

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

PHILIPS NORTH AMERICA LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

FITBIT, INC.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 1:19-cv-11586-IT

Leave to file excess pages granted
on December 10, 2019

**DEFENDANT FITBIT INC.'S MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF ITS RENEWED
RULE 12(b)(6) MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFF PHILIPS NORTH AMERICA
LLC'S FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. LEGAL STANDARDS	1
A. Rule 12(b)(6) motions to dismiss under section 101	1
B. Patent eligibility under 35 U.S.C. § 101	2
II. ARGUMENT	4
A. The '233 patent is invalid as patent ineligible	4
1. The '233 patent is directed to the abstract idea of secure data transfer between devices	4
a. The claims recite generic devices	4
b. "Security mechanism" is a result, not a particular way of achieving the result	5
c. Federal Circuit has determined similar claims to be directed to abstract ideas	6
d. Result-oriented mobile device functionality does not save claims from § 101 abstraction	7
2. The '233 patent recites no inventive concept	8
3. Claim 1 of the '233 patent is representative	9
B. The '377 patent is invalid as patent ineligible	10
1. The '377 patent is directed to the abstract idea of collecting and analyzing exercise data, and presenting that data to a user	10
a. Claims are directed to the abstract idea of data collection, analysis, and presentation	11
b. Claims recite no improvements to technology or methods for exercise monitoring	12
c. Claims recite no improvements to mobile phone technology	13
d. The Federal Circuit has determined similar claims to collection, analysis, and display of physiological data to be patent-ineligible	14
2. The '377 patent recites no inventive concept	14
3. Claim 1 of the '377 patent is representative	16
C. The '958 patent is invalid as patent ineligible	16
1. The '958 patent is directed to the abstract idea of collecting and storing health data so it is not lost during a wireless connection interruption	17
a. Collecting and storing data is an abstract concept	17

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
b. Claims recite the abstract idea in a generic mobile environment	18
c. Recited storing of health data is a result, not a specific improvement or solution	18
2. The '958 patent recites no inventive concept	19
3. Claim 16 of the '958 patent is representative	20
D. The '007 patent is invalid as patent ineligible	20
1. The '007 patent is directed to the abstract idea of collecting and analyzing exercise data to track an athlete's performance.....	21
a. Reciting generic physical components is immaterial to whether a claim is "abstract" under § 101	21
b. Claims do not recite improvements to GPS, networking, or exercise monitoring technology	22
c. Claims do not recite improvements to athletic feedback data analysis	23
d. Claims recite no improvements to presentation or comparing of athletic performance data	23
2. The '007 patent recites no inventive concept	23
3. Claim 21 of the '007 patent is representative and Fitbit's motion should be granted even under Philips' constructions.....	24
III. CONCLUSION.....	25

..

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

<i>Aatrix Software, Inc. v. Green Shades Software, Inc.</i> , 882 F.3d 1121 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	2, 8, 25
<i>Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , 838 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	7, 8
<i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l</i> , 573 U.S. 208 (2014).....	1, 2, 3, 8
<i>Am. Axle & Mfg., Inc. v. Neapco Holdings LLC</i> , 939 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	3, 4, 21, 23
<i>Am. Well Corp. v. Teladoc, Inc.</i> , 191 F. Supp. 3d 135 (D. Mass. 2016).....	15
<i>Ariosa Diagnostics, Inc. v. Sequenom, Inc.</i> , 788 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	3
<i>Aristocrat Techs. Austl. Pty Ltd. v. Int’l Game Tech.</i> , 521 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	25
<i>Athena Diagnostics Inc. v. Mayo Collab. Servs. LLC</i> , 915 F.3d 743 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	2
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	1
<i>Berkheimer v. HP, Inc.</i> , 881 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	2, 8
<i>Bridge & Post, Inc. v. Verizon Commc’ns, Inc.</i> , 778 F. App’x 882 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	3
<i>British Telecom. PLC v. IAC/InterActiveCorp</i> , 381 F. Supp. 3d 293 (D. Del. 2019).....	8, 16, 20, 24
<i>BSG Tech LLC v. Buyseasons, Inc.</i> , 899 F.3d 1281 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>CardioNet, LLC v. InfoBionic, Inc.</i> , 348 F. Supp. 3d 87 (D. Mass. 2018).....	1, 8
<i>CardioNet, LLC v. InfoBionic, Inc.</i> , No. 15-CV-11803, 2017 WL 1788650 (D. Mass. May 4, 2017).....	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(continued)

	Page(s)
<i>Cellspin Soft, Inc. v. Fitbit, Inc.</i> , 927 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	9
<i>Chamberlain Grp., Inc. v. Techtronic Indus. Co.</i> , 935 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	8
<i>ChargePoint, Inc. v. SemaConnect, Inc.</i> , 920 F.3d 759 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.</i> , 776 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	8, 17, 18
<i>Elec. Power Grp, LLC v. Alstom, S.A.</i> , 830 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>First-Class Monitoring, LLC v. United Parcel Serv. of Am., Inc.</i> , 389 F. Supp. 3d 456 (E.D. Tex. 2019).....	2
<i>Hyper Search LLC v. Facebook Inc.</i> , No. 17-1387, 2018 WL 6617143 (D. Del. Dec. 17, 2018)	25
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Capital One Fin. Corp.</i> , 850 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	11
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Symantec Corp.</i> , 838 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	9
<i>Interval Licensing LLC v. AOL, Inc.</i> , 896 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	3, 4
<i>Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.</i> , 566 U.S. 66 (2012).....	2
<i>Prism Techs. LLC v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.</i> , 696 F. App'x 1014 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	6
<i>Return Mail, Inc. v. U.S. Postal Serv.</i> , 868 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	4
<i>SAP Am., Inc. v. InvestPic, LLC</i> , 898 F.3d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	2, 6
<i>Secured Mail Sols. LLC v. Universal Wilde, Inc.</i> , 873 F.3d 905 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	2

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.