Paper No. 1

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SHOPIFY, INC.

Petitioner

v.

DDR HOLDINGS, LLC

Patent Owner

U.S. Patent 9,639,876

TITLE: METHOD AND COMPUTER SYSTEM FOR SERVING COMMERCE INFORMATION OF AN OUTSOURCE PROVIDER IN CONNECTION WITH HOST WEB PAGES OFFERING COMMERCIAL OPPORTUNITIES

Issue Date May 2, 2017

PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 312

DOCKET

Petitioners' Exhibit List

Exhibit	Description
No.	
1001	U.S. Patent No. 9,639,876 ('876 Patent)
1002	Declaration of Michael Shamos
1003	RESERVED
1004	RESERVED
1005	RESERVED
1006	RESERVED
1007	RESERVED
1008	RESERVED
1009	RESERVED
1010	U.S. Patent No. 6,330,575 (Moore)
1011	U.S. Patent No. 6,016,504 (Arnold)
1012	Declaration of Nathaniel Borenstein
1013	"Selling Online with First Virtual," by Pete Loshin (Published 1996)
1014	First Virtual Seller Programs Webpage (June 1997)
1015	First Virtual InfoHaus Guide Webpages (June 1997)
1016	First Virtual InfoHaus HelpMeister (June 1997)
1017	DDR Holdings, LLC, v. Hotels.com, L.P., et al., 773 F.3d 1245 (2014)
1018	BPAI Decision, Ex parte DDR Holdings, LLC, Appeal No. 2009-
	0013987, Reexamination Control No. 90/008,374, U.S. Patent No.
	6,993,572, April 16, 2010
1019	BPAI Decision, Ex parte DDR Holdings, LLC, Appeal No. 2009-
	0013988, Reexamination Control No. 90/008,375, U.S. Patent No.
	6,629,135, April 16, 2010
1020	Affidavit of Christopher Butler, Office Manager at the Internet Archive
1021	Definition of "commission" - <u>The American Heritage Collegiate</u>
	Dictionary 280 (Robert B. Costello et al. eds., 3rd ed. 1997)
1022	Definition of "commission" - Webster's New World Basic Dictionary
	of American English 167-168 (Michael Agnes et al. eds., 1998)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION				
II.	MANDATORY NOTICES1				
	A.	Real	Party in Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))1		
	B.	Relat	ted Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2))1		
	C.	Lead	and Back-Up Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3))4		
	D.	Servi	ice Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4))4		
III.	GRO	UNDS	FOR STANDING4		
IV.			NT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED FOR EACH CLAIM GED5		
	A.	Clair	ns for Which Review is Requested (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(1))5		
	B.	Statu	tory Grounds of Challenge (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(2))		
		1.	The Asserted References are Printed Publications and Available as Prior Art		
		2.	The Asserted Grounds are not Cumulative6		
V.			FOR THE RELIEF REQUESTED UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.22(a)(2) AND		
	A.	Back	ground7		
		1.	Field of Technology7		
		2.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art7		
		3.	The '876 Patent		
	B.	Clair	n Construction (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3))9		
		1.	"merchants" (Claims 1, 3, 7, 11, 13, 17)9		
		2.	"host" (Claims 1, 4, 6, 11, 14, 16)9		
		3.	"commerce object" (Claims 1, 2, 3, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 17, 19)10		
		4.	"commission" (Claims 4, 14)10		
	C.	The	Challenged Claims Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 10310		
		1.	Ground 1: The Challenged Claims are anticipated by Loshin10		
			 (a) Summary of Loshin		

	(e) Claim 4 is anticipated by Loshin	26
	(f) Claim 5 is anticipated by Loshin	
	(g) Claim 7 is anticipated by Loshin	28
	(h) Claim 8 is anticipated by Loshin	
	(i) Claim 11 is anticipated by Loshin	32
	(j) Claim 12 is anticipated by Loshin	32
	(k) Claim 13 is anticipated by Loshin	
	(l) Claim 16 is anticipated by Loshin	
	(m) Claim 17 is anticipated by Loshin	
	(n) Claim 18 is anticipated by Loshin	33
2.	Ground 2: The Challenged Claims are obvious in view of Loshin and the InfoHaus Documents	
	(a) Summary of the InfoHaus Documents	31
	(b) Claim 1 is rendered obvious by Loshin in view of the InfoHaus	54
	Documents	36
	(c) Claim 7 is rendered obvious by Loshin in view of the InfoHaus	50
	Documents	42
	(d) Claim 11 is rendered obvious by Loshin in view of the InfoHaus	т2
	Documents	43
	(e) Claim 16 is rendered obvious by Loshin in view of the InfoHaus	15
	Documents	44
	(f) Claim 17 is rendered obvious by Loshin in view of the InfoHaus	• •
	Documents	44
3.	Ground 3: The Challenged Claims are obvious in view of Loshin and	
5.	Moore	44
	(b) Motivation to Combine Loshin and Moore	
	(c) Claim 1 is rendered obvious by Loshin in view of Moore	
	(d) Claim 2 is rendered obvious by Loshin in view of Moore	
	(e) Claim 3 is rendered obvious by Loshin in view of Moore	
	(f) Claim 4 is rendered obvious by Loshin in view of Moore	
	(g) Claim 5 is rendered obvious by Loshin in view of Moore	
	(h) Claim 7 is rendered obvious by Loshin in view of Moore	
	(i) Claim 8 is rendered obvious by Loshin in view of Moore	
	(j) Claim 11 is rendered obvious by Loshin in view of Moore	
	 (k) Claim 12 is rendered obvious by Loshin in view of Moore (l) Claim 13 is rendered abvious by Loshin in view of Moore 	
	(1) Claim 13 is rendered obvious by Loshin in view of Moore	
	(m) Claim 14 is rendered obvious by Loshin in view of Moore	
	(n) Claim 15 is rendered obvious by Loshin in view of Moore	
	(o) Claim 17 is rendered obvious by Loshin in view of Moore	
	(p) Claim 18 is rendered obvious by Loshin in view of Moore	
CONCLUSIC)N	67

VI.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

DDR Holdings, LLC v. Booking.com B.V., Civil Action No. 17-499(D. Del. 2017)1
<i>DDR Holdings, LLC, v. Hotels.com, L.P., et al.,</i> 773 F.3d 1245 (2014)2
<i>DDR Holdings, LLC, v. Hotels.com, L.P., et al.,</i> 954 F.Supp.2d 509 (E.D. Tex. 2013)
DDR Holdings, LLC v. Priceline.com, LLC, Civil Action No. 17-498 (D. Del. 2017)1
DDR Holdings, LLC v. Shopify, Inc., Civil Action No. 17-501 (D. Del. 2018)2
DDR Holdings, LLC v. TicketNetwork, Inc., Civil Action No. 17-500 (D. Del. 2017)1
DDR Holdings, LLC v. Travel Holdings, Inc., and Tourico Holidays, Inc.,
Civil Action No. 17-502 (D. Del. 2017)2
Priceline Group Inc. v. DDR Holdings, LLC, IPR2018-00482
Statutes
35 U.S.C. § 101
35 U.S.C. § 102
35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103
35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103(a)67
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
35 U.S.C. § 312
California Rules of Court
Rule 42.104(b)(4)10
Other Authorities
37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e)

DOCKET A L A R M



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.