

1 committed acts of infringement in this district. With respect to the allegations in this paragraph
2 that relate to parties other than Facebook, Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief
3 as to the truth of those allegations, and on that basis denies them. Except as expressly admitted
4 herein, Facebook denies each and every allegation about Facebook set forth in this paragraph.

5 **INTERVAL RESEARCH CORPORATION WAS A PIONEER IN THE TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY**

6 14. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
7 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

8 15. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
9 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

10 16. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
11 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

12 17. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
13 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

14 18. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
15 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

16 19. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
17 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

18 **ALLEGED INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,263,507**

19 20. Facebook admits that the face of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,507 (“the ’507 patent”),
20 issued July 17, 2001, is entitled “Browser for Use in Navigating a Body of Information, With
21 Particular Application to Browsing Information Represented by Audiovisual Data.” Facebook
22 admits that a copy of the ’507 patent was attached to the First Amended Complaint as Exhibit 2.
23 Facebook denies that the ’507 patent was duly and legally issued. Except as expressly admitted
24 herein, Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining
25 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

26 21. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
27 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

1 22. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations
2 recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

3 23. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
4 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

5 24. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
6 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

7 25. Facebook admits that it operates a website that can be found at
8 www.facebook.com. Facebook further admits that the www.facebook.com website contains
9 information. Facebook admits that Interval has attached as Exhibit 9 what appears to be a
10 screenshot from the Facebook website. Except as expressly admitted herein, Facebook denies all
11 other allegations recited in this paragraph, and specifically denies that it has infringed or is
12 infringing the '507 patent.

13 26. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
14 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

15 27. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
16 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

17 28. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
18 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

19 29. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
20 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

21 30. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
22 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

23 31. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
24 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

25 32. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
26 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

27 33. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
28 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

1 64. Facebook admits that it operates a website that can be found at
2 www.facebook.com. Facebook admits that there is a “News Feed” feature on the
3 www.facebook.com website. Facebook admits that there is a feature on the www.facebook.com
4 website called “People You May Know.” Facebook admits that Interval has attached as Exhibit
5 32 what appears to be a screenshot from the Facebook website at www.facebook.com. Except as
6 expressly admitted herein, Facebook denies all other allegations recited in this paragraph, and
7 specifically denies that it has infringed or is infringing the ’682 patent.

8 65. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
9 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

10 66. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
11 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

12 67. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
13 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

14 68. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
15 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

16 69. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
17 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

18 70. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
19 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

20 71. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
21 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

22 72. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
23 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

24 73. Facebook lacks sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of the
25 allegations recited in this paragraph, and on that basis denies them.

26 74. Facebook denies that it has infringed or is infringing the ’682 patent. Facebook
27 denies that Interval is entitled to recover damages from Facebook. Facebook denies that Interval
28 will be harmed by Facebook’s actions unless Facebook is enjoined by this Court. With respect to

1 the allegations of this paragraph that relate to parties other than Facebook, Facebook lacks
2 sufficient information to form a belief as to the truth of those allegations, and on that basis denies
3 them. Facebook denies all other allegations about Facebook recited in this paragraph. Insofar as
4 Interval reserves the right to allege that Facebook has willfully infringed without leave of this
5 Court, Facebook objects as this would be improper.

6 **JURY DEMAND**

7 75. This paragraph sets forth Interval's request for a jury trial, to which no response is
8 required.

9 **INTERVAL'S PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

10 Facebook incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs of this Answer as if fully set
11 forth herein. Facebook denies that Interval is entitled to any relief sought in Interval's Prayer for
12 Relief against Facebook.

