

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

AMERANTH, INC.,

§

Plaintiff,

§

§

v.

§

§

MENUSOFT SYSTEMS CORPORATION
and CASH REGISTER SALES & SERVICE
OF HOUSTON, INC.
(dba CRS TEXAS),

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2:07-CV-271-TJW-CE

**DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO AMERANTH'S MOTION FOR JUDGMENT
AS A MATTER OF LAW OF NONOBVIOUSNESS (DKT. 281)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page(s)</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	1
III. LEGAL STANDARDS	3
IV. ARGUMENTS	4
A. There is Substantial Evidence of Obviousness In View of Digital Dining 7.0.....	5
B. There is Substantial Evidence of Obviousness In View of Camaisa.....	6
C. There is Substantial Evidence of Obviousness in view of Micros 8700 and Kanevsky.....	7
1. Micros 8700 Was On Sale and In Public Use Prior to the Critical Date.....	8
2. Dr. Acampora’s Testimony Shows How the Components of Micros 8700 and Kanevsky Embody the Asserted Claims.....	8
3. The PTO’s Rejections in View of the Micros 8700 and Kanevsky Are a Legally Sufficient Evidentiary Basis to Support the Jury’s Verdict.....	10
D. There is Substantial Evidence on TransPad to Sustain the Jury’s Finding of Obviousness.....	11
1. TransPad in Combination with Kanevsky	11
2. TransPad in Combination with Micros 3700.....	13
E. There is Substantial Evidence in the Squirrel Reference to Sustain the Jury’s Finding of Obviousness.....	13
F. There is Substantial Evidence to Support the Jury’s Rejection of Ameranth’s Alleged Secondary Considerations.....	14
V. CONCLUSION.....	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

CASES

Asyst Techs., Inc. v. Emtrak, Inc.,
544 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....4

CA Inc. v. Simple.com, Inc.,
No. 02-CV-2748, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25242 (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 5, 2009).....5

Connell v. Sears, Roebuck, & Co.,
722 F.2d 1542 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....6

Cross Med. Prods., Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.,
424 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....12

In re Fulton,
391 F.3d 1195, 73 USPQ2d 1141 (Fed. Cir. 2004)10

Geo M. Martin v. Alliance Mach. Sys. Int’l,
No. 2009-1132, 2010 U.S. App. LEXIS 17377 (Fed. Cir. Aug. 20, 2010)15

In re Icon Health & Fitness,
496 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....7

Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.,
512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....4

Iron Grip Barbell Co., Inc., v. USA Sports, Inc.,
392 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....4

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 167 L. Ed. 2d 705 (2007).....3, 12

In re Kubin,
561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....3

Med. Instrumentation & Diagnostics Corp. v. Elekta AB,
344 F.3d 1205 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....5

Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech., Inc.,
463 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....4

Richdel, Inc. v. Sunspool Corp.,
714 F.2d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....14

Rose Acre Farms v. United States,
559 F.3d 1260 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(continued)

	Page
<i>Streber v. Hunter</i> , 221 F.3d 701 (5th Cir. 2000)	11
<i>TorPharm, Inc. v. Ranbaxy Pharms., Inc.</i> , 336 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	6
<i>Travelers v. Young</i> , 542 F.3d 475 (5th Cir. 2008)	5
<i>United States v. Gresham</i> , 585 F.2d 103 (5th Cir. 1978)	5
<i>Wyers v. Master Lock Co.</i> , No. 2009-1412, 2010 U.S. App. LEXIS 15271 (Fed. Cir. July 22, 2010).....	3, 4

RULES AND STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	3
--------------------------	---

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE:

Rule 50	14
Rule 59	5

I. INTRODUCTION

Ameranth asks the Court to impermissibly reweigh and reduce the evidence of record to merely Dr. Acampora's testimony on the prior art and disregard (1) Dr. Shamos' testimony, (2) Dr. Acampora's invalidity report, (3) Ameranth's prior art admissions in its interrogatory answers, (4) Keith McNally's admissions regarding the prior art, (5) Ameranth's former director of marketing Kathie Sanders's admissions regarding the prior art, (6) the PTO's rejections of the claims in Ameranth's continuation application based on the same prior art considered by the jury, (7) the PTO's rejection of McNally's declaration on alleged secondary considerations in examining the continuation application, and (8) the PTO's rejection of Ameranth's teaching away arguments on Micros and Kanevsky in the continuation application.

Based on the evidence of record – and not merely what Ameranth asks the Court to consider – the jury had more than sufficient evidence to reach a supportable verdict of obviousness. Rather than stick to the trial record, Ameranth wants the Court (1) to rely on evidence outside the record, (2) to usurp the jury's role by arguing Dr. Acampora was not forthright about his familiarity with TransPad, the content of his expert report, his understanding of Micros 8700, and his consideration of Ameranth's asserted secondary considerations, and (3) find the asserted claims valid based on limitations not found in the asserted claims and based on arguments that even the PTO has rejected. The trial record supports the jury finding that the asserted claims are invalid based on multiple independent combinations, and Ameranth's motion should be denied.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The jury heard about prior art from start to finish, and Dr. Acampora's report, which contained detailed claim charts on the prior art, even went back to the jury room. Ex. 9, 9/13/10 PM Tr. 115:22-116:9; 9/14/10 AM Tr. 11:17-22; Ex. 10, 9/13/10 PM Tr. 16:4-15; 19:8-22:3.

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.