

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

AMERANTH, INC.

v.

PAR TECHNOLOGY CORP., et al.

§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 2:10-CV-294-JRG-RSP

**CLAIM CONSTRUCTION
MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

On May 30, 2012, the Court held a hearing to determine the proper construction of the disputed claim terms in U.S. Patent Nos. 6,384,850 and 6,871,325. After considering the arguments made by the parties at the hearing and in the parties' claim construction briefing (Dkt. Nos. 155, 157, 158 and 160), the Court issues this Claim Construction Memorandum and Order.

APPLICABLE LAW

“It is a ‘bedrock principle’ of patent law that ‘the claims of a patent define the invention to which the patentee is entitled the right to exclude.’” *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc) (quoting *Innova/Pure Water Inc. v. Safari Water Filtration Sys., Inc.*, 381 F.3d 1111, 1115 (Fed. Cir. 2004)). To determine the meaning of the claims, courts start by considering the intrinsic evidence. *See id.* at 1313. *C.R. Bard, Inc. v. U.S. Surgical Corp.*, 388 F.3d 858, 861 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *Bell Atl. Network Servs., Inc. v. Covad Communications Group, Inc.*, 262 F.3d 1258, 1267 (Fed. Cir. 2001). The intrinsic evidence includes the claims themselves, the specification, and the prosecution history. *See Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1314; *C.R. Bard, Inc.*, 388 F.3d at 861. Courts give claim terms their ordinary and accustomed meaning as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in the context of the entire patent. *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1312–13; *Alloc, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n*, 342 F.3d 1361, 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2003).

The claims themselves provide substantial guidance in determining the meaning of particular claim terms. *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1314. First, a term’s context in the asserted claim can be very instructive. *Id.* Other asserted or unasserted claims can aid in determining the claim’s meaning because claim terms are typically used consistently throughout the patent. *Id.* Differences among the claim terms can also assist in understanding a term’s meaning. *Id.* For example, when a dependent claim adds a limitation to an independent claim, it is presumed that the independent claim does not include the limitation. *Id.* at 1314–15.

“[C]laims ‘must be read in view of the specification, of which they are a part.’” *Id.* (quoting *Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*, 52 F.3d 967, 979 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (en banc)). “[T]he specification ‘is always highly relevant to the claim construction analysis. Usually, it is dispositive; it is the single best guide to the meaning of a disputed term.’” *Id.* (quoting *Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.*, 90 F.3d 1576, 1582 (Fed. Cir. 1996)); *Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficosa N. Am. Corp.*, 299 F.3d 1313, 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2002). This is true because a patentee may define his own terms, give a claim term a different meaning than the term would otherwise possess, or disclaim or disavow the claim scope. *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1316. In these situations, the inventor’s lexicography governs. *Id.* The specification may also resolve the meaning of ambiguous claim terms “where the ordinary and accustomed meaning of the words used in the claims lack sufficient clarity to permit the scope of the claim to be ascertained from the words alone.” *Teleflex, Inc.*, 299 F.3d at 1325. But, “[a]lthough the specification may aid the court in interpreting the meaning of disputed claim language, particular embodiments and examples appearing in the specification will not generally be read into the claims.” *Comark Communications, Inc. v. Harris Corp.*, 156 F.3d 1182, 1187 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (quoting *Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc.*, 848 F.2d 1560, 1571 (Fed. Cir. 1988)); *see also Phillips*, 415

F.3d at 1323. The prosecution history is another tool to supply the proper context for claim construction because a patent applicant may also define a term in prosecuting the patent. *Home Diagnostics, Inc., v. Lifescan, Inc.*, 381 F.3d 1352, 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (“As in the case of the specification, a patent applicant may define a term in prosecuting a patent.”).