13 **FACEBOOK'S AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

14 **First Affirmative Defense: Non-Infringement**

15 1. Facebook is not infringing, and has not infringed, directly, contributorily, or by
16 inducement any claims of the '507 patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

17 2. Facebook is not infringing, and has not infringed, directly, contributorily, or by
18 inducement any claims of the '682 patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

19 **Second Affirmative Defense: Invalidity**

20 3. One or more of the claims of the '507 patent are invalid for failure to satisfy the
21 conditions for patentability under the Patent Laws of the United States, including but not limited
22 to 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 *et. seq.*

23 4. One or more of the claims of the '682 patent are invalid for failure to satisfy the
24 conditions for patentability under the Patent Laws of the United States, including but not limited
25 to 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 *et. seq.*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Third Affirmative Defense: Failure to State a Claim

5. Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

Fourth Affirmative Defense: No Injunctive Relief

6. Plaintiff’s demand to enjoin Facebook is barred, as Plaintiff has suffered neither harm nor irreparable harm from Facebook’s actions.

Fifth Affirmative Defense: Failure to Mark

7. Plaintiff’s pre-lawsuit claim for damages are barred, in whole or in part, for failure to comply with 35 U.S.C. § 287.

Sixth Affirmative Defense: Prosecution History Estoppel

8. Interval is estopped from construing any valid claim of the ’507 patent to cover or include, either literally or by application of the doctrine of equivalents, any product or service manufactured, used, imported, sold or offered by Facebook because of admissions and statements to the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the specification of the ’507 patent and during prosecution of the application leading to the issuance of the ’507 patent.

9. Interval is estopped from construing any valid claim of the ’682 patent to cover or include, either literally or by application of the doctrine of equivalents, any product or service manufactured, used, imported, sold or offered by Facebook because of admissions and statements to the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the specification of the ’682 patent and during prosecution of the application leading to the issuance of the ’682 patent.

Seventh Affirmative Defense: Improper Joinder

10. On information and belief, some or all of the defendants have been improperly joined in a single action, and Facebook asserts its right to a separate trial.

Eighth Affirmative Defense: Preclusion of Costs

11. Interval is precluded from recovering costs under 35 U.S.C. § 288.

Other Affirmative Defenses

12. Facebook reserves all other affirmative defenses pursuant to rule 8(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Patent Laws of the United States, and any other defenses at

1 law or in equity, that now exist or in the future may be available based on discovery and further
2 factual investigation in this case.

3
4
5 **COUNTERCLAIMS**

6 Defendant and Counterclaimant Facebook, Inc. (“Facebook”), by and through its
7 undersigned counsel, hereby alleges the following counterclaims against Plaintiff and
8 Counterclaim-Defendant Interval Licensing, LLC (“Interval”).

9 **The Parties**

10 13. Facebook is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State
11 of Delaware, having its principal place of business at 1601 S. California Avenue, Palo Alto,
12 California 94304.

13 14. Facebook is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that counterclaim-
14 defendant Interval is a limited liability company duly organized under the laws of the state of
15 Washington, with its principal place of business at 505 Fifth Avenue South, Suite 900, Seattle,
16 WA 98104.

17 **Jurisdiction and Venue**

18 15. This is a civil action regarding allegations of patent infringement arising under the
19 Patent Laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code, in which Facebook seeks
20 relief under the Declaratory Judgment Act. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this
21 matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338, 2201, 2202.

22 16. The Court has personal jurisdiction and venue over Interval because it consented
23 to personal jurisdiction and venue by filing the Complaint in this action. To the extent that venue
24 is found to be proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1400 for any claims in the Complaint, venue is also
25 appropriate under 28 U.S.C. § 1400 for these Counterclaims. However, Facebook reserves the
26 right to contend that the more appropriate venue for the claims in the Complaint and in these
27 Counterclaims is the Northern District of California.

1 **Actual Controversy**

2 17. Interval claims to be the assignee of the complete interest in the United States
3 Patent No. 6,263,507 (“the ’507 patent”), entitled “Browser for Use in Navigating a Body of
4 Information, With Particular Application to Browsing Information Represented by Audiovisual
5 Data.” Interval alleged that Facebook has and continues to infringe the ’507 patent.

