

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

AMERANTH, INC.)
)
 Plaintiff,) Civil Action No. 2:22-cv-1776-WSH
)
 v.)
)
 DOORDASH, INC.)
)
 Defendant.)
 _____)

**PLAINTIFF AMERANTH, INC'S OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS FOR IMPROPER VENUE, OR
ALTERNATIVELY, TO TRANSFER, AND FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM**

Vincent A. Coppola
PRIBANIC & PRIBANIC
513 Court Place
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Telephone: (412) 281-8844
Facsimile: (412) 281-474

Richard C. Weinblatt (*pro hac vice*)
Stamoulis & Weinblatt LLC
800 N. West Street, Third Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801
Telephone: (302) 999-1540
Facsimile: (302) 762-1688

*Attorneys for Plaintiff
Ameranth, Inc.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	2
III. LEGAL STANDARDS.....	3
A. Venue	3
B. Rule 12(b)(6) Motion.....	4
C. Patentability Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and the Presumption of Validity.....	4
IV. ARGUMENT	5
A. Venue Is Proper in This District	5
1. DoorDash Has Committed and Continues to Commit Acts of Patent Infringement in Pittsburgh.....	5
a. DoorDash Has a Regular and Established Place of Business in This District.....	6
2. In the Alternative, the Court Should Permit Venue Discovery or Transfer the Case to Delaware.....	12
B. DoorDash Fails to Meet Its Burden to Prove the Claims Are Invalid.....	12
1. <i>Alice</i> Step One: DoorDash Misconstrues the Claims and Fails to Show That They Are Directed to an Abstract Idea	14
a. DoorDash Improperly Generalizes the Claims.....	16
b. A Proper <i>Alice</i> Step One Analysis Confirms The '130 Patent Claims Are Directed to the Improved Web Server Computers and Are Patent-Eligible.....	19
c. The Claims Are Not Purely Functional and the "How" is in the Claims as Confirmed by POSITA Dr. Goodrich.....	24
2. <i>Alice</i> Step Two: DoorDash Fails to Prove a Lack of an Inventive Concept—Which POSITA Dr. Goodrich Confirmed Exists.....	25
C. DoorDash's Continued Infringement Of The '130 Claims Has Been Willful	29
VIII. CONCLUSION.....	30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
Cases	
<i>Aatrix Software, Inc. v. Green Shades Software, Inc.</i> , 882 F.3d 1121 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	5, 22
<i>ACS Hosp. Systems, Inc. v. Montefiore Hosp.</i> , 732 F.2d 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....	22
<i>AlexSam, Inc. v. Cigna Corp.</i> , Case No. 2:20-cv-00081-JRG-RSP, 2020 WL 7233403 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 26, 2020).....	19
<i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int'l</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....	passim
<i>Arch v. American Tobacco Co.</i> , 984 F. Supp. 830 (E.D. Pa. 1997)	9
<i>Ariosa Diagnostics, Inc. v. Sequenom, Inc.</i> , 788 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	28
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009)	4
<i>BASCOM Global Internet Services, Inc. v. AT&T Mobility LLC</i> , 827 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	17, 26
<i>Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007)	4
<i>Berkheimer v. HP Inc.</i> , 881 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	5, 16, 25
<i>BillJCo, LLC v. Cisco Sys. Inc.</i> , No. 21-CV-00181-JRG, 2021 WL 6618529 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 30, 2021)	30
<i>Bio-Rad Laboratories, Inc. v. International Trade Commission</i> , 998 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2021)...	17
<i>BlackBerry Ltd. v. Nokia Corp.</i> , No. 17-CV-155-RGA, 2018 WL 1401330 (D. Del. Mar. 20, 2018)	30
<i>Campos v. Ticketmaster Corp.</i> , 140 F.3d 1166 (8th Cir. 1998).....	10
<i>Cellspin Soft, Inc. v. Fitbit, Inc.</i> , 927 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	5
<i>ClubCom, Inc. v. Captive Media, Inc.</i> , No. 02:07cv1462, 2008 WL 2036907 (W.D. Pa. May 9, 2008)	11
<i>Communication Interface Techs., LLC v. Albertson's LLC</i> , Civ. No. 4:20-CV-550-SDJ, 2021 WL 4453580 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 29, 2021)	17
<i>Cooperative Ent., Inc. v. Kollektive Tech., Inc.</i> , 50 F.4th 127 (Fed. Cir. 2022).....	22, 23
<i>Core Wireless Licensing S.A.R.L. v. LG Elecs., Inc.</i> , 880 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	13

