

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

Hon. Marsha J. Pechman

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

INTERVAL LICENSING LLC,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
AOL, INC.; APPLE, INC.; eBAY, INC.;  
FACEBOOK, INC.; GOOGLE INC.;  
NETFLIX, INC.; OFFICE DEPOT, INC.;  
OFFICEMAX INC.; STAPLES, INC.;  
YAHOO! INC.; AND YOUTUBE, LLC,  
  
Defendants.

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

INTERVAL LICENSING LLC’S  
ANSWER TO COUNTERCLAIMS

**JURY DEMAND**

**INTERVAL LICENSING LLC’S ANSWER TO  
GOOGLE INC.’S COUNTERCLAIMS**

Plaintiff Interval Licensing LLC (“Interval”), by and through its attorneys, files this Answer to the counterclaims of Defendant and Counterclaimant Google Inc. (“Google”) and respectfully answers as follows:

Interval denies each and every averment set forth in the Counterclaims, except for those averments expressly and specifically admitted below. To the extent that the headings and non-numbered statements in the Counterclaims contain any averments, Interval denies each and every such averment.

1. Paragraphs 1-89 do not contain any allegations that require an answer. To the extent necessary, Interval incorporates by reference and realleges the allegations in its First Amended Complaint.

1 **Affirmative Defenses**

2 **First Affirmative Defense**

3 2. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 76.

4 **Second Affirmative Defense**

5 3. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 77.

6 **Third Affirmative Defense**

7 4. Paragraph 78 contains legal conclusions that require no response. To the extent a  
8 response is required, Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 78.

9 **Fourth Affirmative Defense**

10 5. Paragraph 79 contains legal conclusions that require no response. To the extent a  
11 response is required, Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 79.

12 **Fifth Affirmative Defense**

13 6. Paragraph 80 contains legal conclusions that require no response. To the extent a  
14 response is required, Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 80.

15 **Sixth Affirmative Defense**

16 7. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 81.

17 **Seventh Affirmative Defense**

18 8. Paragraph 82 contains legal conclusions that require no response. To the extent a  
19 response is required, Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 82.

20 **Eighth Affirmative Defense**

21 9. Paragraph 83 contains legal conclusions that require no response. To the extent a  
22 response is required, Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 83.

23 10. Paragraph 84 contains legal conclusions that require no response. To the extent a  
24 response is required, Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 84.

25 11. Paragraph 85 does not contain allegations that require a response. To the extent a  
26 response is warranted, Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 85.

1 **Ninth Affirmative Defense**

2 12. Paragraph 86 contains legal conclusions that require no response. To the extent a  
3 response is required, Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 86.

4 **Tenth Affirmative Defense**

5 13. Paragraph 87 contains legal conclusions that require no response. To the extent a  
6 response is required, Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 87.

7 **Eleventh Affirmative Defense**

8 14. Paragraph 88 does not contain allegations that require a response. To the extent a  
9 response is warranted, Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 88.

10 **Twelfth Affirmative Defense**

11 15. Paragraph 89 contains legal conclusions that require no response. To the extent a  
12 response is required, Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 89.

13 **COUNTERCLAIMS**

14 **Jurisdiction and Venue**

15 16. Interval admits the allegations in ¶ 90 that this court has jurisdiction.

16 17. Interval admits the allegations in ¶ 91 that this court has personal jurisdiction over  
17 Interval.

18 18. Interval admits the allegations in ¶ 92 that venue is proper in this Judicial District.

19 **COUNT I**

20 **(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of the ‘507 Patent)**

21 19. Interval incorporates by reference its responses to paragraphs 90 to 92 as if fully set forth  
22 herein.

23 20. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 94.

24 21. Interval admits the allegations in ¶ 95 that it alleges that Google infringes one or more  
25 claims of the ‘507 patent, that Google contends that the ‘507 patent is invalid, and therefore an  
26 actual controversy exists between Interval and Google regarding the ‘507 patent.

27 22. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 96.

1 23. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 97.

2 **COUNT II**

3 **(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of the ‘652 Patent)**

4 24. Interval incorporates by reference its responses to paragraphs 90 to 97 as if fully set forth  
5 herein.

6 25. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 99.

7 26. Interval admits the allegations in ¶ 100 that it alleges that Google infringes one or more  
8 claims of the ‘652 patent, that Google contends that the ‘652 patent is invalid, and therefore an  
9 actual controversy exists between Interval and Google regarding the ‘652 patent.

10 27. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 101.

11 28. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 102.

