

THE HONORABLE MARSHA J. PECHMAN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

INTERVAL LICENSING LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

AOL Inc., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:10-cv-1385 MJP

**AOL INC.'S ANSWER AND  
COUNTERCLAIMS TO INTERVAL  
LICENSING LLC'S FIRST  
AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR  
PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

Defendant AOL Inc. ("AOL") hereby answers and asserts affirmative defenses and counterclaims to the First Amended Complaint ("FAC") filed by Plaintiff Interval Licensing LLC ("Interval"), on December 28, 2010, as follows:

**THE PARTIES**

1. AOL admits that Interval purports to be a limited liability company organized under the laws of the state of Washington, with its principal place of business at 505 Fifth Avenue South, Suite 900, Seattle, WA 98104. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of any remaining allegations contained in paragraph 1 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

2. Admitted.

3. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 3 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

1 4. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
2 of the allegations contained in paragraph 4 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

3 5. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
4 of the allegations contained in paragraph 5 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

5 6. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
6 of the allegations contained in paragraph 6 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

7 7. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
8 of the allegations contained in paragraph 7 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

9 8. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
10 of the allegations contained in paragraph 8 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

11 9. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
12 of the allegations contained in paragraph 9 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

13 10. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
14 of the allegations contained in paragraph 10 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

15 11. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
16 of the allegations contained in paragraph 11 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

17 12. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
18 of the allegations contained in paragraph 12 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

19 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

20 13. AOL admits that this action purports to arise under the patent laws of the United  
21 States, Title 35, United States Code 1 *et seq.* AOL further admits that this Court has subject  
22 matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1338(a). AOL denies that it has a  
23 regular and established practice of business in this district. For purposes of this action only, AOL  
24 admits that venue is minimally proper in this judicial district as to AOL under 28 U.S.C. §§  
25 1391(b)-(c) and 1400(b), but denies that it has committed any acts of infringement in this judicial  
26 district. AOL denies any remaining allegations contained in paragraph 13 of the FAC directed to

1 AOL. To the extent the allegations contained in paragraph 13 of the Complaint are directed at any  
2 other defendant, AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
3 truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 13 of the Complaint and on that basis denies the  
4 allegations contained therein.

5 **INTERVAL RESEARCH CORPORATION**

6 14. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
7 of the allegations contained in paragraph 14 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

8 15. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
9 of the allegations contained in paragraph 15 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

10 16. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
11 of the allegations contained in paragraph 16 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

12 17. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
13 of the allegations contained in paragraph 17 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

14 18. AOL admits that the four patents-in-suit purport to have been assigned to Interval  
15 Research Corporation. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to  
16 the truth of the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 18 of the FAC, and therefore denies  
17 the same.

18 19. AOL admits that Interval Licensing LLC purports to own the patents-in-suit. AOL  
19 is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining  
20 allegations contained in paragraph 19 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

21 **U.S. PATENT NO. 6,263,507**

22 20. On information and belief, AOL admits that on July 17, 2001, United States Patent  
23 No. 6,263,507 (“the ’507 patent”) issued and is entitled “Browser for Use in Navigating a Body of  
24 Information, With Particular Application to Browsing Information Represented By Audiovisual  
25 Data.” AOL denies that the ’507 patent was duly and legally issued. AOL specifically denies that  
26 the ’507 patent describes an invention and refers to the patent for its description. AOL is without

1 knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations  
2 contained in paragraph 20 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

3 21. AOL admits that it provides websites that provide information such as, for  
4 example, articles, videos, advertisements, and other types of content to users. AOL denies that it  
5 has infringed or continues to infringe one or more claims of the '507 patent under 35 U.S.C. §  
6 271. AOL denies the remainder of the allegations contained in paragraph 21 of the FAC.

7 22. AOL admits that it provides the AOL Spam Filter as part of its AOL Mail website  
8 and service, and admits that the AOL Spam Filter provides spam filtering of emails. AOL denies  
9 that the hardware and software associated with the AOL Spam Filter have infringed or continue to  
10 infringe any claim of the '507 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271. AOL denies the remainder of the  
11 allegations contained in paragraph 22 of the FAC.

