

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 CBM2015-00082¹

Patent No. 6,871,325

Submitted Electronically via the Patent Review Processing System

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Contents	
I. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	1
II. INTRODUCTION.....	1
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	7
A. Claim Construction Proposals.....	7
1. “wireless handheld computing device”	7
2. “central database”	7
3. “web page”	8
4. “web server”	8
5. “communications control module”	9
6. “synchronized”	10
7. “hospitality applications”	10
8. “application program interface”	10
9. “outside applications”	10
10. “integration”	10
11. “Wherein the communications control module is an interface between the hospitality applications and any other communications protocol”	11
12. “wherein the synchronized data relates to ‘orders,’ ‘waitlists’ and ‘reservations’” respectively as to claims 11, 12 and 13	14
13. “Relates to orders”	15
14. “Relates to waitlists”	16
15. “Relates to reservations”	17
IV. THERE HAS BEEN NO SHOWING THAT ANY OF CLAIMS 11-13 OR 15 ARE OBVIOUS	17
A. Overview	17
B. DeLorme Does Not Render The Claims Obvious.....	18

1. DeLorme Does Not Disclose “Wherein Applications And Data [which] Are Synchronized Between The Central Database, At Least One Wireless Handheld Computing Device, At Least One Web Server And At Least One Web Page” 18

2. DeLorme Does Not Disclose A “Wireless Handheld Computing Device On Which Hospitality Applications And Data Are Stored” 31

3. DeLorme Does Not Disclose The Claimed “Application Program Interface” That Enables Integration of Outside Applications with the Hospitality Applications’ 41

4. DeLorme Does Not Disclose The Claimed “Communications Control Module” Nor ‘Wherein The Communications Control Module Is An Interface Between The Hospitality Applications And Any Other Communications Protocol’ 43

5. Claim As A Whole..... 46

6. DeLorme Does Not Disclose The Fourth Wherein Clause Of ‘325 Claims 11-13 47

C. Objective Evidence Of Non-Obviousness..... 48

1. There is a very strong nexus between the evidence of "secondary considerations" and the challenged claims..... 52

2. The Ameranth patents in this family, including the challenged claims, have been successfully and extensively licensed. 63

3. Ameranth's products enjoyed substantial, widespread commercial success..... 66

4. Ameranth's 21st Century Restaurant received numerous technology awards and industry acclaim after its introduction..... 68

5. Ameranth received overwhelming industry praise for the 21st Century Restaurant technology..... 70

6. Starbucks and numerous other companies copied the Ameranth technology reflected in the challenged claims. 73

7. Other companies in the industry tried and failed to develop the integrated, synchronized innovation of the Ameranth technology and patent claims. 78

8. Objective Evidence Conclusion 80

V. CONCLUSION 80

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Page****Cases**

Allen Archery, Inc. v. Browning Mfg. Co., 819 F.2d 1087 (Fed. Cir. 1987).....	70
Ameranth v. Pizza Hut et al., Case No. 3-11-cv-01810 (S.D. Cal. 2013)	55
Apple Inc. v. International Trade Commission, 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	49
Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc., 776 F.2d 281 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	53
Berk-Tek LLC v. Belden Techs., Inc., IPR2013-00059, FWD 34 (PTAB April 28, 2014).....	26
CAE Screenplates Inc. v. Heinrich Fiedler GmbH & Co. KG, 224 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	14
CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Int'l. Corp., 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	21
Crocs, Inc. v. ITC, 598 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	73
Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. National Graphics, Inc., 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	26
Eli Lilly & Co. v. Zenith Goldline Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 471 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	68

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.