

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

REALTIME ADAPTIVE STREAMING  
LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

NETFLIX, INC. AND NETFLIX  
STREAMING SERVICES, INC.,

Defendants.

C.A. No. 1:17-cv-01692-JFB-SRF

**PLAINTIFF REALTIME ADAPTIVE STREAMING LLC'S ANSWERING BRIEF IN  
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION (D.I. 11) TO DISMISS COMPLAINT**

February 20, 2018

BAYARD, P.A.

OF COUNSEL:

Marc A. Fenster  
Brian D. Ledahl  
Reza Mirzaie  
C. Jay Chung  
RUSS, AUGUST & KABAT  
12424 Wilshire Boulevard, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
(310) 826-7474  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1031  
mfenster@raklaw.com  
bledahl@raklaw.com  
rmirzaie@raklaw.com  
jchung@raklaw.com

Stephen B. Brauerman (No. 4952)  
Sara E. Bussiere (No. 5725)  
600 N. King Street, Suite 400  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
(302) 655-5000  
sbraerman@bayardlaw.com  
sbussiere@bayardlaw.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Realtime Adaptive  
Streaming LLC*

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page(s)</u></b>
I. NETFLIX FAILS TO SHOW THAT ANY OF THE 114 CLAIMS OF THE FOUR FALLON PATENTS ARE INVALID UNDER §101.....	1
B. Netflix Cannot Establish That The Patent Claims Are Directed To An Abstract Idea Under <i>Alice</i> Step 1.....	1
1. Examining the patents confirms that they claim technological solutions to technological problems, not abstract subject matter. ....	2
2. Another district court has repeatedly held that the subject matter of the asserted patents is patent-eligible despite several prior challenges. 6	
3. Netflix’s flawed arguments mischaracterize the law and claims. ....	7
a. Netflix mischaracterizes the applicable law. ....	7
b. Netflix mischaracterizes the claims. ....	9
C. Netflix Also Cannot Establish That the Claims Are Patent Ineligible Under <i>Alice</i> Step 2. ....	11
1. Section 101 analysis under <i>Alice</i> step 2 involves questions of fact. ....	11
2. The intrinsic record confirms that the claimed inventions involve unconventional technological solutions under step 2. ....	13
C. Netflix Fails To Analyze Every Single Claim Separately. ....	15
II. REALTIME’S ELEMENT-BY-ELEMENT ALLEGATIONS FAR EXCEED THE <i>TWOMBLY</i> STANDARD.....	16
III. NETFLIX’S ARGUMENT REGARDING THE ‘462 AND ‘298 PATENTS IS MERITLESS.....	18
B. Realtime’s Allegations Regarding ‘462 Patent Easily Exceeds the <i>Twombly</i> Standard for Pleading Infringement.....	18
C. Realtime’s Allegations Regarding ‘298 Patent Also Easily Exceeds the <i>Twombly</i> Standard for Pleading Infringement.....	19
IV. NETFLIX’S ARGUMENT REGARDING INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT IS MERITLESS.....	20

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b><u>Page(s)</u></b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Aatrix Software, Inc. v. Green Shades Software, Inc.</i> , -- F.3d --, 2018 WL 843288 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 14, 2018).....	12, 16
<i>Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank Int'l</i> , 34 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....	1
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 129 S. Ct. 1937 (2009).....	16
<i>Berkheimer v. HP Inc.</i> , -- F.3d --, 2018 WL 774096 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 8, 2018).....	11, 16
<i>C. R. Bard, Inc. v. Angiodynamics, Inc.</i> , 156 F. Supp. 3d 540 (D. Del. 2016).....	16
<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).....	10
<i>Content Extraction v. Wells Fargo Bank</i> , 776 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	9
<i>Core Wireless Licensing v. LG Elecs., Inc.</i> , --- F.3d ---, 2018 WL 542672 (Fed. Cir. Jan. 25, 2018).....	4
<i>DDR v. Hotels.com LP</i> , 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	4
<i>Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp</i> , 822 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	3
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Sys., Inc.</i> , --- F.3d ---, 2018 WL 341882 (Fed. Cir. Jan. 10, 2018).....	2, 8
<i>Fujitsu Ltd. v. Netgear, Inc.</i> , 620 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	19
<i>In re TLI Communications LLC Patent Litigation</i> , 823 F.3d 607 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	9
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Erie Indem. Co.</i> , 850 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	9

*IOP Techs., Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*,  
728 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... 9

*IP Commc'n Sols., LLC v. Viber Media (USA) Inc.*,  
2017 WL 1312942 (D. Del. Apr. 5, 2017)..... 17

*Lifetime Indus. Inc. v. Trim-Lok Inc.*,  
869 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... 16

*MAZ Encryption Techs. LLC v. Blackberry Corp.*,  
No. 13-304-LPS, 2016 WL 5661981 (D. Del. Sept. 29, 2016) ..... 11

*McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc.*,  
262 F.3d 1339, 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2001)..... 11

*McRO, Inc. v. Bandai Namco Games Am. Inc.*,  
837 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 7

*Modern Telecom Sys. LLC v. TCL Corp.*,  
2017 WL 6524526 (D. Del. Dec. 21, 2017)..... 17

*Nichia Corp. v. VIZIO, Inc.*,  
2017 WL 3836141 (E.D. Tex. July 24, 2017) ..... 17

*Prowire LLC v. Apple, Inc.*,  
2017 WL 3444689 (D. Del. Aug. 9, 2017)..... 16

*Raindance Tech. Inc. v. 10x Genomics, Inc.*,  
2016 WL 927143 (D. Del. Mar. 4, 2016) ..... 17

*Realtime Data LLC v. Rackspace US, Inc.*,  
2017 WL 2590195 (E.D. Tex. June 14, 2017)..... 6

*RecogniCorp, LLC v. Nintendo Co.*,  
855 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... 8

*Smartgene, Inc. v. Advanced Biological Labs., SA*,  
555 Fed. Appx. 950 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 9

*Stragent, LLC v. BMW of N. Am., LLC*,  
2017 WL 2821697 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 3, 2017) ..... 19

*Toshiba Corp. v. Imation Corp.*,  
681 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 19

*TQP Dev., LLC v. Intuit Inc.*,  
2014 WL 651935 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 19, 2014)..... 10

*Two-Way Media Ltd. v. Comcast Cable Commc'ns, LLC*,  
874 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... 9

*U.S. Gypsum Co. v. New NGC, Inc.*,  
2017 WL 5187845 (D. Del. Aug. 18, 2017)..... 16

*Univ. of Pittsburgh v. Varian Med. Sys., Inc.*,  
569 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... 17

*Visual Memory LLC v. Nvidia Corp.*,  
867 F.3d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... 4, 7

*Windy City Innov., LLC v. Microsoft*,  
193 F. Supp. 3d 1109 (N.D. Cal. 2016) ..... 17

# 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.