12 23. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
13 of the allegations contained in paragraph 23 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

14 24. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
15 of the allegations contained in paragraph 24 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

16 25. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
17 of the allegations contained in paragraph 25 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

18 26. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
19 of the allegations contained in paragraph 26 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

20 27. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
21 of the allegations contained in paragraph 27 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

22 28. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
23 of the allegations contained in paragraph 28 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

24 29. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
25 of the allegations contained in paragraph 29 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.  
26

1 30. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
2 of the allegations contained in paragraph 30 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

3 31. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
4 of the allegations contained in paragraph 31 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

5 32. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
6 of the allegations contained in paragraph 32 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

7 33. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
8 of the allegations contained in paragraph 33 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

9 34. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
10 of the allegations contained in paragraph 34 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

11 35. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
12 of the allegations contained in paragraph 35 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

13 36. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
14 of the allegations contained in paragraph 36 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

15 37. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
16 of the allegations contained in paragraph 37 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

17 38. AOL denies the allegations contained in paragraph 38 of the FAC pertaining to  
18 AOL. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the  
19 remaining allegations contained in paragraph 38 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

20 **U.S. PATENT NO. 6,034,652**

21 39. On information and belief, AOL admits that on March 7, 2000, United States  
22 Patent No. 6,034,652 (“the ’652 patent”) issued and is entitled “Attention Manager for Occupying  
23 the Peripheral Attention of a Person in the Vicinity of a Display Device.” AOL denies that the  
24 ’652 patent was duly and legally issued. AOL specifically denies that the ’652 patent describes an  
25 invention and refers to the patent for its description. AOL is without knowledge or information  
26

1 sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 39 of  
2 the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

3 40. AOL admits that it provides the AOL Instant Messenger and Lifestream software.  
4 AOL denies that it has infringed or continues to infringe any claim of the '652 patent under 35  
5 U.S.C. § 271. AOL denies the remainder of the allegations contained in paragraph 40 of the FAC.

6 41. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
7 of the allegations contained in paragraph 41 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

8 42. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
9 of the allegations contained in paragraph 42 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

10 43. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
11 of the allegations contained in paragraph 43 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

12 44. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
13 of the allegations contained in paragraph 44 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

14 45. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
15 of the allegations contained in paragraph 45 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

16 46. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
17 of the allegations contained in paragraph 46 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

18 47. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
19 of the allegations contained in paragraph 47 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

20 48. AOL denies the allegations contained in paragraph 48 of the FAC pertaining to  
21 AOL. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the  
22 remaining allegations contained in paragraph 48 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

23 **U.S. PATENT NO. 6,788,314**

24 49. On information and belief, AOL admits that on September 7, 2004, United States  
25 Patent No. 6,788,314 (“the '314 patent”) issued and is entitled “Attention Manager for Occupying  
26 the Peripheral Attention of a Person in the Vicinity of a Display Device.” AOL denies that the

1 '314 patent was duly and legally issued. AOL specifically denies that the '314 patent describes an  
2 invention and refers to the patent for its description. AOL is without knowledge or information  
3 sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 49 of  
4 the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

5 50. AOL admits that it provides the AOL Instant Messenger and Lifestream software.  
6 AOL denies that it has infringed or continues to infringe any claim of the '314 patent under 35  
7 U.S.C. § 271. AOL incorporates by reference its response to paragraph 40 of the FAC. AOL  
8 denies the remainder of the allegations contained in paragraph 50 of the FAC.

9 51. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
10 of the allegations contained in paragraph 51 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

11 52. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
12 of the allegations contained in paragraph 52 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

13 53. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
14 of the allegations contained in paragraph 53 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

15 54. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
16 of the allegations contained in paragraph 54 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

17 55. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
18 of the allegations contained in paragraph 55 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

19 56. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
20 of the allegations contained in paragraph 56 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

21 57. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
22 of the allegations contained in paragraph 57 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

23 58. AOL denies the allegations contained in paragraph 58 of the FAC pertaining to  
24 AOL. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the  
25 remaining allegations contained in paragraph 58 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.  
26

**U.S. PATENT NO. 6,757,682**

1  
2 59. On information and belief, AOL admits that on June 29, 2004, United States Patent  
3 No. 6,757,682 (“the ’682 patent”) issued and is entitled “Alerting Users to Items of Current  
4 Interest.” AOL denies that the ’682 patent was duly and legally issued. AOL specifically denies  
5 that the ’682 patent describes an invention and refers to the patent for its description. AOL is  
6 without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining  
7 allegations contained in paragraph 59 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

8 60. AOL admits that it provides the AOL Shopping website. AOL denies that it has  
9 infringed or continues to infringe any claim of the ’682 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271. AOL  
10 denies the remainder of the allegations contained in paragraph 60 of the FAC.

