

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

STARBUCKS CORP.  
Petitioner

v.

AMERANTH, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case CBM2015-00091  
Patent No. 6,384,850

---

*Submitted Electronically via the Patent Review Processing System*

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Contents	
I. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED .....	1
II. INTRODUCTION.....	1
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	3
A. Claim Construction Proposals.....	3
1. “wireless handheld computing device” .....	4
2. “central database” .....	4
3. “web page” .....	4
4. “web server” .....	4
5. “communications control module” .....	5
6. “synchronized” .....	5
7. “hospitality applications” .....	6
8. “application program interface” .....	11
9. “outside applications” .....	11
10. “integration” .....	12
11. “single point of entry for all hospitality applications” .....	12
12. “automatic” .....	12
13. “Wherein the communications control module is an interface between the hospitality applications and any other communications protocol” .....	13
IV. THERE HAS BEEN NO SHOWING THAT ANY.....	15
A. Overview .....	15
B. The Asserted References Do Not Render The Claims Obvious .....	23
1. Neither §103 Challenge Provides Disclosure Or Suggestion Of Hospitality Application Functionality As Required By Claims 12-16 .....	23

2. Neither Challenge Provides A Teaching Or Suggestion Of “A Central Database Containing Hospitality Applications And Data” .....24

3. The Asserted References Do 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” .....25

4. The Asserted References Do Not Disclose A “Wireless Handheld Computing Device On Which Hospitality Applications And Data Are Stored” .....32

5. Neither Challenge Identifies A Teaching or Suggestion Of “At Least One Web Page On Which Hospitality Applications And Data Are Stored” As Recited By Claim 12 .....39

6. Neither Reference Discloses The Claimed “Application Program Interface” That “Enables Integration of Outside Applications with the Hospitality Applications” .....39

7. Neither Reference Discloses The Claimed “Communications Control Module” Nor ‘Wherein The Communications Control Module Is An Interface Between The Hospitality Applications And Any Other Communications Protocol’ .....41

8. Claim As A Whole.....45

C. Dependent Claims ..... 45

D. 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 21<sup>st</sup> Century Restaurant received numerous technology awards and industry acclaim after its introduction.....68

5. Ameranth received overwhelming industry praise for the 21<sup>st</sup> 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) .....	32
Crocs, Inc. v. ITC, 598 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	73
Diamond Rubber Co. v. Consolidated Rubber Tire Co., 220 U.S. 428 (1911) .....	2
Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. National Graphics, Inc., 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	31
Eli Lilly & Co. v. Zenith Goldline Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 471 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	68
Ex parte Levengood, 28 USPQ2d 1300 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993).....	31
Gambro Lundia AB v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.,	

# 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.