

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

AMERANTH, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

DOORDASH, INC.,

Defendant.

C.A. No.: 2:22-cv-1776-WSH

**REPLY IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS
FOR IMPROPER VENUE, OR ALTERNATIVELY, TO TRANSFER,
AND FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Venue Remains Improper in This District 1

 A. Ameranth Misconstrues the Public Statements Regarding DashMart..... 1

 B. Ameranth Conflates the Test for Venue in a Patent Infringement Suit with the Test for Personal Jurisdiction 3

 C. DoorDash Essentials and DoorDash Maintain Corporate Separateness 5

 D. Venue Discovery Should be Denied 7

II. The Asserted '130 Patent is Invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 101 8

 A. The Claimed Invention Fails Under *Alice* Step One..... 9

 1. The *Olo* Decision is Highly Instructive 9

 2. The '130 Patent Claims Are Not Directed to Improvements to Web Server Computers 11

 a. “Parallel Operational Capabilities” 11

 b. “Automatic Reflection” 13

 B. The Claimed Invention Fails under *Alice* Step Two 14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank International</i> , 573 U.S. 208 (2014).....	9, 11, 14, 15
<i>Ameranth, Inc. v. Domino's Pizza, LLC</i> , 792 F. App'x. 780 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Andra Grp., LP v. Victoria's Secret Stores, L.L.C.</i> , 6 F.4th 1283 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	1, 3, 4, 6
<i>Bausch Health Ireland Ltd. v. Mylan Lab'ys Ltd.</i> , 2022 WL 683084 (D.N.J. Mar. 8, 2022).....	6, 7
<i>Cannon Mfg. Co. v. Cudahy Packing Co.</i> , 267 U.S. 333 (1925); 14D.....	4
<i>Celgene Corp. v. Mylan Pharms. Inc.</i> , 17 F.4th 1111 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	5, 6
<i>ChargePoint, Inc. v. SemaConnect, Inc.</i> , 920 F.3d 759 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	10
<i>In re Cray</i> , 871 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	2, 3
<i>Directory Dividends, Inc. v. SBC Communications, Inc.</i> , No. 01-CV-1974, 2003 WL 21961448 (E.D. Pa. July 2, 2003).....	4
<i>Galderma Labs, L.P. v. Medinter U.S., LLC et al.</i> , No. 18-cv-1892 (D. Del. Oct. 25, 2019).....	7
<i>Green Fitness Equip. Co., LLC v. Precor Inc.</i> , 2018 WL 3207967 (N.D. Cal. June 29, 2018).....	3
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Capital One Bank</i> , 792 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	15
<i>In re Latex Gloves Prod. Liab. Litig.</i> , 2001 WL 964105 (E.D. Pa. Aug. 22, 2001)	4
<i>Lending Tree, LLC v. Zillow, Inc.</i> , 656 F. App'x. 991 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	9

..

Minn. Min. & Mfg. Co. v. Eco Chem, Inc.,
757 F.2d 1256 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....4

Natera, Inc. v. ArcherDX, Inc.,
No. 20-125-LPS, 2020 WL 6043929 (D. Del. Oct. 13, 2020), *aff'd without opinion*, No. 2021-1211, 2021 WL 4699180 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 8, 2021) *passim*

Patent Holder LLC v. Lone Wolf Distributors, Inc.,
No. 17-cv-23060, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 180699 (S.D. Fla. Oct. 31, 2017)8

Pearson v. Component Tech. Corp.,
247 F.3d 471 (3d Cir. 2001).....5, 7

Post Consumer Brands, LLC v. Gen. Mills, Inc.,
No. 4:17-CV-2471 SNLJ, 2017 WL 4865936 (E.D. Mo. Oct. 27, 2017).....6

SAP Am., Inc. v. InvestPic, LLC,
898 F.3d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....15

Secured Mail Sols. LLC v. Universal Wilde, Inc.,
873 F.3d 905 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....13

TC Heartland LLC v. Kraft Foods Grp. Brands LLC,
581 U.S. 258 (2017).....3, 4

Trinity Indus., Inc. v. Greenlease Holding Co.,
903 F.3d 333 (3d Cir. 2018).....5

Two-Way Media Ltd. v. Comcast Cable Commc'ns, LLC,
874 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....15

Valeant Pharms. N. Am. LLC v. Mylan Pharms. Inc.,
978 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....3, 4

Wechsler v. Macke Int'l Trade, Inc.,
486 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....5

...

Defendant DoorDash, Inc., (“DoorDash”) hereby files this Reply Memorandum in Support of its Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. 23, “Motion”).

I. VENUE REMAINS IMPROPER IN THIS DISTRICT

Ameranth has not met its burden of proving venue is proper in this District. Indeed, Ameranth rests on two theories, neither of which is sufficient to establish venue. First, Ameranth argues that public statements establish that DoorDash owns and controls the Pittsburgh DashMart location. Dkt. 28 (“Opp.”) at 8. Ameranth, however, fails to overcome the compelling evidence Defendant presented to the contrary. Second, Ameranth attempts to save venue by citing cases and applying the standard for personal jurisdiction in attempting to show that DoorDash Essentials, LLC (“DoorDash Essentials”) is an alter-ego of DoorDash. That law is outdated, and this Court cannot exercise venue over DoorDash based on overruled precedent and a complete lack of factors required by this Circuit to show alter-ego. Under current law, venue is improper in this district. DoorDash addresses each of Ameranth’s venue positions in detail below and further reiterates the evidence establishing that DoorDash Essentials and DoorDash maintain corporate separateness.

A. Ameranth Misconstrues the Public Statements Regarding DashMart

First, Ameranth relies on DoorDash’s Form 10-K for Fiscal Year 2022 to establish that DoorDash owns and controls the Pittsburgh DashMart location. Specifically, Ameranth cites to the use of the term “we” such as: “[w]e face certain risks in connection with the operation of DashMart and Wolt Market, our first-party owned and self-operated convenience and grocery delivery businesses.” (Opp. at 7, citing Dkt. 29-2 at pp. 28, 125). As an initial matter, the statement makes clear that the convenience stores [DashMarts] are “self-operated.” As a legal matter, the use of “we” in this financial statement cannot compel the conclusion that the two companies do not maintain corporate separateness, rather it underscores the entities are separate. *See Andra Grp., LP v. Victoria's Secret Stores, L.L.C.*, 6 F.4th 1283, 1288 (Fed. Cir. 2021) (“None of the public filings

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.