6 18. Interval claims to be the assignee of the complete interest in the United States
7 Patent No. 6,757,682 (“the ’682 patent”), entitled “Alerting Users to Items of Current Interest.”
8 Interval alleged that Facebook has and continues to infringe the ’682 patent.

9 19. An actual controversy, within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, exists
10 between Facebook and Interval. Facebook seeks a declaration that it does not infringe the ’507
11 patent or the ’682 patent, specific claims of the ’507 and ’682 patents are invalid, and that
12 Intervals claims under the ’507 and ’682 patents are unenforceable.

13 **COUNT I**

14 **(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,507)**

15 20. Facebook incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs of this Counterclaim
16 as if fully set forth herein.

17 21. By this counterclaim, Facebook seeks a declaration that it does not infringe and
18 has not infringed, either directly or indirectly, contributorily or by inducement any claim of the
19 ’507 patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents and therefore is not liable for
20 infringement thereof. Furthermore, Interval’s claims under the ’507 patent are barred for the
21 reasons set forth above in Facebook’s Affirmative Defenses.

22 **COUNT II**

23 **(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity and/or Unenforceability of Claims 20-24, 27-28, 31, 34,**
24 **37, 63-67, 70-71, 74, 77 and 80 of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,507)**

25 22. Facebook incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs of this Counterclaim
26 as if fully set forth herein.

27 23. Claims 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 31, 34, 37, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 70, 71, 74, 77 and
28 80 of the ’507 patent are invalid for failing to comply with the provisions of the Patent Laws of

1 the United States, including one or more of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, *et. seq.* Furthermore, these claims
2 under the '507 patent are unenforceable for the reasons set forth above in Facebook's Affirmative
3 Defenses.

4 **COUNT III**

5 **(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,757,682)**

6 24. Facebook incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs of this Counterclaim
7 as if fully set forth herein.

8 25. By this counterclaim, Facebook seeks a declaration that it does not infringe and
9 has not infringed, either directly or indirectly, contributorily or by inducement any claim of the
10 '682 patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents and therefore is not liable for
11 infringement thereof. Furthermore, Interval's claims under the '682 patent are barred for the
12 reasons set forth above in Facebook's Affirmative Defenses.

13 **COUNT IV**

14 **(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity and/or Unenforceability of Claims 1-9, 11-13, 16-17** 15 **and 20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,757,682)**

16 26. Facebook incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs of this Counterclaim
17 as if fully set forth herein.

18 27. Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17 and 20 of the '682 patent are
19 invalid for failing to comply with the provisions of the Patent Laws of the United States,
20 including one or more of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, *et. seq.* Furthermore, these claims under the '682
21 patent are unenforceable for the reasons set forth above in Facebook's Affirmative Defenses.

22 **JURY DEMAND**

23 28. Facebook demands a trial by jury as to all issues so triable.
24
25

26 **Relief Requested by Facebook**

27 WHEREFORE, Facebook prays that this Court enter judgment:
28

- 1 A. In favor of Facebook, and against Interval, thereby dismissing Interval’s First
- 2 Amended Complaint in its entirety, with prejudice, with Interval taking nothing by way of its
- 3 claims;
- 4 B. Declaring and adjudging that Facebook does not infringe the ’507 patent;
- 5 C. Declaring and adjudging that claims 20-24, 27-28, 31, 34, 37, 63-67, 70-71, 74, 77
- 6 and 80 of the ’507 patent are invalid and/or unenforceable;
- 7 D. Declaring and adjudging that Facebook does not infringe the ’682 patent.
- 8 E. Declaring and adjudging that claims 1-9, 11-13, 16-17 and 20 of the ’682 patent
- 9 are invalid and/or unenforceable;
- 10 F. Ordering Interval to pay all costs incurred by Facebook in this action;
- 11 G. That the Court find and declare that Facebook has not infringed, contributorily
- 12 infringed, or induced the infringement of, and is not now infringing, contributorily infringing, or
- 13 inducing the infringement of any valid claim of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,507, directly or indirectly,
- 14 under any subsection of 35 U.S.C. § 271;
- 15 H. That the Court find and declare that Facebook has not infringed, contributorily
- 16 infringed, or induced the infringement of, and is not now infringing, contributorily infringing, or
- 17 inducing the infringement of any valid claim of U.S. Patent No. 6,757,682, directly or indirectly,
- 18 under any subsection of 35 U.S.C. § 271;
- 19 I. Declaring that this is an exceptional case pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285 and ordering
- 20 Interval to pay Facebook’s reasonable attorney’s fees incurred in this action; and
- 21 ///
- 22 ///
- 23 ///
- 24 ///
- 25 ///
- 26 ///
- 27 ///
- 28 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