<i>Cosmokey Sols. GMBH & Co. KG v. Duo Sec. LLC</i> , 15 F.4th 1091 (Fed. Cir. 2021).....	21
<i>Data Engine Techs. LLC v. Google LLC</i> , 906 F.3d 999 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	15
<i>Directory Dividends, Inc. v. SBC Communications, Inc.</i> , No. Civ.A. 01-CV-1974, 2003 WL 21961448 (E.D. Pa. July 2, 2003)	9
<i>Doe v. Unocal Corp.</i> , 248 F.3d 915 (9th Cir. 2001)	9
<i>Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 822 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	passim
<i>Erickson v. Pardus</i> , 551 U.S. 89 (2007)	4
<i>Fellner v. Philadelphia Toboggan Coasters, Inc.</i> , 2005 WL 2660351 (E.D. Pa. Oct.18, 2005).....	11
<i>Halo Elecs., Inc. v. Pulse Elecs.</i> , 579 U.S. 93 (2016).....	30
<i>Health Discovery Corp. v. Intel Corp.</i> , 577 F. Supp. 3d 570 (W.D. Tex. 2021).....	13
<i>Heft v. AAI Corp.</i> , 355 F.Supp.2d 757 (M.D. Pa. 2005).....	11
<i>Hoffman v. Blaski</i> , 363 U.S. 3353 (1960).....	1
<i>Hooper v. Safety-Kleen Sys., Inc.</i> , 2:16-cv-123, 2016 WL 7212586 (W.D. Pa. Dec. 13, 2016) ...	9, 10
<i>In re Cray Inc.</i> , 871 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	4, 6, 12
<i>In re EMC Corp.</i> , 501 Fed. Appx. 973 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	1
<i>In re Enter. Litig.</i> , 735 F. Supp. 2d 277 (W.D. Pa. 2010)	9
<i>In re Latex Gloves Prod. Liab. Litig.</i> , 2001 WL 964105 (E.D. Pa. Aug. 22, 2001)	10
<i>In re Nelson</i> , 280 F.2d 172 (C.C.P.A. 1960), <i>rev'd on other grounds</i> , <i>In re Kirk</i> , 376 F.2d 936 (C.C.P.A. 1967)	27
<i>In re Nintendo Co.</i> , 544 F. Appx. 9341 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	2
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. J. Crew Grp., Inc.</i> , No. 6:16-CV-196-JRG, 2016 WL 4591794, (E.D. Tex. Aug. 24, 2016).....	19
<i>International Business Machines Corp. v. Expedia, Inc.</i> , Civil Action No. 17-1875-LPS-CJB, 2019 WL 1571680 (D. Del. Apr. 11, 2019), <i>report and recommendation adopted</i> , 2019 WL 4635137 (D. Del. Sept. 24, 2019)	7
<i>Javelin Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs. Ltd.</i> , No. CV 16-224-LPS, 2017 WL 5953296 (D. Del. Dec. 1, 2017)	12
<i>Kinetic Instruments, Inc. v. Lares</i> , 802 F. Supp. 976 (S.D.N.Y. 1992).....	9

<i>Lockhart v. Garzella</i> , No. 3:19-cv-00405, 2020 WL 6146598 (S.D. Ohio Oct. 20, 2020).....	8
<i>Luminati Networks Ltd. v. Code200, UAB</i> , No. 2:19-CV-00396-JRG, 2021 WL 467591 (E.D. Tex. Fed. 9, 2021)	19
<i>Mallinckrodt IP v. B. Braun Medical Inc.</i> , C.A. No. 17-365-LPS, 2017 WL 6383610 (D. Del. Dec. 14, 2017).....	12
<i>Maxell, Ltd. v. Apple Inc.</i> , No. 5:19-CV-00036-RWS, 2020 WL 8269548 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 17, 2020)	26
<i>McRO, Inc. v. Bandai Namco Games Am. Inc.</i> , 837 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	14, 24, 27
<i>Mentor Graphics Corp. v. EVE-USA, Inc.</i> , 851 F.3d 1275 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	30
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. i4i Ltd. P'ship</i> , 564 U.S. 91 (2011).....	16
<i>Miller Yacht Sales, Inc. v. Smith</i> , 384 F.3d 93 (3d Cir. 2004)	8
<i>Minnesota Mining & Mfg. Co. v. Eco Chem, Inc.</i> , 757 F.2d 1256 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	9
<i>Mirror Imaging, LLC v. PNC Bank</i> , No. W-21-CV-00518-ADA, 2022 WL 229363 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 26, 2022).....	13
<i>Natera, Inc. v. ArcherDX, Inc.</i> , C.A. No. 20-125-LPS, 2020 WL 6043929 (D. Del. Oct. 13, 2020), <i>aff'd sub nom. Ameranth, Inc. v. Olo Inc.</i> , 2021-1211, 2021 WL 4699180 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 8, 2021) (mem.), <i>cert. denied</i> , 142 S. Ct. 2814 (2022).....	passim
<i>Neonode Smartphone LLC v. Samsung Elecs Co.</i> , 6:20-CV-00507-ADA (W.D. Tex. June 27, 2023)	30
<i>Personalized Media Solutions, LLC v. Netflix Inc.</i> , 1:20-cv-3708-GHW, 2020 WL 4345781 (S.D.N.Y. July 28, 2020)	15
<i>Rates Technology, Inc. v. Mediatrice Telecom, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 742 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	15
<i>Schmidt v. Skolas</i> , 770 F.3d 241 (3d Cir. 2014).....	20
<i>Serras v. First Tenn. Bank Nat'l Ass'n</i> , 875 F.2d 1212 (6th Cir. 1989).....	8
<i>Slyce Acquisition v. Syte - Visual Conception</i> , No. W-19-CV-00257-ADA, 2020 WL 278481 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 10, 2020)	13
<i>SRI Int'l v. Matsushita Elec. Corp.</i> , 775 F.2d 1107 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	18
<i>Summit 6, LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 802 F.3d 1283 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	19
<i>TC Heartland LLC v. Kraft Foods Group Brands LLC</i> , 137 S. Ct. 1514 (2017)	4

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.