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

SHOPIFY, INC., Petitioner

v.

DDR HOLDINGS, LLC, Patent Owner

Case IPR2018-01011 U.S. Patent 9,639,876

PATENT OWNER'S SUR-REPLY



TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTSi
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iii
TABLE OF EXHIBITSiv
Summary1
Argument1
I. Ground 2: Moore does not anticipate the challenged claims
A. The Petition does not rely on inherency arguments2
B. Moore does not explicitly say Storefront Pages and Buy Pages should
have corresponding overall appearance2
C. Anticipation cannot be premised only on expert speculation about what a
POSITA supposedly "would understand from a disclosure."
D.Petitioner bears the burden of proof4
E. Petitioner fails to prove that its interpretation of Moore is necessary or
even plausible5
1. Petitioner relies on a set of assumptions not explicit in Moore5
2. Petitioner's interpretation is not required6
3. Petitioner's interpretation contradicts Moore's explicit teachings7
4. Petitioner's Reply fails to support its interpretation of Moore
a. "All/each/any" in Moore's section 6b refers to Storefront Pages10



b. The Reply newly tenders misleading, off-point arguments about page
creation, servlets, Java classes, and style components13
5. Other evidence calls into question Petitioner's interpretation and supports
Patent Owner's interpretation
a. Petitioner's Reply fails to dispute that the PTO examiner rejected its
interpretation of Moore18
b. Petitioner's witness presented technically inaccurate information and has
no answer to being "called out" on it
c. Petitioner's Reply fails to rebut the evidence that limitations on the
amount of information contained in a Price URL prevent making Buy Pages
look like complex Storefront Pages21
F. Dependent claims: The Reply simply ignores deficiencies in the
Petition's showing of anticipation (or obviousness, as to Ground 3)22
G.Because Moore does not teach corresponding overall visual appearance,
Moore does not anticipate any of the challenged claims24
II. Grounds 1 and 4: The Reply presents no additional argument about the
Digital River Publications24
III. Conclusion



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd., 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	4
King Pharms., Inc. v. Eon Labs., Inc., 616 F.3d 1267 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	2
Nidec Motor Corp. v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co., 851 F.3d 1270	
(Fed. Cir. 2017)	3
ParkerVision, Inc. v. Qualcomm Inc., 903 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	3
Personal Web Technologies, LLC v. Apple, Inc., No. 2018-1599 (Fed. Cir.	
Mar. 8, 2019)	2, 7
SRI Int'l, Inc. v. Cisco Systems, Inc., No. 2017-2223 (Fed. Cir. Mar. 20,	
2019)	3
Textron Inc. v. LLC, No. PGR2017-00035, 2018 WL 395662 (P.T.A.B. Jan.	
12, 2018)	4
Wasica Fin GmbH v Cont'l Auto Sys 853 F 3d 1272 (Fed Cir 2017)	



TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Ex. No.	Description
2001	U.S. Patent 6,993,572
2002	U.S. Patent 7,818,399
2003	Decision denying motion to dismiss, June 5, 2018, 17-498 (D. Del.)
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	List of Digital River references of record
2008	Compendium of Digital River references of record
2009	[Reserved]
2010	Moore-related charts from IDSs
2011	Arnold-related charts from IDSs
2012	Decision denying JMOL, June 20, 2013, 2:06-CV-00042-DF (E.D. Tex.)
2013	[Reserved]
2014	[Reserved]
2015	Claim construction order, Nov. 21, 2011, 2:06-CV-00042-DF (E.D. Tex.)
2016	[Reserved]
2017	Opinion denying Motion for Summary Judgment, Oct. 3, 2012, 2:06-CV-
	00042-DF (E.D. Tex.)
2018	[Reserved]
2019	[Reserved]
2020	[Reserved]
2021	Demonstrative exhibit showing where relied-on quotes from uncited
	Digital River exhibits are present in cited Digital River art of record
2022	[Reserved]
2023	[Reserved]
2024	Crosby Declaration in Support of Motion for <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> Admission
2025	Declaration of Dr. Arthur M. Keller, Ph.D.
2026	Keller CV
2027	Shamos deposition
2028	Demonstrative exhibit illustrating Tobin prior art patent's figures
2029	Images from Digital River prior art system discussed at E.D. Tex. trial
2030	[Reserved]
2031	Images discussed at E.D. Tex. trial as infringing overall visual matching
2032	URL containing all information necessary to display Moore Fig. 16
2033	Definition of "commission"
2034	Notice of Allowance and claims of continuation App SN 15/582,105



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.

