

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 12-1595-LPS
)	
LG ELECTRONICS, INC.,)	
LG ELECTRONICS USA, INC. and)	
LG ELECTRONICS MOBILECOMM U.S.A.,)	
INC.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
<hr/>		
ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 12-1596-LPS
)	
APPLE INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
<hr/>		
ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 12-1599-LPS
)	
MICROSOFT MOBILE, INC.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
<hr/>		
ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 12-1601-LPS
)	
MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC)	
f/k/a MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 12-1602-LPS
)	
SONY MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS (USA))	
INC., f/k/a SONY ERICSSON MOBILE)	
COMMUNICATIONS (USA) INC.,)	
SONY CORPORATION and)	
SONY CORPORATION OF AMERICA,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	
<hr/>		
ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 13-919-LPS
)	
GOOGLE LLC,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	
<hr/>		
ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 13-920-LPS
)	
OATH HOLDINGS INC. AND OATH INC.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	
<hr/>		

**OPENING BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS’
MOTION FOR JUDGMENT ON THE PLEADINGS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. NATURE AND STATE OF THE PROCEEDINGS.....	1
III. SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	2
IV. ARGUMENT	3
A. The Court Can and Should Address Section 101 Invalidation Under Rule 12(c)	3
B. Patent Eligibility is Determined Using the Alice Two-Step Test	3
C. Alice Step One: The Asserted Claims Are Directed to Abstract Ideas.....	4
1. The '843 Claims Are Directed to an Abstract Idea.....	5
2. The '854 Claims Are Directed to an Abstract Idea.....	6
3. The '356 Claims Are Directed to an Abstract Idea.....	7
4. The '993 Claims Are Directed to an Abstract Idea.....	9
5. The Claims Are Not Directed to Concrete Technological Improvements	11
6. The Asserted Patents Are Similar to Information Collection and Recognition Patents That Have Been Found Ineligible.....	13
D. Alice Step Two – The Asserted Claims Do Not Recite an Inventive Concept	14
V. CONCLUSION.....	16

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC v. DIRECTV, LLC, 838 F.3d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....4, 17

Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank Int’l, 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014)..... *passim*

Apple, Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc., 842 F.3d 1229 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....4

Berkheimer v. HP Inc., 881 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....3, 18

BSG Tech LLC v. Buyseasons, Inc., 899 F.3d 1281 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....15, 18

buySAFE, Inc. v. Google, Inc., 765 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....3

ChargePoint, Inc. v. SemaConnect, Inc., 920 F.3d 759 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....13, 14

Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, 776 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... *passim*

Elec. Power Grp., LLC v. Alstom S.A., 830 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....4, 5, 14, 15

Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp., 822 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....12

FairWarning IP, LLC v. Iatric Sys., Inc., 839 F.3d 1089 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....4

Hyper Search, LLC v. Facebook, Inc., Case No. 1:17-cv- 01387-CFC-SRF, D.I. 21 (D. Del. Dec. 17, 2018).....7

I.V. I LLC v. Capital One Bank (USA), 792 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....16, 17, 18

I.V. I LLC v. Capital One Fin. Corp., 850 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....5, 13, 18

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page(s)
<i>I.V. I LLC v. Symantec Corp.</i> , 838 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	12
<i>Interval Licensing</i> , 896 F.3d at 1343-45.....	13
<i>Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.</i> , 132 S. Ct. 1289 (2012).....	4
<i>McRO, Inc. v. Bandai Namco Games Am. Inc.</i> , 837 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	12
<i>Mortgage Grader, Inc. v. First Choice Loan Servs. Inc.</i> , 811 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	16
<i>Personalized Media Commc’ns v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , 161 F. Supp. 3d 325 (D. Del. 2015).....	4
<i>RecogniCorp, LLC v. Nintendo Co.</i> , 855 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	15
<i>Rosenau v. Unifund Corp.</i> , 539 F.3d 218 (3d Cir. 2008).....	3
<i>SAP Am. Inc. v. InvestPic, LLC</i> , 898 F.3d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	3
<i>In re TLI</i> , 823 F.3d at 613	13, 15, 16
<i>In re TLI Commc’ns LLC Patent Litig.</i> , 87 F. Supp. 3d 773 (E.D. Va. 2015), <i>aff’d</i> 823 F.3d 607 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	7
<i>Turbe v. Gov’t of Virgin Islands</i> , 938 F.2d 427 (3d Cir. 1991).....	3
<i>Two-Way Media Ltd. v. Comcast Cable Comm’ns, LLC</i> , 874 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	13, 17
 Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 101.....	<i>passim</i>

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.