1 Hon. Marsha J. Pechman 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE 7 8 INTERVAL LICENSING LLC, Case No. 2:10-cv-01385-MJP 9 Plaintiff, 10 V. INTERVAL LICENSING LLC'S 11 AOL, INC.; APPLE, INC.; eBAY, INC.; ANSWER TO COUNTERCLAIMS 12 FACEBOOK, INC.; GOOGLE INC.; **JURY DEMAND** NETFLIX, INC.; OFFICE DEPOT, INC.; 13 OFFICEMAX INC.; STAPLES, INC.; YAHOO! INC.; AND YOUTUBE, LLC, 14 Defendants. 15 16 INTERVAL LICENSING LLC'S ANSWER TO 17 FACEBOOK INC'S COUNTERCLAIMS 18 Plaintiff Interval Licensing LLC ("Interval"), by and through its attorneys, files this 19 Answer to the counterclaims of Defendant and Counterclaimant Facebook Inc.'s ("Facebook") 20 and respectfully answers as follows: 21 Interval denies each and every averment set forth in the Counterclaims, except for those 22 averments expressly and specifically admitted below. To the extent that the headings and non-23 numbered statements in the Counterclaims contain any averments, Interval denies each and 24 every such averment. 25 Paragraphs 1-75 do not contain any allegations that require an answer. To the extent 26 necessary, Interval incorporates by reference and realleges the allegations in its First Amended 27 Complaint. 28 Susman Godfrey, LLP Interval's Answer to Facebook's Counterclaims

1	Affirmative Defenses		
2	First Affirmative Defense: Non-Infringement		
3	2. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 1.		
4	3. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 2.		
5	Second Affirmative Defense: Invalidity		
6	4. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 3.		
7	5. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 4.		
8	Third Affirmative Defense: Failure to State a Claim		
9	6. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 5.		
10	Fourth Affirmative Defense: No Injunctive Relief		
11	7. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 6.		
12	Fifth Affirmative Defense: Failure to Mark		
13	8. Paragraph 7 contains legal conclusions that require no response. To the extent a response		
14	is required, Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 7.		
15	Sixth Affirmative Defense: Prosecution History Estoppel		
16	9. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 8.		
17	10. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 9.		
18	Seventh Affirmative Defense: Improper Joinder		
19	11. Paragraph 10 contains legal conclusions that require no response. To the extent a		
20	response is required, Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 10.		
21	Eighth Affirmative Defense: Preclusion of Costs		
22	12. Paragraph 11 contains legal conclusions that require no response. To the extent a		
23	response is required, Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 11.		
24	Other Affirmative Defenses		
25	13. Paragraph 12 does not call for a response. If a response is warranted, Interval denies the		
26	allegations in ¶ 12.		
27			
28			

1	COUNTERCLAIMS		
2	The Parties		
3	14. Interval is without sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations made in ¶ 13,		
4	and therefore denies those allegations.		
5	15. Interval admits the allegations in ¶ 14.		
6	Jurisdiction and Venue		
7	16. Interval admits that ¶ 15 contains Facebook's characterization of its counterclaims.		
8	Interval admits the allegations in ¶ 15 that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction.		
9	17. Interval admits the allegations in ¶ 16 that the Court has personal jurisdiction over Interval		
10	and that venue is also proper in this district. Interval denies all other allegations in ¶ 16.		
11	<u>Actual Controversy</u>		
12	18. Interval admits the allegations in ¶ 17.		
13	19. Interval admits the allegations in ¶ 18.		
14	20. Interval admits the allegations in ¶ 19 that an actual controversy exists between Facebook		
15	and Interval. It also admits that Facebook seeks a declaration that it does not infringe the '507		
16	and '682 patents, that certain claims of the '507 and '682 patents are invalid, and that Interval's		
17	claims under the '507 and '682 patents are unenforceable.		
18	<u>COUNT I</u>		
19	(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '507 Patent)		
20	21. Interval incorporates by reference its responses to all preceding paragraphs of this Answer		
21	as if fully set forth herein.		
22	22. Interval admits that ¶ 21 describes what Facebook is seeking by way of its counterclaims.		
23	Interval denies all other allegations in ¶ 21.		
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	3		

