

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

STARBUCKS CORPORATION  
Petitioner

v.

AMERANTH, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

CASE: To Be Assigned  
Patent No. 6,871,325 B1

---

**DECLARATION OF ABDELSALAM HELAL, PH.D.  
IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR  
COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT  
REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,871,325 B1**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Summary of Opinions.....	2
III. Qualifications and Experience.....	4
A. Education and Experience.....	4
B. Compensation.....	11
C. Documents and Other Materials Relied Upon.....	11
IV. Statement of Legal Principles.....	12
A. Claim Construction.....	12
B. Anticipation.....	13
C. Obviousness.....	13
D. The Written Description Requirement.....	14
E. The Enablement Requirement.....	15
F. The Definiteness Requirement.....	15
G. Patent-Eligible Subject Matter.....	15
V. Overview of the '325 Patent.....	16
A. Summary of the '325 Patent.....	16
B. State of the Art Prior to the '325 Patent.....	21
1. The Internet and Web-Based Applications.....	22
2. Handheld Computing Devices.....	24
a. Apple Newton PDA Devices.....	24
b. Nokia 9000i Communicator.....	28
c. Windows CE.....	29
d. Mobile Computing Software.....	30
3. Computer Technology in the Hospitality Industry.....	31
C. The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	34
VI. Identification of the Prior Art and Summary of Opinions.....	36
VII. Claim Construction.....	37
VIII. Unpatentability of the Challenged Claims of the '325 Patent.....	38

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
A. Grounds 1 – 8: Invalidity under § 112 .....	38
1. The “Hospitality Applications and Data” Limitations.....	38
a. Ground 1: The Challenged Claims are Invalid for Lack of Enablement Because of the “Hospitality Applications and Data” Limitations .....	39
b. Ground 2: The Challenged Claims are Invalid for Being Indefinite Because of the “Hospitality Applications and Data” Limitations .....	43
c. Ground 3: The Challenged Claims are Invalid for Lack of Written Description Because of the “Hospitality Applications and Data” Limitations .....	45
2. The “Communications Control Module” Limitations .....	47
a. Ground 4: The Challenged Claims are Invalid for Lack of Enablement Because of the “Communication Control Module” Limitations.....	47
b. Ground 5: The Challenged Claims are Invalid for Being Indefinite Because of the “Communication Control Module” Limitations .....	55
c. Ground 6: The Challenged Claims are Invalid for Lack of Written Description Because of the “Communication Control Module” Limitations.....	55
3. Ground 7: The Claims Are Invalid for Lack of Enablement Because the Specification Fails to Disclose the “Software Libraries” that Supposedly Enable the Claimed Subject Matter .....	56
4. Ground 8: The Challenged Claims are Invalid for Lack of Enablement Because Each of the Challenged Claims, as a Whole, is not Enabled .....	57
B. Grounds 9 - 12: Invalidity under pre-AIA § 103(a).....	58
1. Grounds 9 & 10: The Challenged Claims are Obvious Over Brandt in View of NetHopper, Carter, and Rossmann .....	58

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
a.    Ground 9: Claims 11-13 are obvious over Brandt in view of NetHopper and Carter .....	63
b.    Ground 10: Claim 15 is obvious over Brandt in view of NetHopper, Carter, and Rossmann.....	119
2.    Grounds 11 & 12: The Challenged Claims are Obvious Over Brandt in View of Demers, Alonso, Carter, and Rossmann .....	121
a.    Ground 11: Claims 11-13 are obvious over Brandt in view of Demers, Alonso, and Carter .....	124
b.    Ground 12: Claim 15 is obvious over Brandt in view of Demers, Alonso, Carter, and Rossmann .....	128
C.    Ground 13: The Challenged Claims are Patent-Ineligible under § 101 .....	128
IX.  Conclusion .....	135

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Abdelsalam Helal. I am a Professor in the Computer and Information Science and Engineering Department at the University of Florida (1998 – present), and a Finland Distinguished Professor at Aalto University, Finland (2011-2013).

2. I have been engaged by Starbucks Corporation (“Starbucks”) as a consultant in connection with Starbucks’ Petition for Covered Business Method Patent Review (“Starbucks CBM Petition”) of U.S. Patent No. 6,871,325 B1 (the “’325 patent”).

3. I understand that the ’325 patent has been assigned to Ameranth, Inc. (“Ameranth”). Ameranth is also referred to as the “Patent Owner” in this declaration.

4. This declaration is based on the information currently available to me. To the extent that additional information becomes available, I reserve the right to continue my investigation and study, which may include a review of documents and information that may be produced, as well as testimony from depositions that not yet been taken.

5. In forming my opinions, I have relied on information and evidence identified in this declaration, including the ’325 patent, the prosecution history of the ’325 patent, and prior art references including Japanese Published Appl. No.

# 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.