11 61. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
12 of the allegations contained in paragraph 61 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

13 62. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
14 of the allegations contained in paragraph 62 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

15 63. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
16 of the allegations contained in paragraph 63 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

17 64. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
18 of the allegations contained in paragraph 64 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

19 65. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
20 of the allegations contained in paragraph 65 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

21 66. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
22 of the allegations contained in paragraph 66 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

23 67. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
24 of the allegations contained in paragraph 67 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

25 68. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
26 of the allegations contained in paragraph 68 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.



1 69. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
2 of the allegations contained in paragraph 69 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

3 70. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
4 of the allegations contained in paragraph 70 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

5 71. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
6 of the allegations contained in paragraph 71 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

7 72. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
8 of the allegations contained in paragraph 72 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

9 73. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
10 of the allegations contained in paragraph 73 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

11 74. AOL denies the allegations contained in paragraph 74 of the FAC pertaining to  
12 AOL. AOL is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the  
13 remaining allegations contained in paragraph 74 of the FAC, and therefore denies the same.

14 **JURY DEMAND**

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

17 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

18 AOL denies that Interval is entitled to any relief, including the relief requested in the FAC.

19 **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

20 Without conceding that any of the following necessarily must be pleaded as an affirmative  
21 defense, or that any of the following is not already at issue by virtue of the foregoing denials, and  
22 without prejudice to AOL's right to plead additional defenses as discovery into the facts of the  
23 matter warrant, AOL hereby asserts the following defenses. By pleading these defenses, AOL  
24 does not agree to undertake any burden of proof beyond that required by law.

1 **Noninfringement**

2 1. AOL has not infringed and does not infringe, either directly, contributorily, or by  
3 inducement, any claim of the '507, '652, '314, or '682 patents, either literally or under the  
4 doctrine of equivalents.

5 **Invalidity**

6 2. The claims of the '507, '652, '314, and '682 patents are invalid for failing to  
7 comply with the provisions of the Patent Laws of the United States, including without limitation  
8 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103 and/or 112.

9 **Laches**

10 3. On information and belief, and in view of Interval's infringement contentions,  
11 Interval has had knowledge of one or more accused AOL products for at least six years before  
12 instituting this lawsuit.

13 4. On information and belief, Interval delayed filing the instant suit against AOL for  
14 an unreasonable and inexcusable length of time after it knew or reasonably should have known of  
15 its infringement claims against AOL with respect to the '507, '652, '314, and '682 patents.

16 5. Interval's delay in filing the instant suit has caused AOL material prejudice of an  
17 economic and/or evidentiary nature.

18 6. AOL's conduct with respect to Interval has not been culpable, and a finding of  
19 laches applied to Interval's patent infringement claims would not be inequitable.

20 7. On information and belief, Interval's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the  
21 doctrine of laches.

22 **Prosecution History Estoppel**

23 8. By reason of the proceedings in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office during the  
24 prosecution of the applications for the '507, '652, '314, and '682 patents, including but not limited  
25 to amendments to the claims and arguments and representations made to induce the grant of those  
26

1 patents, Interval is barred by prosecution history estoppel from relying on the doctrine of  
2 equivalents to prove infringement.

### 3 **No Entitlement to Injunctive Relief**

4 9. Upon information and belief, Interval does not make or sell any systems or  
5 methods that compete with AOL's accused instrumentalities. Upon further information and belief,  
6 Interval does not make or sell any products at all.

7 10. Interval is not entitled to any injunctive relief in connection with this action  
8 because, *inter alia*: (1) AOL has not infringed and is not infringing any of the asserted patents; (2)  
9 the asserted patents are invalid; (3) any purported injury to Interval is neither immediate nor  
10 irreparable; (4) even if Interval had suffered some injury (which it has not), there is an adequate  
11 remedy at law and monetary damages would be sufficient; (5) the public interest strongly  
12 disfavors an injunction under the circumstances present here; and (6) the balance of hardships  
13 favors AOL.

### 14 **COUNTERCLAIMS**

15 Pursuant to Rule 13 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Defendant/Counter-Plaintiff  
16 AOL asserts the following counterclaims against Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant Interval:

### 17 **THE PARTIES**

18 1. AOL Inc. ("AOL") is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of  
19 the state of Delaware, with its principal place of business at 770 Broadway, New York, NY 10003.