J. Awarding Facebook all other relief the Court deems just and proper.

DATED this 14th day of January, 2011.

COOLEY LLP

/s/ Christopher B. Durbin
Christopher B. Durbin (WSBA #41159)
COOLEY LLP
719 Second Avenue, Suite 900
Seattle, WA 98104
Tel: (206) 452-8700
Fax: (206) 452-8800
Email: cdurbin@cooley.com

Michael G. Rhodes (*pro hac vice*)
Heidi L. Keefe (*pro hac vice*)
Mark R. Weinstein (*pro hac vice*)
Christen M.R. Dubois (*pro hac vice*)
Elizabeth L. Stameshkin (*pro hac vice*)
3175 Hanover St.
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1130
Tel: (650) 843-5000
Fax: (650) 849-7400

Attorneys for Defendant FACEBOOK, INC.

908556/HN

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 I hereby certify that on January 14, 2011, I electronically filed the following document(s):
3 **Facebook , Inc.'s Answer and Counterclaims to Interval Licensing LLC's First Amended**
4 **Complaint for Patent Infringement** with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system,
5 which will send an email notification of such filing to the attorney(s) of record listed below.

6 Justin A. Nelson
7 Matthew R. Berry
8 Edgar Guy Sargent
9 SUSMAN GODFREY
10 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3800
11 Seattle, WA 98101

By Electronic CM/ECF:

jnelson@susmangodfrey.com
mberry@susmangodfrey.com
esargent@susmangodfrey.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Interval Licensing LLC

12 Eric J. Enger
13 Michael F. Heim
14 Nathan J. Davis
15 HEIM PAYNE & CHORUSH LLP
16 600 Travis Street, Suite 6710
17 Houston, TX 77002

By Electronic CM/ECF:

eenger@hpcllp.com
mheim@hpcllp.com
ndavis@hpcllp.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Interval Licensing LLC

17 Max L. Tribble
18 SUSMAN GODFREY
19 1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 5100
20 Houston, TX 77002

By Electronic CM/ECF:

mtribble@susmangodfrey.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Interval Licensing LLC

21 Cortney S. Alexander
22 Gerald F. Ivey
23 Robert L. Burns
24 Elliott C. Cook
25 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
26 GARRETT & DUNNER LLP
27 Two Freedom Square
28 11955 Freedom Drive
Reston, VA 20910

By Electronic CM/ECF:

cortney.alexander@finnegan.com
gerald.ivey@finnegan.com
robert.burns@finnegan.com
elliott.cook@finnegan.com

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Brian M. Berliner
Neil L. Yang
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
400 South Hope Street, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, CA 90071

By Electronic CM/ECF:

bberliner@omm.com
nyan@omm.com

Attorneys for Defendant Apple, Inc.

David Almeling
George A. Riley
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, 28th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111

By Electronic CM/ECF:

dalmeling@omm.com
griley@omm.com

Attorneys for Defendant Apple, Inc.

Jeremy E. Roller
Scott T. Wilsdon
YARMUTH WILSDON CALFO PLLC
818 Stewart Street, Suite 1400
Seattle, WA 98101

By Electronic CM/ECF:

jroller@yarmuth.com
wilsdon@yarmuth.com

Attorneys for Defendant Apple, Inc.

