

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

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS
MEDICAL SCHOOL and CARMEL
LABORATORIES, LLC,

C.A. No. 17-868-JFB-SRF

Plaintiffs,

v.

L'ORÉAL S.A. and L'ORÉAL USA, INC.,

Defendants

**OPENING BRIEF OF DEFENDANT L'ORÉAL S.A. IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION TO DISMISS FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Of Counsel:

Dennis S. Ellis
Katherine F. Murray
Adam M. Reich
Paul Hastings LLP
515 South Flower Street, 25th Floor
Los Angeles, CA, 90071
(213) 683-6000

Naveen Modi
Joseph E. Palys
Paul Hastings LLP
875 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C., 20005
(202) 551-1990

Blaine M. Hackman
Paul Hastings LLP
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166
212-318-6000

Frederick L. Cottrell, III (#2555)
Jeffrey L. Moyer (#3309)
Katharine L. Mowery (#5629)
Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A.
One Rodney Square
920 N. King Street
Wilmington, Delaware 19801
(302) 651-7700
cottrell@rlf.com
moyer@rlf.com
mowery@rlf.com

*Attorneys for Defendants
L'Oréal S.A. and L'Oréal USA, Inc.*

Dated: October 16, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
I. STATEMENT OF NATURE AND STAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS	1
II. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	1
III. STATEMENT OF FACTS	2
A. The Parties and the Accused Products	2
B. Allegations and Notable Omissions of the FAC.....	4
IV. LEGAL STANDARD.....	6
A. Rule 12(b)(2) Standard	6
B. Rule 12(b)(6) Standard	6
V. THE COURT LACKS PERSONAL JURISDICTION OVER L'ORÉAL S.A.	7
A. L'Oréal S.A. Is Not Subject to General Jurisdiction.	9
B. L'Oréal S.A. Is Not Subject to Specific Jurisdiction.....	11
VI. PLAINTIFFS' INFRINGEMENT CLAIMS ARE NOT ADEQUATELY PLED.....	12
A. The FAC Does Not Adequately Plead Direct Infringement	13
1. The FAC Does Not Adequately Plead that L'Oréal S.A. Directly Infringes the Asserted Patent Claims	13
2. The FAC Does Not Adequately Plead any Directly Infringing Use of the Accused Adenosine	14
B. The FAC Does Not Adequately Plead Induced or Contributory Infringement.....	16
C. The FAC Does Not Adequately Plead Willful Infringement.....	17
D. Plaintiffs' Repeated Failure to Plausibly Allege Infringement Against any Party Warrants Dismissing the FAC with Prejudice.....	18
VII. CONCLUSION.....	18

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Acorda Therapeutics, Inc. v. Mylan Pharms. Inc.</i> , 78 F. Supp. 3d 572 (D. Del. 2015), <i>aff'd</i> , 817 F.3d 755 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	10
<i>Applied Biosystems, Inc. v. Cruachem, Ltd.</i> , 772 F. Supp. 1458 (D. Del. 1991).....	8, 10
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009).....	2, 6, 12
<i>Azubuko v. Comm’r of Police of Boston</i> , No. 05-094-SLR, 2005 WL 914779 (D. Del. Apr. 13, 2005).....	7
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	2, 6
<i>Budget Blinds, Inc. v. White</i> , 536 F.3d 244 (3d Cir. 2008).....	12
<i>Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz</i> , 471 U.S. 462 (1985).....	8
<i>Bush v. City of Wilmington</i> , No. 89-628-JRR, 1990 WL 10824350 (D. Del. Aug. 23, 1990).....	1
<i>Componentone, L.L.C. v. Componentart, Inc.</i> , No. 02:05cv1122, 2007 WL 2359827 (W.D. Pa. Aug. 16, 2007)	1
<i>In re Conex Holdings, LLC</i> , 514 B.R. 405 (Bankr. D. Del. 2014)	7
<i>Cupp v. Alberto-Culver USA, Inc.</i> , 308 F. Supp. 2d 873 (W.D. Tenn. 2004).....	10, 11
<i>Daimler AG v. Bauman</i> , 134 S. Ct. 746 (2014).....	9, 11
<i>Evolved Wireless, LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , No. 15-545-SLR-SRF, 2016 WL 1019667 (D. Del. Mar. 15, 2016).....	16
<i>Fowler v. UPMC Shadyside</i> , 578 F.3d 203 (3d Cir. 2009).....	6
<i>Gibbs v. Coupe</i> , 192 F. Supp. 3d 503 (D. Del. 2016).....	7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(continued)

