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 NETFLIX 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 Netflix Inc. ("Netflix") and 20 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 Netflix's Counterclaims

1	Affirmative Defenses		
2	First Affirmative Defense: Non-Infringement		
3	2. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 1.		
4	Second Affirmative Defense: Invalidity		
5	3. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 2.		
6	Third Affirmative Defense: Failure to State a Claim		
7	4. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 3.		
8	Fourth Affirmative Defense: Use/Manufacture By/For United States Government		
9	5. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 4.		
10	Fifth Affirmative Defense: Dedication to the Public		
11	6. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 5.		
12	Sixth Affirmative Defense: Equitable Defenses		
13	7. Paragraph 6 contains legal conclusions that require no response. To the extent a response		
14	is required, Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 6.		
15	Seventh Affirmative Defense: Lack of Standing		
16	8. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 7.		
17	Eighth Affirmative Defense: Failure to Mitigate Damages		
18	9. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 8.		
19	Ninth Affirmative Defense: Sections 284-288		
20	10. Paragraph 9 contains legal conclusions that require no response. To the extent a response		
21	is required, Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 9.		
22	11. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 10. Interval, through its sister corporation, Vulcan Inc.		
23	sent a letter to Netflix prior to the commencement of this action informing Netflix that Vulcar		
24	Inc. and its affiliated companies had patents that may be of interest to Netflix, and invited Netflix		
25	to contact Vulcan's intellectual property counsel to discuss further.		
26	12. Paragraph 11 contains legal conclusions that require no response. To the extent a		
27	response is required, Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 11.		
28	2		

1	Tenth Affirmative Defense: Reverse Doctrine of Equivalents		
2	13. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 12.		
3	Eleventh Affirmative Defense: Prosecution History Estoppel		
4	14. Paragraph 13 contains legal conclusions that require no response. To the extent a		
5	response is required, Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 13.		
6	Twelfth Affirmative Defense: No Entitlement to an Injunction		
7	15. Interval admits the allegations in ¶ 14.		
8	16. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 15.		
9	17. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 16.		
10	18. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 17.		
11	19. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 18.		
12	20. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 19.		
13	Thirteenth Affirmative Defense: Indispensable Parties		
14	21. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 20.		
15	PRAYER FOR RELIEF		
16	22. In response to Netflix's Prayer for Relief, Interval denies that Netflix is entitled to relief of		
17	any kind.		
18	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL		
19	23. This paragraph sets forth Netflix's request for a jury trial, to which no response is		
20	required.		
21	COUNTERCLAIMS FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT		
22	24. Interval is without sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations made in ¶ 1, and		
23	therefore denies those allegations.		
24	25. Interval admits the allegations in \P 2.		
25			
26			
27			
28	3		
	Interval's Answer to Netflix's Counterclaims Susman Godfrey, LLP		

1	<u>JURISDICTION</u>	
2	26. Interval admits the allegations in ¶ 3 that Netflix's counterclaims constitute an action	
3	seeking a declaration of non-infringement and invalidity of the '507 and '682 patents and that the	
4	Court has jurisdiction over the counterclaims.	
5	27. Interval admits the allegations in ¶ 4.	
6	28. Interval admits the allegations in ¶ 5 that an actual case and controversy exists between	
7	Interval and Netflix relating to the '507 and '682 patents.	
8	COUNT ONE	
9	(Declaration of Non-Infringement of the '507 Patent)	
10	29. Interval incorporates by reference its responses to paragraphs 1-5 as if fully set forth	
11	herein.	
12	30. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 7.	
13	31. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 8.	
14	COUNT TWO	
15	(Declaration of Non-Infringement of the '682 Patent)	
16	32. Interval incorporates by reference its responses to paragraphs 1-8 as if fully set forth	
17	herein.	
18	33. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 10.	
19	34. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 11.	
20	COUNT THREE	
21	(Declaration of Invalidity of the '507 Patent)	
22	35. Interval incorporates by reference its responses to paragraphs 1-11 as if fully set forth	
23	herein.	
24	36. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 13.	
25	37. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 14.	
26		
27		
28	4	

1	COUNT FOUR		
2	(Declaration of Invalidity of the '682 Patent)		
3	38. Interval incorporates by reference its responses to paragraphs 1-14 as if fully set forth		
4	herein.		
5	39. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 16.		
6	40. Interval denies the allegations in ¶ 17.		
7	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL		
8	41. This paragraph sets forth Netflix's request for a jury trial, to which no response is		
9	required.		
10	PRAYER FOR RELIEF		
11	42. In response to Netflix's Prayer for Relief, Interval denies that Netflix is entitled to relief of		
12	any kind.		
13	REQUEST FOR RELIEF		
14	43. WHEREFORE, Interval respectfully requests judgment of the Court against Netflix a		
15	follows:		
16	(a) Dismissal of Netflix's counterclaims with prejudice;		
17	(b) Declaration that Netflix has infringed U.S. Patent Nos. 6,263,507 and 6,757,682;		
18	(c) Awarding the damages arising out of Netflix's infringement of U.S. Patent Nos.		
19	6,263,507 and 6,757,682, to Interval, together with prejudgment and post-judgment interest, in an		
20	amount according to proof;		
21	(d) Permanently enjoining Netflix and its respective officers, agents, employees, and		
22	those acting in privity with them, from further infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,263,507 and		
23	6,757,682, or in the alternative, awarding a royalty for post judgment infringement;		
24	(e) Awarding attorney's fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285 or as otherwise permitted by		
25	law; and		
26	(f) Awarding such other costs and further relief as the Court may deem just and		
27	proper.		
28	5		

1		
2	Dated: February 7, 2011	/s/ Matthew R. Berry
3		Justin A. Nelson WA Bar No. 31864
4		E-Mail: jnelson@susmangodfrey.com
5		Edgar G. Sargent WA Bar No. 28283
		E-Mail: esargent@susmangodfrey.com
6		Matthew R. Berry WA Bar No. 37364
7		E-Mail: mberry@susmangodfrey.com
8		SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P. 1201 Third Ave, Suite 3800
9		Seattle, WA 98101
10		Telephone: (206) 516-3880 Facsimile: (206) 516-3883
11		
12		Max L. Tribble, Jr. E-Mail: mtribble@susmangodfrey.com
		SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
13		1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 5100 Houston, Texas 77002
14		Telephone: (713) 651-9366
15		Facsimile: (713) 654-6666
16		Michael F. Heim
17		E-mail: mheim@hpcllp.com Eric J. Enger
		E-mail: eenger@hpcllp.com
18		Nathan J. Davis
19		E-mail: ndavis@hpcllp.com HEIM, PAYNE & CHORUSH, L.L.P.
20		600 Travis, Suite 6710
21		Houston, Texas 77002 Telephone: (713) 221-2000
22		Facsimile: (713) 221-2021
23		Attorneys for INTERVAL LICENSING LLC
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		6
20		U

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.	
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
	Attorneys for OfficeMax, Inc.	khaumaardnar@aarraranin aam
8	Kevin Baumgardner Steven Fogg	kbaumgardner@corrcronin.com sfogg@corrcronin.com
9	John Letchinger Douglas Rupert	letchinger@wildman.com
10	Douglas Rupert	rupert@wildman.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
	Eric Ow Mark Walters	eow@mofo.com mwalters@flhlaw.com
15	iviair waiteis	mwaters@maw.com
16		By: /s/ Bianca Nealious
17		By: /s/ Bianca Nealious Bianca Nealious
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		ii
	Interval's Answer to Netflix's Counterclaims	Susman Godfrey, LLP 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3800

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