

PETITION FOR POST-GRANT REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,871,325

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

EXPEDIA, INC., FANDANGO, LLC, HOTEL TONIGHT INC., HOTWIRE, INC., HOTELS.COM, L.P., KAYAK SOFTWARE CORP., LIVE NATION ENTERTAINMENT, INC., MICROS SYSTEMS, INC., ORBITZ, LLC, OPENTABLE, INC., PAPA JOHN'S USA, INC., STUBHUB, INC., TICKETMASTER, LLC, TRAVELOCITY.COM LP, WANDERSPOT LLC, PIZZA HUT, INC., PIZZA HUT OF AMERICA, INC., DOMINO'S PIZZA, INC., DOMINO'S PIZZA, LLC, GRUBHUB, INC., SEAMLESS NORTH AMERICA, LLC, ORDR.IN, INC., MOBO SYSTEMS, INC., STARBUCKS CORPORATION, EVENTBRITE, INC., BEST WESTERN INTERNATIONAL, INC., HILTON RESORTS CORP., HILTON WORLDWIDE, INC., HILTON INTERNATIONAL CO., HYATT CORPORATION, MARRIOTT INTERNATIONAL, INC., STARWOOD HOTELS & RESORTS WORLDWIDE, INC., AGILYSYS, INC., USABLENET, INC., AND APPLE INC.

Petitioners

v.

AMERANTH, INC.

Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 6,871,325
Issue date: March 22, 2005

Title: Information Management and Synchronous Communications System
with Menu Generation

CBM: Unassigned

PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,871,325 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 321
AND § 18 OF THE LEAHY-SMITH AMERICA INVENTS ACT

PETITION FOR POST-GRANT REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,871,325

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

 A. The Challenged Claims Fail to Satisfy the Written Description
 and Definiteness Requirement of § 1125

 B. The Challenged Claims Fail to Claim Patentable Subject Matter
 under § 1018

II. REQUIRED DISCLOSURES10

 A. Mandatory Notices10

 1. Real Parties-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)) 10

 2. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2))..... 12

 3. Lead and Back-Up Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3))..... 17

 4. Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4))..... 19

 B. Filing Date Requirements.....20

 1. Compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.304..... 21

 2. Certificate of Service on Patent Owner (37 C.F.R. §
 42.205(a))..... 21

 3. The Filing Fee (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.15(b) and 42.203(a))..... 21

 C. Additional Disclosures22

 1. At Least One Challenged Claim Is Unpatentable (37
 C.F.R. § 42.208(c))..... 22

 2. Eligibility Based on Time of Filing (37 C.F.R. § 42.303)..... 22

PETITION FOR POST-GRANT REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,871,325

1.	The '325 Patent Does Not Provide a Written Description Sufficient to Describe the Later Presented Continuation Claims Directed to a "Synchronous Communications System" When Only Use of a Local Database is Described In the Original Specification	42
2.	Claims 8-9 Fail to Satisfy the Written Description Requirement	48
B.	The Challenged Claims Are Indefinite for Mixing Apparatus and Method Elements.....	52
C.	Claims 11-15 Are Indefinite.....	56
VI.	THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE INVALID UNDER § 101.....	58
A.	Section 101 Analysis.....	58
B.	The Challenged Claims Impermissibly Claim An Abstract Idea.....	61
C.	The Challenged Claims Also Fail the "Machine or Transformation Test"	71
D.	The Challenged Claims Are Invalid Under <i>Mayo</i>	75
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	78

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Accenture Global Servs., GMBH v. Guidewire Software, Inc.</i> , No. 2011-1486, 2013 WL 4749919 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 5, 2013)	8, 77
<i>Ameranth, Inc. v. Menusoft Sys. Corp.</i> , No. 2:07-CV-271, 2010 WL 4952758 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 20, 2010)	3, 4, 51
<i>In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech Ctr.</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	38
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc.</i> , 314 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	47
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly and Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (<i>en banc</i>)	41
<i>Athletic Alternatives, Inc. v. Prince Mfg., Inc.</i> , 73 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	56
<i>Bancorp Servs., LLC v Sun Life Assurance Co. of Canada</i> , 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	59, 63, 65, 67, 71
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 130 S. Ct. 3218 (2010) (“ <i>Bilski II</i> ”).....	8, 58, 59, 60, 71, 74, 75
<i>CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.</i> , 288 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	51
<i>CLS Bank International v. Alice Corporation Pty. Ltd.</i> , 717 F.3d 1269 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	58, 59, 60, 66, 70
<i>Compression Tech. Solutions LLC v. EMC Corp.</i> , 2013 WL 2368039 (N.D. Cal. May 29, 2013).....	58, 59, 74

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.