20 2. On information and belief, Interval Licensing LLC ("Interval") is a limited liability  
21 company duly organized under the laws of the state of Washington, with its principal place of  
22 business at 505 Fifth Avenue South, Suite 900, Seattle, WA 98104.

### 23 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

24 3. AOL's counterclaims for declaratory judgments arise under the patent laws of the  
25 United States, more particularly under Title 35, United States Code. The jurisdiction of this Court  
26 is proper under at least 35 U.S.C. § 271 et seq. and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338, 1367, and 2201-02.

1           4.       On August 27, 2010, Interval commenced a civil action for infringement of the  
2 '507, '652, '314, and '682 patents by filing a Complaint in this Court against AOL. Interval's  
3 Complaint was dismissed by this Court on December 10, 2010. On December 28, 2010, Interval  
4 filed its First Amended Complaint ("FAC"). AOL denies infringement of the '507, '652, '314,  
5 and '682 patents as alleged in Interval's FAC and asserts the invalidity of the patents, as set forth  
6 above in AOL's Answer to the FAC. As a consequence, there is an actual justiciable controversy  
7 between AOL and Interval concerning whether AOL infringes any valid and enforceable claim of  
8 the '507, '652, '314, and '682 patents.

9           5.       This Court has personal jurisdiction over Interval at least because Interval, on  
10 information and belief, is organized under the laws of the state of Washington, has its principal  
11 place of business in the state of Washington, and has submitted itself to the jurisdiction of this  
12 Court.

13           6.       Venue in this judicial district is proper at least because Interval has consented to  
14 this venue by asserting and filing claims of patent infringement against AOL in this judicial  
15 district. Venue is also proper in this District pursuant to at least 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400.

16                   **First Counterclaim for Declaratory Judgment That AOL's Accused Products**  
17                   **Do Not Infringe Any Claim of the '507 Patent**

18           7.       AOL incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 6  
19 of its Counterclaims.

20           8.       AOL does not directly or indirectly infringe any claim of the '507 patent because  
21 AOL does not make, use, sell, offer to sell, or import any system, apparatus, or method claimed in  
22 the '507 patent and AOL does not induce or contribute to the direct infringement of the '507  
23 patent by any party.

24           9.       A judicial declaration that AOL does not directly or indirectly infringe the claims  
25 of the '507 patent is necessary and appropriate at this time pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a) in  
26 order that AOL may ascertain its rights and duties with respect to the '507 patent.

1                   **Second Counterclaim for Declaratory Judgment That AOL's Accused Products**  
2                   **Do Not Infringe Any Claim of the '652 Patent**

3           10.    AOL incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 9  
4 of its Counterclaims.

5           11.    AOL does not directly or indirectly infringe any claim of the '652 patent because  
6 AOL does not make, use, sell, offer to sell, or import any system, apparatus, or method claimed in  
7 the '652 patent and AOL does not induce or contribute to the direct infringement of the '652  
8 patent by any party.

9           12.    A judicial declaration that AOL does not directly or indirectly infringe the claims  
10 of the '652 patent is necessary and appropriate at this time pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a) in  
11 order that AOL may ascertain its rights and duties with respect to the '652 patent.

12                   **Third Counterclaim for Declaratory Judgment That AOL's Accused Products**  
13                   **Do Not Infringe Any Claim of the '314 Patent**

14           13.    AOL incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through  
15 12 of its Counterclaims.

16           14.    AOL does not directly or indirectly infringe any claim of the '314 patent because  
17 AOL does not make, use, sell, offer to sell, or import any system, apparatus, or method claimed in  
18 the '314 patent and AOL does not induce or contribute to the direct infringement of the '314  
19 patent by any party.

20           15.    A judicial declaration that AOL does not directly or indirectly infringe the claims  
21 of the '314 patent is necessary and appropriate at this time pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a) in  
22 order that AOL may ascertain its rights and duties with respect to the '314 patent.

23                   **Fourth Counterclaim for Declaratory Judgment That AOL's Accused Products**  
24                   **Do Not Infringe Any Claim of the '682 Patent**

25           16.    AOL incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through  
26 15 of its Counterclaims.

1 17. AOL does not directly or indirectly infringe any claim of the '682 patent because  
2 AOL does not make, use, sell, offer to sell, or import any system, apparatus, or method claimed in  
3 the '682 patent and AOL does not induce or contribute to the direct infringement of the '682  
4 patent by any party.