Although extrinsic evidence can be useful, it is “less significant than the intrinsic record in determining the legally operative meaning of claim language.” *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1317 (quoting *C.R. Bard, Inc.*, 388 F.3d at 862). Technical dictionaries and treatises may help a court understand the underlying technology and the manner in which one skilled in the art might use claim terms, but technical dictionaries and treatises may provide definitions that are too broad or may not be indicative of how the term is used in the patent. *Id.* at 1318. Similarly, expert testimony may aid a court in understanding the underlying technology and determining the particular meaning of a term in the pertinent field, but an expert’s conclusory, unsupported assertions as to a term’s definition is entirely unhelpful to a court. *Id.* Generally, extrinsic evidence is “less reliable than the patent and its prosecution history in determining how to read claim terms.” *Id.*

DISCUSSION

Claim Term 1: “an information management and synchronous communications system for use with wireless handheld computing devices and the internet”

Claim Term	Ameranth’s Proposed Construction	PAR’s Proposed Construction
“an information management and synchronous communications system for use with wireless handheld computing devices and the internet”	“a computerized system having multiple devices in which a change to data made on a central server is updated via the internet on wireless handheld computing devices and vice versa”	“a computerized system having a plurality of connected components including a central database, at least one wireless handheld device, at least one Web server, and at least one Web page, each of which stores hospitality applications and data, in which a change made to applications and/or data stored on one of the components is automatically made in real time to applications and/or data stored on all other connected components”

The parties agree that this language, which is the preamble to claims 12-15 of the ‘850 patent, and claims 11-13 and 15 of the ‘325, is a limitation, but do not agree on its proper construction. There are two areas of disagreement. First, PAR contends that changes made to the applications and data must be made in real time. Second, Ameranth contends that elements from the body of the claim should not be imported into the preamble (such as “a central database, at least one wireless handheld device, at least one Web server, and at least one Web page”).

A preamble is properly considered a limitation of a claim “if it recites essential structure or steps, or if it is ‘necessary to give life, meaning, and vitality’ to the claim.” *Catalina Mktg. Int’l, Inc. v. Coolsavings.com, Inc.*, 239 F.3d 801, 808 (Fed. Cir. 2001). Having considered the parties’ arguments and the evidence, the Court declines to adopt the parties’ agreement that the preamble is limiting and finds that no construction is necessary. Neither party has identified a single aspect of the preamble that is necessary to define the scope of the claims, or is not already captured as a limitation in the body of the claims. The parties’ dispute over whether changes

must be made in “real time” merits the Court’s consideration but is more properly presented in consideration of the term “synchronized” in the body of the claims.

Claim Terms 3 and 4: “hospitality applications” and “hospitality applications and data”

Claim Term	Ameranth’s Proposed Construction	PAR’s Proposed Construction
“hospitality applications”	“one or more application software programs enabled to present information to a user via a user interface regarding reservations, frequency, ticketing, wait lists, food/drink ordering, payment processing or other services provided in the hospitality industry”	“two or more software programs each adapted to perform or assist with hospitality related tasks, e.g., restaurant ordering, reservations, customer ticketing, and wait-list management, etc.”
“hospitality applications and data”	Other than “hospitality applications,” construction not required, but if construed: “one or more application software programs enabled to present information to a user via a user interface regarding reservations, frequency, ticketing, wait lists, food/drink ordering, payment processing or other services provided in the hospitality industry and associated data”	“two or more software programs each adapted to perform or assist with hospitality related tasks, e.g., restaurant ordering, reservations, customer ticketing, and wait-list management, etc., and the data that is processed, stored, and/or manipulated by these programs”

The terms “hospitality applications” and “hospitality applications and data” both appear in claim 12 of the ‘850 patent, which is representative of their usage in the asserted claims:

12. An information management and synchronous communications system . . . comprising:
- a. a central database containing *hospitality applications and data*,
 - b. at least one wireless handheld computing device on which *hospitality applications and data* are stored,
 - c. at least one Web server on which *hospitality applications and data* are stored,
 - d. at least one Web page on which *hospitality applications and data* are stored,
 - e. an application program interface, and
 - f. a communications control module, wherein applications and data are synchronized between the central data base, at least one wireless handheld computing device, at least one Web server and

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.