IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

ALMONDNET, INC. and INTENT IQ, LLC, and DATONICS LLC,

Plaintiffs,

LOTAME SOLUTIONS, INC.,

v.

Defendant.

C.A. No. 24-00376-MN

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS

Dated: October 1, 2024

Susan E. Morrison (No. 4690) Grayson P. Sundermeir (No. 6517) FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. 222 Delaware Avenue, 17th Floor Wilmington, DE 19899-1114 (302) 652-5070 morrison@fr.com sundermeir@fr.com

Aamir A. Kazi (GA Bar No. 104235) 1180 Peachtree Street, NE, 21st Floor Atlanta, GA 30309 (404) 892-5005 kazi@fr.com

Attorneys for Defendant LOTAME SOLUTIONS, INC.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTR	INTRODUCTION		
II.	ARGUMENT			
	A.	AlmondNet's Mixed-and-Matched Infringement Allegations Do Not Satisfy the Pleading Requirements		
		AlmondNet Failed to Identify An Accused Instrumentality that Meets All Claim Limitations of the Asserted Patents	1	
		2. AlmondNet Must Provide Adequate Notice of its Infringement Theories Even if Only Asserting Method Claims	4	
	B.	Any Claim for Past Damages Should be Dismissed		
	C.	Without Indirect Infringement, Claims for '445 Patent Must Also Be Dismissed		
Ш	CONCLUSION			

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
Am. Med. Sys., Inc. v. Med. Eng'g Corp., 6 F.3d 1523 (Fed. Cir. 1993)	6
Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Recreational Prod. Inc., 876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	7
Bausch & Lomb Incorporated v. SBH Holdings LLC, No. 20-1463-LPS, 2022 WL 856750 (D. Del. Mar. 23, 2022)	4, 5
CAP Co. v. McAfee, Inc., No. 14-5068-JD, 2015 WL 4734951 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 10, 2015)	4
Carnegie Mellon Univ. v. Marvell Tech. Grp., Ltd., 906 F. Supp. 2d 399 (W.D. Pa. 2012)	7
Crown Packaging Tech. v. Rexam Beverage Can, 498 F. Supp. 2d 718 (D. Del. 2007)	6
Crown Packaging Tech. v. Rexam Beverage Can, 559 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	6
CTD Networks, LLC v. Google, LLC, 688 F. Supp. 3d 490 (W.D. Tex. 2023)	4
GeoVector Corp. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., No. 16-2463-WHO, 2017 WL 76950 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 9, 2017)	4
Michigan Motor Techs., LLC v. Bayerische Motoren Werke AG, 683 F. Supp. 3d 811 (N.D. III. 2023)	6, 7
Siemens Mobility Inc. v. Westinghouse Air Brake Techs. Corp., No. 16-0284-LPS-CJB, 2018 WL 7893901 (D. Del. Dec. 17, 2018)	6, 7
Uniloc 2017 LLC v. Apple, Inc., No. 19-1904-WHO, 2019 WL 8810168 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 16, 2019)	4
Com. of Pa. ex rel. Zimmerman v. PepsiCo, Inc., 836 F.2d 173 (3d Cir. 1988)	1
ZitoVault v. IBM, No. 16-0962-M. 2018 WL 2971179 (N.D. Tex. Mar. 29, 2018)	4



C40	4	400
Sta	TII	ites



I. INTRODUCTION

AlmondNet's Answering Brief (D.I. 23) recharacterizes its infringement allegations by arguing, contrary to the allegations in its First Amended Complaint, that multiple different accused Lotame products are in fact one product. Its insistence that it identified a single infringing product, the Spherical Platform, is at odds with both the language of the First Amended Complaint, which defines the accused products as including Lotame's Spherical Platform "without limitation," and with the claim charts accompanying the First Amended Complaint, which cite to a scattershot combination of Lotame and non-Lotame products. Additionally, AlmondNet's assertion of apparatus claims in its original Complaint are fatal to its ability to recover past damages. Finally, by dismissing its indirect infringement claims, AlmondNet is without an infringement theory for at least the '445 Patent, and its allegations as to that patent should be dismissed for that reason as well.

II. ARGUMENT

- A. AlmondNet's Mixed-and-Matched Infringement Allegations Do Not Satisfy the Pleading Requirements
 - 1. AlmondNet Failed to Identify An Accused Instrumentality that Meets All Claim Limitations of the Asserted Patents

AlmondNet now attempts to sweep a suite of software and products offered by Lotame into one accused instrumentality: Lotame's Spherical Platform. (D.I. 16 at ¶¶ 10–16.) AlmondNet argues that its First Amended Complaint "expressly accused a single overall product: 'Lotame's Spherical Platform product and services.'" (D.I. 23 at 9.)¹ But the language of the First Amended Complaint and the accompanying claim charts belie AlmondNet's arguments.

¹ This is an assertion notably absent from either of its Complaints, and inappropriate at this stage. See Com. of Pa. ex rel. Zimmerman v. PepsiCo, Inc., 836 F.2d 173, 181 (3d Cir. 1988) ("[I]t is axiomatic that the complaint may not be amended by the briefs in opposition to a motion to dismiss.")



DOCKET

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.

