. Fed. R. Evid. 801(c).</p> <p>Authentication. Petitioner has not provided sufficient evidence to establish that the exhibit is a true and correct copy of what Petitioner claims it to be. Fed. R. Evid. 901(a).</p>   |
| Exhibit 1072 | <p>Outside the Scope Permitted with a Reply. The exhibit is not permitted to be submitted with a reply, because it could have been presented in a prior filing. 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b); Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756-48773, at 48767.</p> <p>Hearsay. The statements in the exhibit used by Petitioner to prove the truth of matters described therein are hearsay. Fed. R. Evid. 801(c).</p> <p>Authentication. Petitioner has not provided sufficient evidence to establish that the exhibit is a true and correct copy of what Petitioner claims it to be. Fed. R. Evid. 901(a).</p> |
| Exhibit 1073 | <p>Outside the Scope Permitted with a Reply. The exhibit is not permitted to be submitted with a reply, because it could have been presented in a prior filing. 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b); Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756-48773, at 48767.</p> <p>Hearsay. The statements in the exhibit used by Petitioner to prove the truth of matters described therein are hearsay. Fed. R. Evid. 801(c).</p> <p>Authentication. Petitioner has not provided sufficient</p>   |

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
|              | evidence to establish that the exhibit is a true and correct copy of what Petitioner claims it to be. Fed. R. Evid. 901(a).  |
| Exhibit 1074 | Outside the Scope Permitted with a Reply. The exhibit is not permitted to be submitted with a reply, because it could have been presented in a prior filing. 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b); Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756-48773, at 48767.   |
| Exhibit 1075 | Outside the Scope Permitted with a Reply. The exhibit is not permitted to be submitted with a reply, because it could have been presented in a prior filing. 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b); Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756-48773, at 48767.   |
| Exhibit 1077 | Outside the Scope Permitted with a Reply. The exhibit is not permitted to be submitted with a reply, because it could have been presented in a prior filing. 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b); Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756-48773, at 48767.   |
| Exhibit 1078 | <p>Outside the Scope Permitted with a Reply. The exhibit is not permitted to be submitted with a reply, because it could have been presented in a prior filing. 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b); Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756-48773, at 48767.</p> <p>Relevance. Because the exhibit is not discussed or even cited in the Petitioner's Reply Brief, it is not relevant to any issue in this proceeding and any probative value of the exhibit is substantially outweighed by unfair prejudice and waste of time. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403.</p> <p>Further, the inclusion of these institution decisions from the parallel, but not joined, Starbucks petition against the same patent is an unauthorized attempt to effectively achieve 'joinder' with these petitions, when such joinder has not been requested in</p> |

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
|              | <p>accordance with the AIA rules. Petitioners have already sought ‘joinder’ with these Starbucks petitions in the proceedings of yet another petition of their own, and those proceedings are independent as well and, therefore, the inclusion of these institution decisions as an exhibit with the reply is improper for this additional reason.</p>   |
| Exhibit 1079 | <p>Outside the Scope Permitted with a Reply. The exhibit is not permitted to be submitted with a reply, because it could have been presented in a prior filing. 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b); Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756-48773, at 48767.</p> <p>Relevance. Because the exhibit is not discussed or even cited in the Petitioner’s Reply Brief, it is not relevant to any issue in this proceeding and any probative value of the exhibit is substantially outweighed by unfair prejudice and waste of time. Fed. R. Evid. 401-403.</p> <p>Further, the inclusion of these institution decisions from the parallel, but not joined, Starbucks petition against the same patent is an unauthorized attempt to effectively achieve ‘joinder’ with these petitions, when such joinder has not been requested in accordance with the AIA rules. Petitioners have already sought ‘joinder’ with these Starbucks petitions in the proceedings of yet another petition of their own, and those proceedings are independent as well and, therefore, the inclusion of these institution decisions as an exhibit with the reply is improper for this additional reason.</p> |
| Exhibit 1080 | <p>Outside the Scope Permitted with a Reply. The exhibit is not permitted to be submitted with a reply, because it could have been presented in a prior filing. 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b); Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756-48773, at 48767.</p>   |

# 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.