	Page(s)
<i>Global-Tech Appliances, Inc. v. SEB S.A.</i> , 563 U.S. 754 (2011).....	16
<i>Halo Elecs., Inc. v. Pulse Elecs., Inc.</i> , 136 S. Ct. 1923 (2016).....	2, 17
<i>Helicopteros Nacionales de Colombia, S.A. v. Hall</i> , 466 U.S. 408 (1984).....	9
<i>IMO Indus., Inc. v. Kiekert AG</i> , 155 F.3d 254 (3d Cir. 1998).....	7
<i>Int’l Shoe Co. v. Washington</i> , 326 U.S. 310 (1945).....	8
<i>Krantz v. Prudential Investments Fund Mgmt. LLC</i> , 305 F.3d 140, 144 (3d Cir. 2002)	18
<i>LaSala v. Marfin Popular Bank Pub. Co.</i> , 410 F. App’x 474 (3d Cir. 2011)	11
<i>M2M Solutions, LLC v. Telit Commc’ns PLC</i> , No. 14–1103–RGA, 2015 WL 4640400 (D. Del. Aug. 5, 2015).....	13
<i>MacQueen v. Huntington Ingalls, Inc.</i> , 134 F. Supp. 3d 803 (D. Del. 2015).....	9
<i>Macronix Int’l Co. v. Spansion Inc.</i> , 4 F. Supp. 3d 797 (E.D. Va. 2014)	15
<i>Mayne Pharma Int’l PTY Ltd. v. Merck & Co.</i> , No. 15-438-LPS-CJB, 2015 WL 7833206 (D. Del. Dec. 3, 2015).....	17
<i>Mellon Bank (East) PSFS, Nat’l Ass’n v. Farino</i> , 960 F.2d 1217 (3d Cir. 1992).....	6
<i>Meritcare, Inc. v. St. Paul Mercury Ins. Co.</i> , 166 F.3d 214 (3d Cir. 1999).....	7
<i>North Star Innovations, Inc. v. Toshiba Corp.</i> , No. CV 16-115-LPS-CJB, 2016 WL 7107230 (D. Del. Dec. 6, 2016)	13
<i>O’Connor v. Sandy Lane Hotel Co.</i> , 496 F.3d 312 (3d Cir. 2007).....	11, 12

...

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(continued)

	Page(s)
<i>Provident Nat’l Bank v. Cal. Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass’n</i> , 819 F.2d 434 (3d Cir. 1987).....	6, 9
<i>Raindance Techs., Inc. v. 10x Genomics, Inc.</i> , No. 15-152-RGA, 2016 WL 927143 (D. Del. Mar. 4, 2016)	14
<i>Rano v. Sipa Press, Inc.</i> , 987 F.2d 580 (9th Cir. 1993)	12
<i>ReefEdge Networks, LLC v. Juniper Networks, Inc.</i> , 29 F. Supp. 3d 455 (D. Del. 2014).....	16, 17
<i>Rush v. Savchuk</i> , 444 U.S. 320 (1980).....	8, 12
<i>Shoemaker v. McConnell</i> , 556 F. Supp. 2d 351 (D. Del. 2008).....	8
<i>SIPCO, LLC v. Streetline, Inc.</i> , 230 F. Supp. 3d 351 (D. Del. 2017).....	14
<i>T-Jat Sys. 2006 Ltd. v. Expedia, Inc. (DE)</i> , No. 16-581-RGA-MPT, 2017 WL 896988 (D. Del. Mar. 7, 2017).....	2
<i>Telcordia Techs., Inc. v. Alcatel, S.A.</i> , No. 04-874 GMS, 2005 WL 1268061 (D. Del. May 27, 2005).....	1
<i>Tellabs, Inc. v. Makor Issues & Rights, Ltd.</i> , 551 U.S. 308 (2007).....	5
<i>Time Share Vacation Club v. Atl. Resorts, Ltd.</i> , 735 F.2d 61 (3d Cir. 1984).....	6
<i>Varian Med. Sys., Inc. v. Elekta AB</i> , No. 15-871-LPS, 2016 WL 3748772 (D. Del. July 12, 2016).....	16
<i>World-Wide Volkswagen Corp. v. Woodson</i> , 444 U.S. 286 (1980).....	8
Statutes	
10 Del. C. § 3104(c)(1)-(4).....	8

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.