12 **COUNT III**

13 **(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of the ‘314 Patent)**

14 29. Interval incorporates by reference its responses to paragraphs 90 to 102 as if fully set forth  
15 herein.

16 30. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 104.

17 31. Interval admits the allegations in ¶ 105 that it alleges that Google infringes one or more  
18 claims of the ‘314 patent, that Google contends that the ‘314 patent is invalid, and therefore an  
19 actual controversy exists between Interval and Google regarding the ‘314 patent.

20 32. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 106.

21 33. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 107.

22 **COUNT IV**

23 **(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of the ‘682 Patent)**

24 34. Interval incorporates by reference its responses to paragraphs 90 to 107 as if fully set forth  
25 herein.

26 35. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 109.

1 36. Interval admits the allegations in ¶ 110 that it alleges that Google infringes one or more  
2 claims of the '682 patent, that Google contends that the '682 patent is invalid, and therefore an  
3 actual controversy exists between Interval and Google regarding the '682 patent.

4 37. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 111.

5 38. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 112.

6 **COUNT V**

7 **(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '507 Patent)**

8 39. Interval incorporates by reference its responses to paragraphs 90 to 112 as if fully set forth  
9 herein.

10 40. Interval admits the allegations in ¶ 114 that it alleges that Google infringes one or more  
11 claims of the '507 patent, and that Google denies those allegations.

12 41. Interval admits the allegations in ¶ 115 that an actual controversy exists between Interval  
13 and Google over the alleged infringement of the '507 patent.

14 42. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 116.

15 43. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 117.

16 **COUNT VI**

17 **(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '652 Patent)**

18 44. Interval incorporates by reference its responses to paragraphs 90 to 117 as if fully set forth  
19 herein.

20 45. Interval admits the allegations in ¶ 119 that it alleges that Google infringes one or more  
21 claims of the '652 patent, and that Google denies those allegations.

22 46. Interval admits the allegations in ¶ 120 that an actual controversy exists between Interval  
23 and Google over the alleged infringement of the '652 patent.

24 47. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 121.

25 48. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 122.

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

**COUNT VII**

**(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the ‘314 Patent)**

49. Interval incorporates by reference its responses to paragraphs 90 to 122 as if fully set forth herein.

50. Interval admits the allegations in ¶ 124 that it alleges that Google infringes one or more claims of the ‘314 patent, and that Google denies those allegations.

51. Interval admits the allegations in ¶ 125 that an actual controversy exists between Interval and Google over the alleged infringement of the ‘314 patent.

52. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 126.

53. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 127.

**COUNT VIII**

**(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the ‘682 Patent)**

54. Interval incorporates by reference its responses to paragraphs 90 to 127 as if fully set forth herein.

55. Interval admits the allegations in ¶ 129 that it alleges that Google infringes one or more claims of the ‘682 patent, and that Google denies those allegations.

56. Interval admits the allegations in ¶ 130 that an actual controversy exists between Interval and Google over the alleged infringement of the ‘682 patent.

57. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 131.

58. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 132.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

59. In response to Google’s Prayer for Relief, Interval denies that Google is entitled to relief of any kind.

**REQUEST FOR RELIEF**

60. WHEREFORE, Interval respectfully requests judgment of the Court against Google as follows:

- (a) Dismissal of Google’s counterclaims with prejudice;

1 (b) Declaration that Google has infringed, directly and/or indirectly, U.S. Patent Nos.  
2 6,263,507; 6,757,682; 6,034,652; and 6,788,314;

3 (c) Awarding the damages arising out of Google's infringement of U.S. Patent Nos.  
4 6,263,507; 6,757,682; 6,034,652; and 6,788,314, to Interval, together with prejudgment and post-  
5 judgment interest, in an amount according to proof;

6 (d) Permanently enjoining Google and its respective officers, agents, employees, and  
7 those acting in privity with them, from further infringement, including contributory infringement  
8 and/or inducing infringement, of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,263,507, 6,034,652, 6,788,314, and  
9 6,757,682, or in the alternative, awarding a royalty for post judgment infringement;

10 (e) Awarding attorney's fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285 or as otherwise permitted by  
11 law; and

12 (f) Awarding such other costs and further relief as the Court may deem just and  
13 proper.

