

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

REALTIME ADAPTIVE STREAMING
LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

BRIGHTCOVE INC., AND
BRIGHTCOVE HOLDINGS, INC.,

Defendants.

C.A. No. 17-1519-JFB-SRF

**PLAINTIFF REALTIME ADAPTIVE STREAMING LLC'S ANSWERING BRIEF IN
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION (D.I. 15) TO DISMISS PURSUANT TO
RULE 12(B)(6)**

February 9, 2018

BAYARD, P.A.

OF COUNSEL:

Stephen B. Brauerman (No. 4952)

Sara E. Bussiere (No. 5725)

Marc A. Fenster

600 N. King Street, Suite 400

Brian D. Ledahl

Wilmington, DE 19801

Reza Mirzaie

(302) 655-5000

C. Jay Chung

sbrauerman@bayardlaw.com

RUSS, AUGUST & KABAT

sbussiere@bayardlaw.com

12424 Wilshire Boulevard, 12th Floor

(310) 826-7474

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Realtime Adaptive
Streaming LLC*

Los Angeles, CA 90025-1031

mfenster@raklaw.com

bledahl@raklaw.com

rmirzaie@raklaw.com

jchung@raklaw.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page(s)</u>
I. BRIGHTCOVE’S <i>IQBAL</i> / <i>TWOMBLY</i> ARGUMENTS FAIL.	1
A. Realtime’s Element-By-Element Factual Allegations Regarding The Fallon Patents Easily Exceed the <i>Iqbal</i> / <i>Twombly</i> Standard.	2
B. Realtime’s Element-By-Element Factual Allegations Regarding The ‘462 And ‘298 Patents Also Easily Exceed the <i>Iqbal</i> / <i>Twombly</i> Standard.	5
II. BRIGHTCOVE FAILS TO SHOW THAT ANY OF THE 143 CLAIMS OF THE FIVE FALLON PATENTS ARE INVALID UNDER §101.	6
A. Brightcove Cannot Establish That The Patent Claims Are Directed To An Abstract Idea Under <i>Alice</i> Step 1.	6
1. Examining the patents confirms that they claim technological solutions to technological problems, not abstract subject matter.	7
2. Another court has repeatedly held that the subject matter of the Fallon patents is patent-eligible despite several prior challenges.	11
3. Brightcove’s flawed arguments mischaracterize the law and claims.	13
B. Brightcove Also Cannot Establish That the Claims Are Patent Ineligible Under <i>Alice</i> Step 2.	17
1. Under any reasonable characterization, the patented claims include additional limitations that are unconventional.	17
2. Brightcove’s arguments under step 2 are based on attorney arguments that not only rely on a misapplication of controlling law, but are also contradicted by the patents themselves.	19
C. Brightcove Fails To Analyze Every Single Claim Separately.	19

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
Cases	
<i>Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank Int’l</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....	6
<i>Amdocs v. Openet Telecom, Inc.</i> , 841 F.3d 1288 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	18
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 129 S. Ct. 1937 (2009).....	2
<i>Atlas IP LLC v. PG&E Co.</i> , 2016 WL 1719545 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 9, 2016).....	2
<i>Atlas IP, LLC v. Exelon Corp.</i> , 189 F. Supp. 3d 768 (N.D. Ill. 2016)	2
<i>Bascom Global v. AT&T Mobility</i> , 827 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	17
<i>Berkheimer v. HP Inc.</i> , No. 2017-1437 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 8, 2018).....	17
<i>buySAFE, Inc. v. Google, Inc.</i> , 765 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	14
<i>C. R. Bard, Inc. v. Angiodynamics, Inc.</i> , 156 F. Supp. 3d 540 (D. Del. 2016).....	20
<i>Cal. Institute of Tech. v. Hughes Commcn’s Inc.</i> , No. 2:13-cv-07245-MRP-JEM, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 156763 (C.D. Cal Nov. 3 2014).....	15
<i>Card Verification Solutions, LLC. v. Citigroup Inc.</i> , No. 13-C-6339, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 137577 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 29, 2014).....	6
<i>Cleveland Clinic v. True Health Diag. LLC</i> , 859 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	20
<i>Content Extraction v. Wells Fargo Bank</i> , 776 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	14
<i>Core Wireless Licensing v. LG Elecs., Inc.</i> , --- F.3d ---, 2018 WL 542672 (Fed. Cir. Jan. 25, 2018).....	9
<i>CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc.</i> ,	

654 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2011)..... 14

DDR v. Hotels.com LP,
773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 8

Delavau, LLC v. Corbion NV,
2016 WL 3410176 (D.N.J. June 16, 2016)..... 4

Digitech Image Techs. v. Electronics for Imaging,
758 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 13

Electric Power Group, LLC v. Alstom SA,
830 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 14

Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp,
822 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 8

Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Sys., Inc.,
--- F.3d ---, 2018 WL 341882 (Fed. Cir. Jan. 10, 2018)..... 7

In re Bill of Lading,
681 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 4

In re TLI Communications LLC Patent Litigation,
823 F.3d 607 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 14

JSDQ Mesh Techs. LLC v. Fluidmesh Networks, LLC,
No. 16-CV-212-GMS, 2016 WL 4639140 (D. Del. Sept. 6, 2016)..... 6

Lifetime Indus. Inc. v. Trim-Lok Inc.,
869 F.3d 1372, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... 2

MAZ Encryption Techs. LLC v. Blackberry Corp.,
No. 13-304-LPS, 2016 WL 5661981 (D. Del. Sept. 29, 2016) 17, 19

McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc.,
262 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2001)..... 17

McRO, Inc. v. Bandai Namco Games Am. Inc.,
837 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 13

Modern Telecom Sys. LLC v. TCL Corp.,
2017 WL 6524526 (D. Del. Dec. 21, 2017)..... 2

Philips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 12

Prowire LLC v. Apple, Inc.,
2017 WL 3444689 (D. Del. Aug. 9, 2017)..... 2

Raindance Tech. Inc. v. 10x Genomics, Inc.,
2016 WL 927143 (D. Del. Mar. 4, 2016) 2

Realtime Data LLC v. Rackspace US, Inc.,
2017 WL 2590195 (E.D. Tex. June 14, 2017)..... 11

RecogniCorp, LLC v. Nintendo Co.,
855 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... 13

Synopsys, Inc. v. Mentor Graphics Corp.,
839 F.3d 1138 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 14

Thales Visionix Inc. v. U.S.,
850 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... 9

TQP Dev., LLC v. Intuit Inc.,
2014 WL 651935 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 19, 2014)..... 15

U.S. Gypsum Co. v. New NGC, Inc.,
2017 WL 5187845 (D. Del. Aug. 18, 2017)..... 1

Univ. of Pittsburgh v. Varian Med. Sys., Inc.,
569 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... 5

Visual Memory LLC v. Nvidia Corp.,
867 F.3d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... 8, 13

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.