5 18. A judicial declaration that AOL does not directly or indirectly infringe the claims  
6 of the '682 patent is necessary and appropriate at this time pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a) in  
7 order that AOL may ascertain its rights and duties with respect to the '682 patent.

8 **Fifth Counterclaim for Declaratory Judgment That the**  
9 **Claims of the '507 Patent Are Invalid**

10 19. AOL incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through  
11 18 of its Counterclaims, as if fully set forth herein.

12 20. The claims of the '507 patent are invalid because they fail to comply with one or  
13 more of the statutory requirements for patentability set forth in 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 et seq.

14 21. A judicial declaration of the invalidity of the claims of the '507 patent is necessary  
15 and appropriate at this time pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a) in order that AOL may ascertain its  
16 rights and duties with respect to the '507 patent.

17 **Sixth Counterclaim for Declaratory Judgment That the**  
18 **Claims of the '652 Patent Are Invalid**

19 22. AOL incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through  
20 21 of its Counterclaims, as if fully set forth herein.

21 23. The claims of the '652 patent are invalid because they fail to comply with one or  
22 more of the statutory requirements for patentability set forth in 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 et seq.

23 24. A judicial declaration of the invalidity of the claims of the '652 patent is necessary  
24 and appropriate at this time pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a) in order that AOL may ascertain its  
25 rights and duties with respect to the '652 patent.

26

1                                   **Seventh Counterclaim for Declaratory Judgment That the**  
2                                   **Claims of the '314 Patent Are Invalid**

3           25.    AOL incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through  
4 24 of its Counterclaims, as if fully set forth herein.

5           26.    The claims of the '314 patent are invalid because they fail to comply with one or  
6 more of the statutory requirements for patentability set forth in 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 et seq.

7           27.    A judicial declaration of the invalidity of the claims of the '314 patent is necessary  
8 and appropriate at this time pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a) in order that AOL may ascertain its  
9 rights and duties with respect to the '314 patent.

10                                   **Eighth Counterclaim for Declaratory Judgment That the**  
11                                   **Claims of the '682 Patent Are Invalid**

12           28.    AOL incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through  
13 27 of its Counterclaims, as if fully set forth herein.

14           29.    The claims of the '682 patent are invalid because they fail to comply with one or  
15 more of the statutory requirements for patentability set forth in 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 et seq.

16           30.    A judicial declaration of the invalidity of the claims of the '682 patent is necessary  
17 and appropriate at this time pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a) in order that AOL may ascertain its  
18 rights and duties with respect to the '682 patent.

19                                   **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

20           WHEREFORE, AOL respectfully requests that the Court:

21           A.    Enter a judgment in AOL's favor and against Interval for a declaration that AOL  
22 does not directly or indirectly infringe the claims of the '507, '652, '314, and '682 patents;

23           B.    Enter a judgment in AOL's favor and against Interval for a declaration that the  
24 claims of the '507, '652, '314, and '682 patents are invalid;

25           C.    Declare that Interval, its officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, licensees  
26 or others acting for, on behalf of, or in concert with Interval, be enjoined from asserting or

1 threatening to assert any rights under the '507, '652, '314, and '682 patents against AOL, its  
2 customers, suppliers, licensees, agents, employees or others acting for, on behalf of, or in concert  
3 with AOL;

4 D. Declare that Interval takes nothing by its FAC;

5 E. Declare an award to AOL of its costs, expenses and interest incurred in this action;

6 F. Declare that this case is "exceptional" pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285, and award to  
7 AOL its attorneys' fees in this action; and

8 G. Award AOL any other further relief as this Court deems just and appropriate.

9 AOL reserves the right to supplement or amend this Answer and its Counterclaims, if  
10 necessary, after further investigation and as more information becomes known.

11 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

12 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38, AOL respectfully demands a trial by jury  
13 on all issues so triable.

