

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

**SIPCO, LLC, and IP CO., LLC (d/b/a
INTUS IQ),**

Plaintiffs,

v.

**STREETLINE, INC., and KAPSCH
TRAFFICCOM HOLDING CORP.,**

Defendants.

Civ. No. 1: 16-cv-00830-RGA

PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS'

MOTION TO DISMISS UNDER RULE 12(b)(6) (D.I. 18, 19)

Dated: March 7, 2017

George Pazuniak DE (No. 478)
Sean T. O'Kelly (DE No. 4349)
Daniel P. Murray (DE No. 5785)
O'Kelly & Ernst, LLC
901 N. Market Street, Suite 1000
Wilmington, Delaware 19801
(302) 478-4230 / 778-4000
(302) 295-2873 (facsimile)
gp@del-iplaw.com
sokelly@oeblegal.com
dmurray@oeblegal.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. NATURE AND STAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS - 1 -

II. SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT - 1 -

III. STATEMENT OF FACTS - 2 -

 A. The Patent Claims - 2 -

 B. Defendants’ Infringement - 3 -

 1. System Claims - 3 -

 2. Streetline Equipment Plus Program Claims - 4 -

 3. Method Claims - 7 -

 4. Inducement to Infringe - 7 -

IV. ARGUMENT - 8 -

 A. Legal Standard - 8 -

 1. Direct Infringement - 8 -

 2. Inducement to Infringe - 9 -

 B. Plaintiffs State A Claim for Direct Infringement..... - 10 -

 1. Plaintiffs Plead That Defendants Literally Infringed Each Limitation..... - 10 -

 2. Plaintiffs Plausibly Allege That Defendants’ Infringe - 11 -

C. Plaintiffs State A Claim for Direct Infringement by Kapsch Holding..... - 14 -

D. Plaintiffs State A Claim for Inducing Infringement - 15 -

1. Plaintiffs Pled Direct Infringement..... - 15 -

2. Plaintiffs Have Identified the Induced Direct Infringers - 16 -

3. Plaintiffs Have Pled The Required Mental State..... - 17 -

4. Induced Infringement Against Kapsch Holding Is Adequately Pled - 18 -

E. Dismissal With Prejudice Would Be Improper - 20 -

V. CONCLUSION..... - 20 -

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Addiction & Detoxification Inst. L.L.C. v. Carpenter,

620 F. App'x 934 (Fed. Cir. 2015) _____ - 17 -

Applera Corp. v. MJ Research, Inc.,

297 F. Supp. 2d 459 (D. Conn. 2004) _____ - 19 -

Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) _____

- 9 -

Atlas IP, LLC v. Exelon Corp.,

189 F. Supp. 3d 768 (N.D. Ill. 2016) _____ - 11 -

Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) _____

- 8 -, - 9 -, - 14 -

Broadcom Corp. v. Qualcomm Inc.,

543 F.3d 683 (Fed. Cir. 2008) _____ - 18 -

Carson Optical Inc. v. eBay, Inc.,

2016 WL 4385998 (E.D.N.Y. 2016) _____ - 18 -

Collabo Innovations, Inc. v. Omnivision Techs., Inc.,

2017 WL 374484 (D. Del. 2017), report and recommendation adopted, 2017 WL 603471 (D. Del. 2017) ___ - 17 -

DSU Med. Corp. v. JMS Co.,

471 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2006) _____ - 10 -

e.Digital Corp. v. iBaby Labs, Inc.,

2016 WL 4427209 (N.D. Cal. 2016) _____ - 12 -

Eli Lilly & Co. v. Teva Parenteral Medicines, Inc.,

845 F.3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2017) _____ - 9 -, - 16 -

Fowler v. UPMC Shadyside, 578 F.3d 203, 210 (3d Cir. 2009) _____ - 9 -

Fuji Photo Film Co., Ltd. v. Jazz Photo Corp.,

394 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2005) _____ - 18 -

Glob.-Tech Appliances, Inc. v. SEB S.A.,

563 U.S. 754 (2011) _____ - 15 -

Kaneka Corp. v. SKC Kolon PI, Inc.,

198 F. Supp. 3d 1089 (C.D. Cal. 2016) _____ - 16 -

Largan Precision Co. v. Genius Elec. Optical Co.,

646 F. App'x 946 (Fed. Cir. 2016) _____ - 10 -

Limelight Networks, Inc. v. Akamai Techs., Inc. (Akamai III),

— U.S. —, 134 S.Ct. 2111 (2014) _____ - 10 -

MGM Studios Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd.,

545 U.S. 913 (2005) _____ - 18 -

Nexxon Ltd. v. Eaglepicher Techs., LLC,

2016 WL 4045474 (D. Del. 2016), report and recommendation adopted, 2016 WL 6093471 (D. Del. 2016) - 19 -

Philips v. ASUSTeK Computer Inc., 2016 WL 6246763, slip op. at *2 (D. Del. Oct. 25, 2016) _____ - 8 -, - 9 -

Phillips v. County of Allegheny, 515 F.3d 224, 231 (3d Cir. 2008) _____ - 9 -, - 14 -

Power Integrations, Inc. v. Fairchild Semiconductor Int'l, Inc.,

843 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2016) _____ - 16 -, - 19 -

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.