

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

Case IPR2018-01012
U.S. Patent 9,043,228

Case IPR2018-01014
U.S. Patent 8,515,825

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Issues addressed	1
Argument.....	2
I. Overview of DDR patents, challenged claims, and file histories.....	2
II. The Petitions offer no reason for instituting IPRs to reconsider prior art addressed during examination and litigation.	13
A. The examiner thoroughly considered the relied-upon art.	13
B. The Petitions conceal the duplication and fail to explain why the Board should undertake a fresh consideration.	17
C. The Petitions ignore “informative” rulings placing the burden on Petitioner to justify re-evaluation of previously considered art.	18
III. None of the references disclose corresponding “overall appearance” between a host and an outsource provider page, as claimed.	23
A. Construction of key terms.	24
1. “Merchant”	25
2. “Commerce object”	25
3. “Outsource provider”	27
4. “Host/owner”	28
B. Ground 1: Digital River does not obviate the claims.	28
C. Ground 2: Moore does not anticipate the claims.....	33

D. Ground 3: Adding Arnold to Moore does not obviate the claims.....37

E. Ground 4: The combination of Moore and the Digital River Publications
does not obviate the claims.37

IV. The Board should not institute an IPR proceeding.....38

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Cases**

<i>Becton Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Mesungen AG</i> , IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (Bd. App. Dec. 15, 2017) (informative)	19
<i>Cultec, Inc. v. StormTech LLC</i> , IPR2017-00777, Paper No. 7 (Bd. App. Aug. 22, 2017) (informative).....	21
<i>DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.</i> , 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	passim
<i>DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.</i> , 954 F. Supp. 2d 509 (E.D. Tex. 2013)	2, 23, 29
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	13
<i>Hospira, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-00739, Paper No. 16 (Bd. App. July 27, 2017).....	33
<i>Nu Mark LLC v. Fontem Holdings I, B.V.</i> , IPR201601309, Paper 11 (Bd. App. Dec. 15, 2016).....	21, 22
<i>Unified Patent, Inc. v. Berman</i> , IPR2016-01571, Paper 10 (Bd. App. Dec. 14, 2016) (informative).....	18, 20

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 313	1
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	passim
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	1, 13, 19, 33

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.107(b)	1
-----------------------------	---

Rules

<i>Trial Practice Guide</i> , 77 Fed. Reg. 48756 (Aug. 14, 2012).....	33
---	----

Treatises

R. Lee, “The PTAB Establishes Standards for Exercising Discretion to Deny Institution Under § 314(a) and § 325(d),” <i>Buchanan PTAB Report</i> (Oct. 27, 2017)	19
---	----

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	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	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	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]

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.