1	M. Elizabeth Day (SBN 177125))	
2	eday@feinday.com Marc Belloli (SBN 244290)	
3	mbelloli@feinday.com FEINBERG DAY KRAMER ALBERTI	
4	LIM TONKOVICH & BELLOLI LLP	
5	577 Airport Blvd., Suite 250 Burlingame, CA. 94010	
	Tel: 650 825-4300/Fax 650 460-8443	
6 7	Brian N. Platt (Admitted pro hac vice)	
	bplatt@wnlaw.com Brent P. Lorimer (<i>Admitted pro hac vice</i>)	
8	blorimer@wnlaw.com WORKMAN NYDEGGER	
9	60 East South Temple Suite 1000	
10	Salt Lake City, UT 84111 Tel: 801-533-9800/Fax 801-328-1707	
11		
12	Thiorneys for Defendant Tritler, the.	
13	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
14		
15		
16 17	BYTEDANCE INC., TIKTOK INC., and TIKTOK PTE. LTD.,	Case No: 4:20-cv-7572-JSW
18	Plaintiffs,	DEFENDANT'S ANSWER TO BYTEDANCE INC., TIKTOK INC., AND
19	v.	TIKTOK PTE. LTD.'S SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT
20		
21	TRILLER, INC.,	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
22	Defendant.	
23		
24		
25	Triller, Inc. ("Triller") by and through its undersigned counsel, for its Answer to the Second	
26	Amended Complaint ("SAC" filed by ByteDance, Inc. ("BDI"), TikTok, Inc. ("TTI"), and TikTok	
27	Pte. Ltd. ("TTPL") (collectively "Plaintiffs"), states as follows:	
28		

NATURE OF ACTION

- 1. Triller admits this is an action for patent infringement and declaratory judgment of non-infringement of a patent. Triller also admits that BDI and TTI seek a declaratory judgment of non-infringement and that TTI and TTPL have requested injunctive relief and money damages against Triller. Triller denies that BDI and TTI are entitled to the declaratory judgment they seek, denies that it has in the past infringed any of the TikTok patents-in-suit, and denies that it is currently infringing any of said patents.
- 2. Triller admits that BDI and TTI seek declaratory judgment that they do not infringe the '429 patent but denies that they are entitled to any such relief. Triller admits that TTI and TTPL have asked for remedies in equity and law for alleged infringement of patents they assert against Triller but denies that it infringes any of the TikTok patents-in-suit and denies that TTI and TTPL are entitled to any such relief.
- 3. Triller admits that the TikTok entities are a collection of related entities who together make, use, and distribute a mobile software application known as the "TikTok" app that millions of Americans use to create and share videos. Triller is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations of Paragraph 3 of the SAC and therefore denies them.
- 4. Triller admits that it develops and distributes the Triller application and admits that it alleges that the TikTok application is used to infringe claims 1 and 3-9 of U.S. Patent No. 9,692,429 ("the '429 Patent"). Triller denies that it is liable for infringement of U.S. Patent No. 9,648,132 ("the '132 Patent), U.S. Patent No. 9,992,322 ("the '322 patent"), or U.S. Patent No. 9,294,430 ("the '430 patent"). Triller is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations of Paragraph 4 of the SAC and therefore denies them.
 - 5. Triller admits the allegations of paragraph 5 of the SAC.
- 6. Triller admits that the Honorable Alan Albright transferred the Texas Litigation to this Court, that the Texas Litigation has been deemed related to this action, and that the litigation



of issues related to the '429 patent has been stayed pending resolution of the IPR related to that patent but denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 6 of the SAC.

- 7. Triller admits that there is a real and immediate controversy between Triller, BDI, and TTI as to whether the TikTok entities infringe claims 1 and 3-9 of the '429 Patent. Triller denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 7 of the SAC.
- 8. Triller admits that there is an actual and justiciable controversy as to whether the TikTok entities infringe claims 1 and 3-9 of the '429 Patent. Triller denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 8 of the SAC.
 - 9. Triller denies the allegations of Paragraph 9 of the SAC.
- 10. Triller denies the allegations of paragraph 10 of the SAC because they are not accurate and/or because Triller is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of said paragraph.
- 11. Triller denies the allegations of paragraph 11 of the SAC because they are not accurate and/or because Triller is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of said paragraph.
- 12. Triller denies the allegations of paragraph 12 of the SAC because they are not accurate and/or because Triller is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of said paragraph.
- 13. Triller denies the allegations of paragraph 13 of the SAC because they are not accurate and/or because Triller is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of said paragraph.
- 14. Triller denies the allegations of paragraph 14 of the SAC because they are not accurate and/or because Triller is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of said paragraph.
- 15. Triller denies the allegations of paragraph 15 of the SAC because they are not accurate and/or because Triller is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of said paragraph.



- 16. Triller denies the allegations of paragraph 16 of the SAC because they are not accurate and/or because Triller is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of said paragraph.
- 17. Triller denies the allegations of paragraph 17 of the SAC because they are not accurate and/or because Triller is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of said paragraph.
- 18. Triller denies the allegations of paragraph 18 of the SAC because they are not accurate and/or because Triller is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of said paragraph.
- 19. Triller denies the allegations of paragraph 19 of the SAC because they are not accurate and/or because Triller is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of said paragraph.
- 20. Triller admits that the '322 patent includes the quoted language, but otherwise denies the allegations of paragraph 20 of the SAC.
- 21. Triller denies the allegations of paragraph 21 of the SAC because they are not accurate and/or because Triller is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of said paragraph.
- 22. Triller denies the allegations of paragraph 22 of the SAC because they are not accurate and/or because Triller is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of said paragraph.
- 23. Triller denies the allegations of paragraph 23 of the SAC because they are not accurate and/or because Triller is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of said paragraph.
 - 24. Triller denies the allegations of paragraph 24 of the SAC.
 - 25. Triller denies the allegations of paragraph 25 of the SAC.
 - 26. Triller denies the allegations of paragraph 26 of the SAC.
 - 27. Triller denies the allegations of Paragraph 27 of the SAC.



10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26 27

28

28. Triller admits that the '132 patent, the '322 patent, and the '430 patent appear to be titled "Method of enabling digital music content to be downloaded to and used on a portable wireless computing device." Triller denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 28 of the SAC because they are not accurate and/or because Triller is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of said paragraph.

- 29. Triller denies the allegations of Paragraph 29 of the SAC.
- 30. Triller denies the allegations of Paragraph 30 of the SAC.
- 31. Triller denies the allegations of Paragraph 31 of the SAC.
- 32. Triller denies the allegations of Paragraph 32 of the SAC.
- 33. Triller denies the allegations of Paragraph 33 of the SAC.

PARTIES

- 34. Triller is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 34 of the SAC and therefore denies them.
- 35. Triller is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 35 of the SAC and therefore denies them.
- 36. Triller is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 36 of the SAC and therefore denies them.
- 37. Triller admits that it is a Delaware corporation having its principal place of business at 2121 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 2320, Los Angeles, California, 90067.
 - 38. Triller admits that it is the owner of the '429 Patent.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- Triller admits that this action arises under the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 39. U.S.C. § 1 et seq. Triller admits that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338. Triller denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 39 of the SAC.
- 40. Triller admits that there is an actual case or controversy between Triller and the TikTok entities regarding infringement of claims 1 and 3-9 of the '429 patent with respect to the Accused TikTok Products. Triller denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 40 of the SAC.



DOCKET

Explore Litigation Insights



Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time** alerts and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.