J. Christopher Carraway
John D. Vandenberg
Kristin L. Cleveland
Klaus H. Hamm
KLARQUIST SPARKMAN
121SW Salmon Street, Suite 1600
Portland, OR 97204

By Electronic CM/ECF:

chris.carraway@klarquist.com
john.vandenberg@klarquist.com
kristin.cleveland@klarquist.com
klaus.hamm@klarquist.com

Attorneys for eBay, Inc.; Netflix, Inc.; Office Depot, Inc.; and Staples, Inc.

Arthur W. Harrigan, Jr.
Christopher Wion
DANIELSON HARRIGAN LEYH &
TOLLEFSON
999 Third Avenue, Suite 4400
Seattle, WA 98104

By Electronic CM/ECF:

arthurh@dhlt.com
chrisw@dhlt.com

Attorneys for eBay, Inc.; Netflix, Inc.; Office Depot, Inc.; and Staples, Inc.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Aneelah Afzali
Scott A.W. Johnson
Shannon M. Jost
STOKES LAWRENCE
800 5th Avenue, Suite 4000
Seattle, WA 98104-3179

*Attorneys for Defendants Google, Inc. and
YouTube LLC*

Dimitrios T. Drivas
John Handy
Kevin X. McGann
Aaron Chase
WHITE & CASE
1155 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

*Attorneys for Defendants Google, Inc. and
YouTube LLC*

Warren S. Heit
Wendy Schepler
WHITE & CASE
3000 El Camino Real
Bldg. 5, 9th Floor
Palo Alto, CA 94306

*Attorneys for Defendants Google, Inc. and
YouTube LLC*

Kevin C. Baumgardner
Steven W. Fogg
CORR CRONIN MICHELSON
BAUMGARDNER & PREECE
1001 4th Avenue, Suite 3900
Seattle, WA 98154

Attorneys for Defendant OfficeMax Inc.

Jeffrey D. Neumeyer
OFFICEMAS INCORPORATED
1111 West Jefferson Street
P.O. Box 50
Boise, ID 83728

Attorneys for Defendant OfficeMax Inc.

By Electronic CM/ECF:
aneelah.afzali@stokeslaw.com
sawj@stokeslaw.com
shannon.jost@stokeslaw.com

By Electronic CM/ECF:
ddrivas@whitecase.com
jhandy@whitecase.com
kmcgann@whitecase.com
aaron.chase@whitecase.com

By Electronic CM/ECF:
wheit@whitecase.com
wschepler@whitecase.com

By Electronic CM/ECF:
kbaumgardner@corrchronin.com
sfogg@corrchronin.com

By Electronic CM/ECF:
JeffNeumeyer@officemax.com

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Douglas S. Rupert
John L. Letchinger
WILDMAN, HARROLD ALLEN & DIXON
225 West Wacker Drive, Suite 2700
Chicago, IL 60606

By Electronic CM/ECF:

rupert@wildman.com
letchinger@wildman.com

Attorneys for Defendant OfficeMax Inc.

Eric W. Ow
Francis Ho
Michael I. Kreeger
Michael A. Jacobs
Richard S. J. Hung
MORRISON & FOERSTER
425 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

By Electronic CM/ECF:

eow@mofo.com
fho@mofo.com
mkreeger@mofo.com
mjacobs@mofo.com
rhung@mofo.com

Attorneys for Defendants Yahoo! Inc.

Mark P. Walters
Dario A. Machleidt
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
1191 Second Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101

By Electronic CM/ECF:

dmachleidt@flhlaw.com
mwalters@flhlaw.com

Attorneys for Defendants Yahoo! Inc.

/s/Christopher B. Durbin
Christopher B. Durbin (WSBA #41159)
COOLEY LLP
719 Second Avenue, Suite 900
Seattle, WA 98104-1732
Telephone: (262) 452-8700
Facsimile: (262) 452-8800
Email: cdurbin@cooley.com

Attorneys for Defendant
FACEBOOK, INC.