

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

ALMONDNET, INC. and INTENT IQ, LLC,)	
)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	C.A. No. 23-1373 (MN)
)	
v.)	
)	
LINKEDIN, CORPORATION,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

**ALMONDNET'S RESPONSE BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO
LINKEDIN'S MOTION TO DISMISS**

Dated: March 4, 2024

OF COUNSEL:

Reza Mirzaie
Benjamin T. Wang
Amy E. Hayden
James A. Milkey
James S. Tsuei
Jonathan Ma
Jason M. Wietholter
RUSS, AUGUST & KABAT
12424 Wilshire Boulevard, 12th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
Telephone: (310) 826-7474

Brian E. Farnan (Bar No. 4089)
Michael J. Farnan (Bar No. 5165)
FARNAN LLP
919 North Market Street, 12th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 777-0300
bfarnan@farnanlaw.com
mfarnan@farnanlaw.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs
AlmondNet, Inc. and Intent IQ, LLC*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	STATEMENT OF FACTS	1
III.	LEGAL STANDARD	3
IV.	ARGUMENT.....	4
	A. AlmondNet States A Claim For Post-Suit Willfulness.....	4
	B. Almondnet States A Claim For Pre-Suit Willfulness Because The Complaint Adequately Alleges That LinkedIn Had Knowledge Of Infringement Of The '139 And '398 Patents	4
	C. AlmondNet States A Claim For Pre-Suit Willfulness As To The '146 And '878 Patents.....	8
V.	CONCLUSION.....	11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Cases**

<i>ACQIS LLC v. Lenovo Grp. Ltd.</i> , No. 6:20-CV-00967-ADA, 2022 WL 2705269 (W.D. Tex. July 12, 2022).....	6
<i>Afros S.P.A. v. Krauss-Maffei Corp.</i> , 671 F. Supp. 1458 (D. Del. 1987).....	4, 5
<i>Alarm.com, Inc. v. SecureNet Techs. LLC</i> , 345 F. Supp. 3d 544 (D. Del. 2018).....	8
<i>Alston v. Parker</i> , 363 F.3d 229 (3d Cir. 2004)	11
<i>Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Recreational Prods. Inc.</i> , 876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	4
<i>Arthur v. Maersk, Inc.</i> , 484 F.3d 196, 204 (3d Cir. 2006)	11
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	3
<i>Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	3
<i>Diceon Elecs., Inc. v. Calvary Partners, L.P.</i> , 772 F. Supp. 859 (D. Del. 1991).....	2
<i>Elm 3DS Innovations, LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , No. CV 14-1430-LPS-CJB, 2015 WL 5725768 (D. Del. Sept. 29, 2015).....	9, 11
<i>Elm 3DS Innovations, LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , No. CV 14-1430-LPS-CJB, 2016 WL 1274812 (D. Del. Mar. 31, 2016)	9
<i>Free Speech Coalition, Inc. v. AG of the United States</i> , 677 F.3d 519 (3d. Cir. 2012)	11
<i>Kewazinga Corp. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 558 F. Supp. 3d 90 (S.D.N.Y. 2021)	9
<i>Lytone Enter., Inc. v. Agrofresh Sols., Inc.</i> , No. CV 20-678-LPS, 2021 WL 534868 (D. Del. Feb. 12, 2021).....	6
<i>Lytone Enter., Inc. v. Agrofresh Sols., Inc.</i> , No. CV 20-678-LPS-SRF, 2021 WL 1153002 (D. Del. Mar. 26, 2021).....	6

<i>Northwestern Univ. v. Universal Robots A/S,</i> No. CV 21-149 (MN), 2022 WL 903892 (D. Del. Mar. 28, 2022)	3, 7, 8, 11
<i>Novozymes N. Am., Inc. v. Danisco US Inc.,</i> No. 1:19-CV-01902-JDW, 2020 WL 12895027 (D. Del. Feb. 12, 2020)	9, 11
<i>OnDemand LLC v. Spotify Tech., S.A.,</i> 484 F. Supp. 3d 188 (D. Del. 2020)	11
<i>Oran v. Stafford,</i> 226 F.3d 275 (3d Cir. 2000)	2
<i>Ravgen, Inc. v. Ariosa Diagnostics, Inc.,</i> No. CV 20-1646-RGA-JLH, 2021 WL 3526178 (D. Del. Aug. 11, 2021)	4
<i>Robocast, Inc. v. Netflix, Inc.,</i> 640 F. Supp. 3d 365 (D. Del. 2022).....	9
<i>SIMO Holdings Inc. v. Hong Kong uCloudlink Network Tech. Ltd.,</i> 396 F. Supp. 3d 323 (S.D.N.Y. 2019)	9
<i>SoftView LLC v. Apple Inc.,</i> No. CIV. 10-389-LPS, 2012 WL 3061027 (D. Del. July 26, 2012).....	7, 8
<i>Software Rsch., Inc. v. Dynatrace LLC,</i> 316 F. Supp. 3d 1112 (N.D. Cal. 2018)	10, 11
<i>Sonos, Inc. v. Google LLC,</i> 591 F. Supp. 3d 638 (N.D. Cal. 2022).....	10, 11
<i>Sonos, Inc. v. Google LLC,</i> No. 2022-134, 2022 WL 1486359 (Fed. Cir. May 11, 2022).....	10
<i>SRI Int'l, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.,</i> 14 F.4th 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	4
<i>Thompson v. Real Est. Mortg. Network,</i> 748 F.3d 142 (3d Cir. 2014)	3
<i>Varian Med. Sys., Inc. v. Elekta AB,</i> No. CV 15-871-LPS, 2016 WL 3748772 (D. Del. July 12, 2016)	7
<i>Varian Med. Sys., Inc. v. Elekta AB,</i> No. CV 15-871-LPS, 2016 WL 9307500 (D. Del. Dec. 22, 2016)	7
<i>WCM Indus., Inc. v. IPS Corp.,</i> 721 F. App'x 959 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	4, 5

Xiros, Ltd. v. Depuy Synthes Sales, Inc.,
2022 WL 3592449 (W.D. Tex. Aug. 22, 2022)..... 8

ZitoVault, LLC v. Int'l Bus. Machines Corp.,
2018 WL 2971131 (N.D. Tex. Mar. 29, 2018)..... 8

Rules

Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2)..... 11

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.