14  
15 Dated: February 7, 2011

/s/ Matthew R. Berry

16 Justin A. Nelson  
17 WA Bar No. 31864  
18 E-Mail: jnelson@susmangodfrey.com  
19 Edgar G. Sargent  
20 WA Bar No. 28283  
21 E-Mail: esargent@susmangodfrey.com  
22 Matthew R. Berry  
23 WA Bar No. 37364  
24 E-Mail: mberry@susmangodfrey.com  
25 SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
26 1201 Third Ave, Suite 3800  
27 Seattle, WA 98101  
28 Telephone: (206) 516-3880  
Facsimile: (206) 516-3883

Max L. Tribble, Jr.  
E-Mail: mtribble@susmangodfrey.com  
SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 5100  
Houston, Texas 77002  
Telephone: (713) 651-9366

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

Facsimile: (713) 654-6666

Michael F. Heim  
E-mail: mheim@hpcllp.com  
Eric J. Enger  
E-mail: eenger@hpcllp.com  
Nathan J. Davis  
E-mail: ndavis@hpcllp.com  
HEIM, PAYNE & CHORUSH, L.L.P.  
600 Travis, Suite 6710  
Houston, Texas 77002  
Telephone: (713) 221-2000  
Facsimile: (713) 221-2021

Attorneys for INTERVAL LICENSING LLC

1  
2 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

3 I hereby certify that on February 7, 2011, I electronically filed the foregoing with the  
4 Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the  
5 following counsel of record:

6 **Attorneys for AOL, Inc.**

6 Aneelah Afzali aneelah.afzali@stokeslaw.com  
7 Cortney Alexander cortney.alexander@finnegan.com  
7 Robert Burns robert.burns@finnegan.com  
8 Elliot Cook elliot.cook@finnegan.com  
8 Gerald Ivey gerald.ivey@finnegan.com  
9 Scott Johnson scott.johnson@stokeslaw.com  
9 Shannon Jost shannon.jost@stokeslaw.com

10  
11 **Attorneys for Apple, Inc.**

11 David Almeling dalmeling@omm.com  
12 Brian Berliner bberliner@omm.com  
12 George Riley griley@omm.com  
13 Jeremy Roller jroller@yarmuth.com  
13 Scott Wilsdon wilsdon@yarmuth.com  
14 Neil Yang nyang@omm.com

15 **Attorneys for eBay, Inc., Netflix, Inc., and Staples, Inc.**

16 Chris Carraway chris.carraway@klarquist.com  
16 Kristin Cleveland kristin.cleveland@klarquist.com  
17 Klaus Hamm klaus.hamm@klarquist.com  
17 Arthur Harrigan, Jr. arthurh@dhl.com  
18 John Vandenberg john.vandenberg@klarquist.com  
19 Christopher Wion chrisw@dhl.com

20 **Attorneys for Facebook, Inc.**

20 Christen Dubois cdubois@cooley.com  
21 Heidi Keefe hkeefe@cooley.com  
21 Michael Rhodes mrhodes@cooley.com  
22 Elizabeth Stameshkin lstameshkin@cooley.com  
23 Mark Weinstein mweinstein@cooley.com

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

24 Aneelah Afzali aneelah.afzali@stokeslaw.com  
25 Aaron Chase achase@whitecase.com  
25 Dimitrios Drivas ddrivas@whitecase.com  
26 John Handy jhandy@whitecase.com  
26 Warren Heit wheat@whitecase.com  
27 Scott Johnson scott.johnson@stokeslaw.com  
28 Shannon Jost shannon.jost@stokeslaw.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

Kevin McGann  
Wendi Schepler

kmcgann@whitecase.com  
wschepler@whitecase.com

**Attorneys for Office Depot, Inc.**

Chris Carraway  
Kristin Cleveland  
Klaus Hamm  
Arthur Harrigan, Jr.  
John Vandenberg  
Christopher Wion

chris.carraway@klarquist.com  
Kristin.cleveland@klarquist.com  
Klaus.hamm@klarquist.com  
arthurh@dhl.com  
john.vandenberg@klarquist.com  
chrisw@dhl.com

**Attorneys for OfficeMax, Inc.**

Kevin Baumgardner  
Steven Fogg  
John Letchinger  
Douglas Rupert

kbaumgardner@correronin.com  
sfogg@correronin.com  
letchinger@wildman.com  
rupert@wildman.com

**Attorneys for Yahoo! Inc.**

Francis Ho  
Richard S.J. Hung  
Michael Jacobs  
Matthew Kreeger  
Dario Machleidt  
Eric Ow  
Mark Walters

fho@mof.com  
rhung@mof.com  
mjacobs@mof.com  
mkreeger@mof.com  
dmachleidt@flhlaw.com  
eow@mof.com  
mwalters@flhlaw.com

By: /s/ Bianca Nealious  
Bianca Nealious