

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PRICELINE.COM LLC AND BOOKING.COM B.V.

Petitioners

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**

Petitioners' Exhibit List

| Exhibit No. | Description |
|-------------|--|
| 1001 | U.S. Patent No. 9,639,876 ('876 Patent) |
| 1002 | Declaration of Peter Kent |
| 1003 | RESERVED |
| 1004 | RESERVED |
| 1005 | RESERVED |
| 1006 | RESERVED |
| 1007 | RESERVED |
| 1008 | RESERVED |
| 1009 | RESERVED |
| 1010 | U.S. Patent No. 6,330,575 (<i>Moore</i>) |
| 1011 | U.S. Patent No. 6,016,504 (<i>Arnold</i>) |
| 1012 | Declaration of Nathaniel Borenstein |
| 1013 | " <i>Selling Online with First Virtual</i> ," 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 | <i>DDR Holdings, LLC, v. Hotels.com, L.P., et al.</i> , 773 F.3d 1245 (2014) |
| 1018 | BPAI Decision, <i>Ex parte</i> 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, <i>Ex parte</i> DDR Holdings, LLC, Appeal No. 2009-0013988, Reexamination Control No. 90/008,375, U.S. Patent No. 6,629,135, April 16, 2010 |
| 1020 | RESERVED |
| 1021 | Definition of "commission" - <u>The American Heritage Collegiate Dictionary</u> 280 (Robert B. Costello et al. eds., 3rd ed. 1997) |
| 1022 | Definition of "commission" - <u>Webster's New World Basic Dictionary of American English</u> 167-168 (Michael Agnes et al. eds., 1998) |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II. MANDATORY NOTICES | 1 |
| A. Real Party in Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)) | 1 |
| B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2))..... | 1 |
| C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3))..... | 6 |
| D. Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4)) | 6 |
| III. GROUNDS FOR STANDING..... | 7 |
| IV. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED FOR EACH CLAIM CHALLENGED | 7 |
| A. Claims for Which Review is Requested (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(1)) | 7 |
| B. Statutory Grounds of Challenge (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(2)) | 7 |
| 1. The Asserted References are Printed Publications and Available as Prior Art | 8 |
| 2. The Asserted Grounds are not Cumulative..... | 8 |
| V. REASONS FOR THE RELIEF REQUESTED UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.22(a)(2) AND 42.104(b)(4) | 9 |
| A. Background | 9 |
| 1. Field of Technology | 9 |
| 2. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art..... | 10 |
| 3. The '876 Patent | 10 |
| B. Claim Construction (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3))..... | 11 |
| 1. “ <i>merchants</i> ” (Claims 1, 3, 7, 11, 13, 17) | 11 |
| 2. “ <i>host</i> ” (Claims 1, 4, 6, 11, 14, 16) | 12 |
| 3. “ <i>commerce object</i> ” (Claims 1, 2, 3, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 17, 19) | 12 |
| 4. “ <i>commission</i> ” (Claims 4, 14) | 12 |

| | | |
|----|--|----|
| C. | The Challenged Claims Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103 | 13 |
| 1. | Ground 1: The Challenged Claims are anticipated by <i>Loshin</i> | 13 |
| | (a) Summary of <i>Loshin</i> | 13 |
| | (b) Claim 1 is anticipated by <i>Loshin</i> | 16 |
| | (c) Claim 2 is anticipated by <i>Loshin</i> | 26 |
| | (d) Claim 3 is anticipated by <i>Loshin</i> | 28 |
| | (e) Claim 4 is anticipated by <i>Loshin</i> | 29 |
| | (f) Claim 5 is anticipated by <i>Loshin</i> | 30 |
| | (g) Claim 7 is anticipated by <i>Loshin</i> | 31 |
| | (h) Claim 8 is anticipated by <i>Loshin</i> | 34 |
| | (i) Claim 11 is anticipated by <i>Loshin</i> | 35 |
| | (j) Claim 12 is anticipated by <i>Loshin</i> | 35 |
| | (k) Claim 13 is anticipated by <i>Loshin</i> | 35 |
| | (l) Claim 16 is anticipated by <i>Loshin</i> | 36 |
| | (m) Claim 17 is anticipated by <i>Loshin</i> | 36 |
| | (n) Claim 18 is anticipated by <i>Loshin</i> | 36 |
| 2. | Ground 2: The Challenged Claims are obvious in view of <i>Loshin</i> and the <i>InfoHaus Documents</i> | 36 |
| | (a) Summary of the <i>InfoHaus Documents</i> | 37 |
| | (b) Claim 1 is rendered obvious by <i>Loshin</i> in view of the <i>InfoHaus Documents</i> | 39 |
| | (c) Claim 7 is rendered obvious by <i>Loshin</i> in view of the <i>InfoHaus Documents</i> | 45 |
| | (d) Claim 11 is rendered obvious by <i>Loshin</i> in view of the <i>InfoHaus Documents</i> | 47 |
| | (e) Claim 16 is rendered obvious by <i>Loshin</i> in view of the <i>InfoHaus Documents</i> | 48 |
| | (f) Claim 17 is rendered obvious by <i>Loshin</i> in view of the <i>InfoHaus Documents</i> | 48 |

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 3. | Ground 3: The Challenged Claims are obvious in view of <i>Loshin</i> and <i>Moore</i> | 48 |
| (a) | Summary of <i>Moore</i> | 48 |
| (b) | Motivation to Combine <i>Loshin</i> and <i>Moore</i> | 50 |
| (c) | Claim 1 is rendered obvious by <i>Loshin</i> in view of <i>Moore</i> | 51 |
| (d) | Claim 2 is rendered obvious by <i>Loshin</i> in view of <i>Moore</i> | 62 |
| (e) | Claim 3 is rendered obvious by <i>Loshin</i> in view of <i>Moore</i> | 63 |
| (f) | Claim 4 is rendered obvious by <i>Loshin</i> in view of <i>Moore</i> | 65 |
| (g) | Claim 5 is rendered obvious by <i>Loshin</i> in view of <i>Moore</i> | 66 |
| (h) | Claim 7 is rendered obvious by <i>Loshin</i> in view of <i>Moore</i> | 67 |
| (i) | Claim 8 is rendered obvious by <i>Loshin</i> in view of <i>Moore</i> | 68 |
| (j) | Claim 11 is rendered obvious by <i>Loshin</i> in view of <i>Moore</i> | 69 |
| (k) | Claim 12 is rendered obvious by <i>Loshin</i> in view of <i>Moore</i> | 70 |
| (l) | Claim 13 is rendered obvious by <i>Loshin</i> in view of <i>Moore</i> | 70 |
| (m) | Claim 14 is rendered obvious by <i>Loshin</i> in view of <i>Moore</i> | 70 |
| (n) | Claim 15 is rendered obvious by <i>Loshin</i> in view of <i>Moore</i> | 70 |
| (o) | Claim 17 is rendered obvious by <i>Loshin</i> in view of <i>Moore</i> | 71 |
| (p) | Claim 18 is rendered obvious by <i>Loshin</i> in view of <i>Moore</i> | 71 |
| VI. | CONCLUSION..... | 71 |

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.