

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

MAIL STOP PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Post Office Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Submitted Electronically via the Patent Review Processing System

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	1
II. INTRODUCTION.....	1
III. THE PETITION DOES NOT ESTABLISH STANDING.....	13
IV. OVERVIEW.....	14
A. 35 U.S.C. §103 Overview	14
B. Overview Of Helal Declaration Errors And Omissions.....	18
C. Overview Of Helal 2004 Patent Application	20
V. THE PETITION SHOULD BE REJECTED FOR IMPROPER INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE	24
VI. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	26
A. PO’s Proposals In Juxtaposition To Petitioner’s Flawed Invalidity Challenges	28
1. “wireless handheld computing device”	29
2. “central database”	29
3. “web page”	29
4. “communications control module”	29
5. “synchronized”	30
6. “applications and data are synchronized between the central database, at least one wireless handheld computing device, at least one web server and at least one web page”	30
7. “wireless handheld computing device on which hospitality applications and data are stored”	30
8. “hospitality applications”	32
9. “API,” “outside applications” and “integration”	33

10. “data is sent to a wireless paging device” 34

VII. PETITIONER HAS NOT SHOWN THAT ANY OF CLAIMS 11-13 OR 15 ARE MORE LIKELY THAN NOT INVALID UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112 35

 A. “Hospitality Applications And Data” 36

 1. Enablement 36

 2. Definiteness..... 40

 3. Written Description..... 40

 B. “Communications Control Module” 41

 1. Enablement 41

 2. Definiteness..... 42

 3. Written Description..... 43

 C. “Software Libraries” 43

 D. “Claims As A Whole” Are Enabled..... 44

VIII. PETITIONER HAS NOT SHOWN THAT ANY OF CLAIMS 11-13 OR 15 ARE MORE LIKELY THAN NOT OBVIOUS 45

 A. Overview..... 45

 B. No Challenge Provides A Teaching Or Suggestion Of “A Central Database Containing Hospitality Applications And Data” 52

 C. No Challenge Provides Disclosure of A Teaching Or Suggestion Of “Hospitality Applications And Data” Which Are “Stored” On A Wireless Handheld Computing Device..... 54

 D. No Challenge Identifies A Teaching or Suggestion Of “At Least One Web Page On Which Hospitality Applications And Data Are Stored” As Recited By Claim 12 57

 E. No Challenge Provides A Teaching Or Suggestion Of The “Communications Control Module” Functionality Of Claim 12 58

 F. No Challenge Identifies A Teaching Or Suggestion Of “Wherein

Applications And Data Are Synchronized Between The Central Data Base, At Least One Wireless Handheld Computing Device, At Least One Web Server And At Least One Web Page” 59

G. No Challenge Provides Disclosure Or Suggestion Of Hospitality Application Functionality As Required By Claims 11-13 And 15 62

H. Integration/API/Outside Applications..... 64

I. Dependent Claim 15..... 65

J. Objective Evidence Of Non-Obviousness..... 65

IX. PETITIONER HAS NOT SHOWN THAT ANY OF CLAIMS 11-13 OR 15 ARE MORE LIKELY THAN NOT INVALID UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101 75

X. CONCLUSION 80

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Cases</u>	
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon, Inc.</i> 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	47-48
<i>Agilysys, Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc.</i> CBM2014-00015 (Paper 20) (Mar. 26, 2014).....	36
<i>Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank Intl.</i> 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014)	75, 76, 77, 78, 79
<i>Allen Archery, Inc. v. Browning Mfg. Co.</i> 819 F.2d 1087 (Fed. Cir. 1987).....	70
<i>Amgen, Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc.</i> 314 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	39
<i>Apple v. ContentGuard, Inc.</i> CBM2015-00046, Paper 12.....	14
<i>Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	36, 41
<i>Biosig Instruments, Inc. v. Nautilus, Inc.</i> No. 2014-1289, at 6-7 (Fed. Cir. Apr. 27, 2015).....	36
<i>Bloomberg L.P. v. Quest Corp.</i> CBM2014-00205, Paper No. 16.....	13-14
<i>CAE Screenplates Inc. v. Heinrich Fiedler GmbH & Co. KG</i> 224 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	33
<i>CBS v. Sylvania., Inc.</i> 415 F.2d 719 (1st Cir. 1969), <i>cert. denied</i> , 396 U.S. 1061 (1970).....	68
<i>Cisco Systems, Inc., v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 at 10 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2014).....	25

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.