14 DATED this 14th day of January, 2011.

15 Respectfully submitted,

16 SUMMIT LAW GROUP PLLC

17 By /s/ Molly A. Terwilliger

18 Molly A. Terwilliger, WSBA #28449  
19 315 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue S, Suite 1000  
20 Seattle, WA 98104.2682  
21 Tel: 206.676.7000  
22 Fax: 206.676.7001  
23 mollyt@summitlaw.com

24 Gerald F. Ivey (*pro hac vice*)  
25 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
26 GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP  
901 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001-4413  
Tel: 202.408.4000  
gerald.ivey@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

Robert L. Burns (*pro hac vice*)  
Elliot C. Cook (*pro hac vice*)  
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP  
Two Freedom Square  
11955 Freedom Drive, Suite 800  
Reston, VA 20190-5675  
Tel: 571.203.2700  
robert.burns@finnegan.com  
elliott.cook@finnegan.com

Cortney S. Alexander (*pro hac vice*)  
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP  
3500 SunTrust Plaza  
303 Peachtree Street, NE  
Atlanta, GA 30308-3263  
Tel: 404.653.6400  
cortney.alexander@finnegan.com

***Attorneys for Defendant AOL Inc.***

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this day I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the following:

***Attorneys for Plaintiff Interval Licensing LLC***

Matthew R. Berry (mberry@susmangodfrey.com)  
Justin A. Nelson (jnelson@susmangodfrey.com)  
Edgar G. Sargent (esargent@susmangodfrey.com)  
Max L. Tribble (mtribble@susmangodfrey.com)  
Nathan J. Davis (ndavis@hpcllp.com)  
Eric J. Enger (eenger@hpcllp.com)  
Michael F. Heim (mheim@hpcllp.com)

***Attorneys for Apple Inc.***

Jeremy E. Roller (jroller@yarmuth.com)  
Scott T. Wilsdon (wilsdon@yarmuth.com)  
David S. Almeling (dalmeling@omm.com)  
Brian M. Berliner (bberliner@omm.com)  
George A. Riley (griley@omm.com)  
Neil L. Yang (nyang@omm.com)

***Attorneys for Ebay Inc., NetFlix, Inc., Office Depot, Inc., and Staples, Inc.***

J. Christopher Carraway (chris.carraway@klarquist.com)  
Kristin L. Cleveland (Kristin.cleveland@klarquist.com)  
Klaus H. Hamm (Klaus.hamm@klarquist.com)  
Jeffrey S. Love (Jeffrey.love@klarquist.com)  
Derrick W. Toddy (derrick.toddy@klarquist.com)  
John D. Vandenberg (john.vandenberg@klarquist.com)  
Arthur W. Harrigan (arthurh@dhlt.com)  
Christopher T. Wion (chrisw@dhlt.com)

***Attorneys for Facebook Inc.***

Christen M.R. Dubois (cdubois@cooley.com)  
Christopher B. Durbin (cdurbin@cooley.com)  
Heidi L. Keefe (hkeefe@cooley.com)  
Michael G. Rhodes (mrhodes@cooley.com)  
Elizabeth L. Stameshkin (lstameshkin@cooley.com)  
Mark R. Weinstein (mweinstein@cooley.com)

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

2 Scott A.W. Johnson (sawj@stokeslaw.com)  
3 Aaron Chase (aaron.chase@whitecase.com)  
4 Dimitrios T. Drivas (ddrivas@whitecase.com)  
5 John Handy (jhandy@whitecase.com)  
6 Warren S. Heit (wheit@whitecase.com)  
7 Kevin X. McGann (kmcgann@whitecase.com)  
8 Wendi R. Schepler (wschepler@whitecase.com)

9 ***Attorneys for OfficeMax, Inc.***

10 Jeffrey D. Neumeyer (jeffneumeyer@officemax.com)  
11 Kevin C. Baumgardner (kbaumgardner@corrchronin.com)  
12 Steven W. Fogg (sfogg@corrchronin.com)  
13 John S. Letchinger (letchinger@wildmanharrold.com)  
14 Douglas S. Rupert (rupert@wildman.com)

15 ***Attorneys for Yahoo!***

16 Dario A. Machleidt (dmachleidt@flhlaw.com)  
17 Mark P. Walters (mwalters@flhlaw.com)  
18 Francis Ho (fho@mofo.com)  
19 Richard S. J. Hung (rhung@mofo.com)  
20 Michael A. Jacobs (mjacobs@mofo.com)  
21 Matthew I. Kreeger (mkreeger@mofo.com)  
22 Eric W. Ow (eow@mofo.com)

23 DATED this 14th day of January, 2011.

24 /s/ Deanna Schow

25 Deanna Schow, Legal Assistant  
26 SUMMIT LAW GROUP, PLLC  
315 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue S, Suite 1000  
Seattle, WA 98104-2682  
Phone: 206.676.7000  
Fax: 206.676.7001  
deannas@summitlaw.com