

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

----- X
AMERANTH, INC., :
 :
 :
 Plaintiff, : Civil Action No. 2:10-cv-294-JRG-RSP
 :
 :
 v. :
 :
 :
 PAR TECHNOLOGY CORP., ET AL., :
 :
 :
 Defendants. :
 :
 :
----- X

**PLAINTIFF AMERANTH'S OPENING
CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. BACKGROUND2

III. LEGAL STANDARDS3

IV. PROPER CONSTRUCTION OF THE DISPUTED TERMS6

 A. “An information management and synchronous communications system for use with wireless handheld computing devices and the internet” 7

 B. “Wireless handheld computing device on which hospitality applications and data are stored” 12

 C. “Hospitality applications” and “hospitality applications and data” 13

 D. “Web page” 21

 E. “At least one Web page on which hospitality applications and data are stored” .. 23

 F. “An application program interface” and “the application program interface enables integration of outside applications with the hospitality applications” 24

 G. “A communications control module” and “an interface between the hospitality applications and any other communications protocol” 26

 H. “Synchronized” 28

 I. “A single point of entry” 29

 J. “Information entered on at least one Web page and transmitted over the internet is automatically communicated to the central database and at least one wireless handheld computing device” and “information entered on at least one wireless handheld computing device is automatically communicated to the central database and at least one Web page” 30

 K. “The data is sent to a wireless paging device” 32

V. CONCLUSION.....33

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
FEDERAL CASES	
<i>ACTV, Inc. v. Walt Disney Co.</i> , 346 F.3d 1082 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	3
<i>Advanced Fiber Tech. Trust v. J&L Fiber Svcs., Inc.</i> , No. 2011-1243 (Fed. Cir. April 3, 2012)	5
<i>C.R. Bard v. U.S. Surgical Corp.</i> , 388 F.3d 858 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	3
<i>Dayco Prod., Inc. v. Total Containment, Inc.</i> , 258 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	19
<i>Electro Med. Sys., S.A. v. Cooper Life Sciences, Inc.</i> , 34 F.3d 1048 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	5
<i>Genentech, Inc. v. Chiron Corp.</i> , 112 F.3d 495 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	11
<i>Gillette Co. v. Energizer Holdings, Inc.</i> , 405 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	4, 11
<i>In re: Google</i> , 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 98469 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 31, 2011)	19
<i>Intellicall, Inc. v. Phonometrics</i> , 952 F.2d 1384 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	5
<i>Innova/Pure Water, Inc. v. Safari Water Filtration Systems, Inc.</i> , 381 F.3d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	3
<i>Kara Tech., Inc. v. Stamps.com, Inc.</i> , 582 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	4
<i>Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 898 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	5
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995), <i>aff'd</i> , 517 U.S. 370 (1996)	4
<i>Mars Inc. v. H.J. Heinz Co.</i> , 377 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	11

Medrad, Inc. v. MRI Devices Corp.,
401 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....4

Oatey Co. v. IPS Corp.,
514 F.3d 1271 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....5

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)..... 3-5

Saunders Group, Inc. v. Comfortrac, Inc.,
492 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....4

Versa Corp. v. Ag-Bag, Int’l.,
392 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2004) 11, 19

Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.,
90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....3, 4

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Web Characterization Terminology & Definitions Sheet, at
<http://www.w3.org/1999/05/WCA-terms>22

I. INTRODUCTION

The two patents-in-suit¹ are part of a family of four issued patents directed to Ameranth's widely acclaimed and multiple-award winning synchronous hospitality communications technology. The asserted claims² encompass, *inter alia*, a client/server system for synchronizing hospitality information between a central database, Web pages and wireless handheld computing devices in an internet-enabled system, as well as between/with other hospitality and third party applications. These breakthrough aspects of the patents were conceived over 13 years ago when internet and wireless communications capabilities and deployment were far more limited than they are today, *e.g.*, prior to the introductions of 3G and 4G wireless networks, the ubiquity of high speed internet connections and modern mobile devices/smart phones—which serve to further increase the need for this breakthrough invention for practical hospitality market implementations in the 21st Century.

The asserted claims are clear and unambiguous when interpreted in light of the specification.³ Ameranth's constructions are entirely consistent with, and compelled by, the intrinsic record alone. These claims are directed to synchronous communication and synchronization of computerized hospitality software applications--such as for online/mobile ordering, reservations, wait lists, ticketing and other applications in the hospitality industry which require a synchronized user interface across different computing components of the synchronized client/server system.

The Court should adopt the straightforward constructions intended by the inventors as

¹ The asserted patents are U.S. 6,384,850 (the “850 Patent”) and U.S. 6,871,325 (the “325 Patent”). The asserted patents claim priority to an original application filed in 1999. The ‘850 Patent issued from the original application. The ‘325 Patent issued from a continuation of the application which issued as the ‘850 Patent as did the ‘733 (U.S. 6,982,733) and ‘077 (U.S. 8,146,077) Patents. The patents are attached as Exhibits 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively. The text of the specifications are nearly identical but the latter two patents include additional disclosure and Figures. For simplicity, citations herein are from the original ‘850 Patent unless otherwise indicated. Citations are in the form “Col.:lines.”

² ‘850 claims 12-15; ‘325 claims 11-13, 15.

³ The meaning of the claims, including each of the disputed terms, is clear, upon reading the specification and prosecution history, to any person with even rudimentary knowledge of computer systems and is thus clear to a person of ordinary skill in the art (“POSA”).

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.