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

SHOPIFY, INC., Petitioner

v.

DDR HOLDINGS, LLC, Patent Owner

Case IPR2018-01008 U.S. Patent 9,639,876

Case IPR2018-01009 U.S. Patent 9,043,228

Case IPR2018-01010 U.S. Patent 8,515,825

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Iss | ues addressed | 1 |
|------|---|------------------------------|
| Ar | gument | 2 |
| I. | Overview of DDR patents, challenged claims, a | nd file histories2 |
| II. | The Petitions offer no reason why the InfoHaus | art in these Petitions are |
| noi | n-duplicative of the Digital River art in the other | Petitions, which the |
| exa | aminer addressed | 9 |
| III. | . None of the references disclose corresponding " | overall appearance" |
| bet | tween a host and an outsource provider page, as c | laimed14 |
| A | A. Construction of key terms | 15 |
| | 1. "Merchant" | 15 |
| | 2. "Commerce object" | 16 |
| | 3. "Outsource provider" | 18 |
| | 4. "Host/owner" | 18 |
| E | 3. Ground 1: Loshin does not anticipate the clair | ns19 |
| | 1. The Petitions fail to show that the "page pai | r" shown in Loshin meets the |
| | claim language | 20 |
| | 2. The Petitions fail to show Loshin teaching v | risual correspondence of |
| | "overall appearance." | 24 |
| | 3 The Petitions fail to show anticipation by Lo | oshin 29 |



| Page ii Case Nos. IPR2018-01008, 09, 10 | U.S. Patents 8,515,825, |
|--|---------------------------|
| | 9,043,228 & 9,639,876 |
| C. Ground 2: Adding the "InfoHaus Documents" | does not address the |
| claim limitations missing from Loshin | 29 |
| D. Ground 3: The combination of Moore and Los | shin does not obviate the |
| claims | 32 |
| IV. The Board should not institute an IPR proceeding | ıg36 |



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

| 8 (Bd. App. Dec. 15, 2017) (informative) | 13 |
|--|------------|
| Canon Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC, IPR2014-00535, Paper 9 (Bd. | |
| App. Sept. 24, 2014) | 13 |
| Continental Can Co. USA v. Monsanto Co., 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991)2 | 28 |
| Corelogic, Inc. v. Boundary Solutions, Inc., IPR2015-00219, Paper 6 (Bd. | 10 |
| App. May 21, 2015) | 13 |
| Cultec, Inc. v. StormTech LLC, IPR2017-00777, Paper No. 7 (Bd. App. Aug. 22, 2017) (informative) | 1 1 |
| DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P., 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014) passi | |
| • | 111 |
| DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P., 954 F. Supp. 2d 509 (E.D. Tex. | 2 |
| 2013) | |
| Ex parte Clapp, 227 USPQ 972 (Bd. Pat. App. & Interf. 1985) | |
| Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech, Inc., 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016) | .9 |
| Hospira, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc., IPR2017-00739, Paper No. 16 (Bd. App. | 3 0 |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 29 |
| Medtronic, Inc. v. Nuvasive, Inc., IPR2014-00487, Paper 8 (Bd. App. Sept. | 12 |
| 11, 2014) | 13 |
| Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. | 30 |
| 1987) | 28 |
| Statutes | |
| 35 U.S.C. § 313 | .1 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) | 29 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) | 29 |
| Other Authorities | |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(b) | .1 |
| Rules | |
| MPEP 2131 | 28 |
| MPEP 2131.01(III) | |
| MPEP 706.02(j) | |
| Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756 (Aug. 14, 2012) | |



TABLE OF EXHIBITS

| Ex. No. | Description |
|---------|---|
| 2001 | U.S. Patent 6,993,572 |
| 2002 | U.S. Patent 7,818,399 |
| 2003 | D. Del. decision denying motion to dismiss |
| 2004 | File history of S.N. 12/906,979 (issued as U.S. Patent 8,515,825) |
| 2005 | File history of S.N. 13/970,515 (issued as U.S. Patent 9,043,228) |
| 2006 | File history of S.N. 14/719,009 (issued as U.S. Patent 9,639,876) |
| 2007 | [Reserved] |
| 2008 | [Reserved] |
| 2009 | [Reserved] |
| 2010 | [Reserved] |
| 2011 | [Reserved] |
| 2012 | Memorandum Opinion and Order denying JMOL and new trial motions, |
| | Case No. 2:06-CV-00042-DF-CMC, June 20, 2013 |
| 2013 | [Reserved] |
| 2014 | [Reserved] |
| 2015 | Claim Construction Order, Case No. 2:06-CV-00042-DF-CMC, |
| | November 21, 2011 |
| 2016 | [Reserved] |
| 2017 | Opinion & Order denying Digital River's Motion for Summary |
| | Judgment, Case No. 2:06-CV-00042-DF-CMC, October 3, 2012 |
| 2018 | [Reserved] |
| 2019 | [Reserved] |
| 2020 | [Reserved] |
| 2021 | [Reserved] |
| 2022 | [Reserved] |
| 2023 | Letter from Shopify counsel |



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.