1	<u>COUNT II</u>		
2	(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity and/or Unenforceability of Claims 20-24, 27-28, 31, 34		
3	37, 63-67, 70-71, 74, 77, and 80 of the '507 Patent)		
4	23. Interval incorporates by reference its responses to all preceding paragraphs of this Answer		
5	as if fully set forth herein.		
6	24. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 23.		
7	<u>COUNT III</u>		
8	(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '682 Patent)		
9	25. Interval incorporates by reference its responses to all preceding paragraphs of this Answer		
10	as if fully set forth herein.		
11	26. Interval admits that ¶ 25 describes what Facebook is seeking by way of its counterclaims.		
12	Interval denies all other allegations in ¶ 25.		
13	<u>COUNT IV</u>		
14	(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity and/or Unenforceability of Claims 1-9, 11-13, 16-17,		
15	and 20 of the '682 Patent)		
16	27. Interval incorporates by reference its responses to all preceding paragraphs of this Answer		
17	as if fully set forth herein.		
18	28. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 27.		
19	Jury Demand		
20	29. This paragraph sets forth Facebook's request for a jury trial, to which no response is		
21	required.		
22	Relief Requested by Facebook		
23	30. In response to Facebook's Relief Requested, Interval denies that Facebook is entitled to		
24	relief of any kind.		
25	REQUEST FOR RELIEF		
26	31. WHEREFORE, Interval respectfully requests judgment of the Court against Facebook as		
27	follows:		
28	4		

1	(a)	Dismissal of Facebook's counterclaims with prejudice;	
2	(b)	(b) Declaration that Facebook has infringed, directly and/or indirectly, U.S. Paten	
3	Nos. 6,263,507 and 6,757,682;		
4	(c)	Awarding the damages arising out of Facebook's infringement of U.S. Patent Nos	
5	6,263,507 aı	nd 6,757,682, to Interval, together with prejudgment and post-judgment interest, in an	
6	amount according to proof;		
7	(d)	(d) Permanently enjoining Facebook and its respective officers, agents, employees	
8	and those acting in privity with them, from further infringement, including contributory		
9	infringement and/or inducing infringement, of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,263,507 and 6,757,682, or in		
10	the alternative, awarding a royalty for post judgment infringement;		
11	(e) Awarding attorney's fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285 or as otherwise permitted by		
12	law; and		
13	(f) Awarding such other costs and further relief as the Court may deem just an		
14	proper.		
15			
16	Dated: Feb	ruary 7, 2011 /s/ Matthew R. Berry	
17		Justin A. Nelson WA Bar No. 31864	
18		E-Mail: jnelson@susmangodfrey.com	
19		Edgar G. Sargent WA Bar No. 28283	
20		E-Mail: esargent@susmangodfrey.com Matthew R. Berry	
21		WA Bar No. 37364	
22		E-Mail: mberry@susmangodfrey.com SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.	
		1201 Third Ave, Suite 3800	
23		Seattle, WA 98101 Telephone: (206) 516-3880	
24		Facsimile: (206) 516-3883	
25		Max L. Tribble, Jr. E-Mail: mtribble@susmangodfrey.com	
26		SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.	
27		1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 5100 Houston, Texas 77002	
28		5	

Interval's Answer to Facebook's Counterclaims Case No. 2:10-cv-01385-MJP

Susman Godfrey, LLP 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3800 Seattle WA 98101-3000

1	Telephone: (713) 651-9366 Facsimile: (713) 654-6666
2 3	Michael F. Heim
4	E-mail: mheim@hpcllp.com Eric J. Enger
5	E-mail: eenger@hpcllp.com Nathan J. Davis
6	E-mail: ndavis@hpcllp.com
7	HEIM, PAYNE & CHORUSH, L.L.P. 600 Travis, Suite 6710
8	Houston, Texas 77002 Telephone: (713) 221-2000 Facsimile: (713) 221-2021
9	Attorneys for INTERVAL LICENSING LLC
10	Attorneys for invierval Electronic Electronic
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	6

Seattle WA 98101-3000

Case No. 2:10-cv-01385-MJP

1	Kevin McGann	kmcgann@whitecase.com
2	Wendi Schepler	wschepler@whitecase.com
3	Attorneys for Office Depot, Inc.	ahmia aammayyay@ldamayyist aama
4	Chris Carraway Kristin Cleveland	chris.carraway@klarquist.com Kristin.cleveland@klarquist.com
5	Klaus Hamm Arthur Harrigan, Jr.	Klaus.hamm@klarquist.com arthurh@dhlt.com
6	John Vandenberg	john.vandenberg@klarquist.com
7	Christopher Wion	chrisw@dhlt.com
8	Attorneys for OfficeMax, Inc. Kevin Baumgardner	kbaumgardner@correronin.com
	Steven Fogg	sfogg@correronin.com
9	John Letchinger Douglas Rupert	letchinger@wildman.com rupert@wildman.com
10		rupert@wildinan.com
11	Attorneys for Yahoo! Inc. Francis Ho	fho@mofo.com
12	Richard S.J. Hung	rhung@mofo.com
13	Michael Jacobs Matthew Kreeger	mjacobs@mofo.com mkreeger@mofo.com
14	Dario Machleidt	dmachleidt@flhlaw.com
15	Eric Ow Mark Walters	eow@mofo.com mwalters@flhlaw.com
16		By: _/s/ Bianca Nealious Bianca Nealious
17		Bianca Nealious
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		ii
	Interval's Answer to Facebook's Cour	

Interval's Answer to Facebook's Counterclaims Case No. 2:10-cv-01385-MJP 1437262v1/011873