

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

STARBUCKS CORP.  
Petitioner

v.

AMERANTH, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case CBM2015-00099  
Patent No. 6,871,325

---

*Submitted Electronically via the Patent Review Processing System*

**CORRECTED PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
I. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED .....	1
II. INTRODUCTION.....	1
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	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” .....	6
7. “hospitality applications” .....	6
8. “application program interface” .....	11
9. “outside applications” .....	11
10. “integration” .....	11
11. “Wherein the communications control module is an interface between the hospitality applications and any other communications protocol” .....	11
12. “wherein the synchronized data relates to ‘orders,’ ‘waitlists’ and ‘reservations’” respectively as to claims 11, 12 and 13 .....	14
IV. THERE HAS BEEN NO SHOWING OF OBVIOUSNESS .....	18
A. Neither §103 Challenge 9 Or 11 Provides Disclosure Or Suggestion Of Hospitality Application Functionality.....	27
B. There is No Teaching Or Suggestion Of “A Central Database Containing Hospitality Applications And Data” .....	28
C. There Is No Disclosure Of Claims 11-13 First Wherein Clause .....	30
D. There Is No Disclosure Of Claims 11-13 Element “b” .....	37
E. There Is No Disclosure Of Claims 11-13Element “d” .....	44
F. Neither Reference Discloses The Claimed “Application Program	

Interface” That “Enables Integration of Outside Applications with the Hospitality Applications” .....	45
G. Brandt Fails To Disclose A “Communications Control Module” Nor “Wherein The Communications Control Module Is An Interface Between The Hospitality Applications And Any Other Communications Protocol” .....	46
H. Neither Combination 9 Or 11 Teaches The “Orders,” “Waitlists” And “Reservations’ Hospitality Aspects Of Claims 11-13 As Properly Construed .....	51
I. Objective Evidence Of Non-Obviousness .....	52
1. There is a very strong nexus between the evidence of "secondary considerations" and the challenged claims.....	55
2. The Ameranth patents in this family, including the challenged claims, have been successfully and extensively licensed .....	64
3. Ameranth's products enjoyed substantial, widespread commercial success .....	66
4. Ameranth's 21st Century Restaurant received numerous technology awards and industry acclaim after its introduction .....	68
5. Ameranth received overwhelming industry praise for the 21st Century Restaurant technology .....	70
6. Starbucks and numerous other companies copied the Ameranth technology reflected in the challenged claims .....	72
7. Other companies tried and failed to develop the integrated, synchronized Ameranth technology .....	78
8. Objective Evidence Conclusion .....	80
V. CONCLUSION.....	80

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Allen Archery, Inc. v. Browning Mfg. Co.</i> , 819 F.2d 1087 (Fed. Cir. 1987).....	70
<i>Ameranth v. Pizza Hut et al.</i> , Case No. 3-11-cv-01810 (S.D. Cal. 2013) .....	57
<i>Apple Inc. v. International Trade Commission</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	52
<i>Berk-Tek LLC v. Belden Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00059, FWD 34 (PTAB April 28, 2014) .....	36
<i>Crocs, Inc. v. ITC</i> , 598 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	72
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. National Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	36
<i>Eli Lilly &amp; Co. v. Zenith Goldline Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</i> , 471 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	68
<i>Gambro Lunda AB v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.</i> , 110 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	55, 70
<i>Heidelberger v. Hantscho Prods.</i> , 21 F.3d 1068, 1072 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	73
<i>HIMPP v. Hear-Wear Techs., LLC</i> , 751 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	37
<i>In re GPAC Inc.</i> , 57 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	55, 65-66

<i>In re Ratti</i> , 270 F.2d 810(CCPA 1959) .....	23
<i>In re Roufett</i> , 149 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....	65
<i>In re Van Geuns</i> , 988 F.2d 1181(Fed. Cir. 1993).....	9
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....	36
<i>Kurtz v. Belle Hat Lining Co., Inc.</i> , 280 F. 277 (2 <sup>nd</sup> Cir. 1922) .....	73
<i>Microsoft Corp.v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	3, 9
<i>PAR Pharma., Inc. v. TWI Pharm., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	21
<i>Power Integrations, Inc. v. Fairchild Semiconductor Int'l, Inc.</i> , 711 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	57
<i>Power-One v. Artesyn Techs, Inc.</i> , 599 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	70, 77
<i>Rambus Inc. v. Rea</i> , 731 F.3d 1248 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	70
<i>Teva Pharm., Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 723 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	55
<i>Vandenberg v. Dairy Equip. Co., a Div. of DEC Int'l, Inc.</i> , 740 F.2d 1560 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....	77

# 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.