	Case 3:20-cv-00603-MMD-CLB Document 58 Filed 07/07/21 Page 1 of 21
4	
1 2	
3	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4	DISTRICT OF NEVADA
5	* * *
6	NEXRF CORP., Case No. 3:20-cv-00603-MMD-CLB
7	Plaintiff, ORDER
8	V.
9	PLAYTIKA LTD., et al.,
10	Defendants.
11	I. SUMMARY
12	Plaintiff NEXREF Corp. sued Defendants Playtika Ltd., Playtika Holding Corp.
13	(collectively, "Playtika") and Caesars Interactive Entertainment ("Caesars") for allegedly
14	infringing five patents ¹ by offering online slot machine games. (ECF No. 1.) Before the
15	Court are Caesars and Playtika's motions to dismiss (ECF Nos. 26, 28), ² and Playtika's
16	motion for sanctions under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11 (ECF No. 53). ^{3, 4} As further
17	explained below, because the Court agrees with Defendants in pertinent part that all five
18	of Plaintiff's asserted patents are invalid under Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int'l, 573
19	U.S. 208 (2014), and its progeny, the Court will grant both motions to dismiss. The Court
20	will also deny Playtika's motion for sanctions primarily because it is based on arguments
21	that the Court does not rule on in this order.
22	///
23	
24	¹ The five patents are U.S. Patent Nos. 8,747,229 (the '229 patent), 8,506,406 (the
25	'406 patent), 9,646,454 (the '454 patent), 8,506,407 (the '407 patent), and 9,373,116 (the '116 patent) (collectively, the "asserted patents"). (ECF No. 1 at 1.)
26 27	² Plaintiff filed a combined response (ECF No. 47), and Defendants filed replies (ECF Nos. 51, 52).
27	³ Plaintiff filed a response (ECF No. 56), and Playtika filed a reply (ECF No. 57).
20	4The Court denies the parties' requests for oral argument. See LR 78-1

DOCKET A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

II. BACKGROUND

The following allegations are adapted from the Complaint. (ECF No. 1.) Plaintiff alleges that the asserted patents "disclose various systems and methods for embodiments of a fully remote, multiplayer capable, secure, and engaging casino-style gaming system." (*Id.* at 2.) Said otherwise, the asserted patents generally claim slot machine games playable on a computer or handheld device run on a remote server. Plaintiff more specifically alleges that all asserted patents cover certain unconventional elements:

9 10

1

 A centralized game server that sends game outcomes and corresponding images to a remote device;

11

12

2. A verification server coupled to the centralized game server that controls access to gaming activities;

- 13
 3. A relatively fast image and/or video delivery component.
- 14 || (*Id.* at 2.)

Plaintiff further alleges that particular asserted patents contain additional unconventional elements. (*Id.* at 2-3.) The '229 patent covers a paytable module associated with the centralized game server. (*Id.*) The '407 patent covers a transactional system that credits funds from winning game outcomes to a user's financial account. (*Id.* at 3.) And the '116 patent covers location tracking of a user, along with providing that user with rewards. (*Id.*)

Caesars owned Playtika for some time but does not anymore. (*Id.* at 4-5.) Both
Defendants offer various mobile slot machine games, some that allow users to wager real
money, and some that do not. (*Id.* at 5-7.) Plaintiff accuses these games of infringement.⁵
(*Id.* at 5-23.)

25 📗

26

///

⁵Plaintiff's Complaint is unclear as to who makes what game, and precisely which games Plaintiff is accusing of infringing which patents. Indeed, Defendants argue Plaintiff's Complaint is fatally unclear. (ECF Nos. 26 at 24-25, 28 at 10-16.) However, the Court does not wade into these issues because it finds the asserted patents invalid under *Alice* and its progeny.

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

	D is intiffied on the second state of the second state of the second state (Id)
1	Plaintiff's Complaint includes five counts, one for each of the asserted patents. (Id.)
2	In each count, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants infringe "the asserted claims of" each of
3	the asserted patents, and otherwise states that Defendants infringe "one or more claims
4	of" each patent, "including but not limited to claim 1[.]" (See, e.g., id. at 7.) But Plaintiff
5	characterizes claim 1 of each asserted patent as exemplary, and only ever specifically
6	includes the limitations of claim 1 of each asserted patent in its Complaint. (Id. at 7-8, 10,
7	14, 17, 20.)
8	Following the order that Plaintiff uses in the Complaint, and to provide necessary
9	context for the Court's discussion infra, claim 1 of each of the asserted patents follows
10	below.
11	A. The '229 patent
12	A gaming server system configured to communicate with at least one network access device communicatively coupled to a network, the gaming
13	server system comprising: a verification system configured to access a registration database
14	having a plurality of registration data associated with each registered user;
15	a memory module configured to store a plurality of images corresponding to at least one game outcome that are communicated
16	to the at least one network access device; a centralized gaming server communicatively coupled to each of the
17	at least one network access device, the centralized gaming server configured to generate at least one random game outcome by
18	random generation at the centralized gaming server; a paytable module associated with the centralized gaming server,
19	the paytable module configured to determine one or more prizes associated with a game outcome; and
20	the centralized gaming server configured to access the memory module and communicate the plurality of images corresponding to
21	the at least one random game outcome to the at least one network access device.
22	(<i>Id.</i> at 7-8.)
23	B. The '406 Patent
24	A system to run a gaming application on a network access device, comprising:
25	the network access device; and
26	a remote gaming system including a verification system; the network access device configured to transmit user identification
27	information and security information to the verification system; the network access device configured to receive an
28	acknowledgement from the verification system indicating that the user identification information and security information are valid;

	Case 3:20-cv-	00603-MMD-CLB Document 58 Filed 07/07/21 Page 4 of 21
1		the network access device configured to receive a game input from
2		a user of the network access device and transmit the game input to the remote gaming system;
3		the remote gaming system configured to receive the game input and generate a random game output, the remote gaming system further
4		configured to associate an image ID with the random game output and select one or more images associated with the image ID for encoding and broadcasting to the network access device;
5		the network access device configured to receive a plurality of broadcast images generated by the remote gaming system.
6	(<i>Id.</i> at 10.)	bioadcast images generated by the remote gaming system.
7	C.	The '454 Patent
8	A net	worked gaming system comprising: a user identification received by at least one network access device
9		that is compared with registration data in a registration database, wherein a player is provided access to a game when the user
10		identification matches the registered player data; a transactional component that charges the registered player at least
11		one credit for a game outcome; a centralized networked gaming module that performs game
12		operations and generates at least one random game output by random generation at the networked gaming module;
13		the networked gaming module associates the at least one random game output with an image ID; and
14		the networked gaming module communicates one or more images corresponding to the image ID to the network access device.
15	(<i>Id.</i> at 14.)	
16	D.	The '407 Patent
17	A gar	ning system network, comprising: a verification system configured to verify that a user attempting to
18		access the gaming system network is a registered player, the user operating a network access device communicating with the gaming
19		system network; a gaming system configured to generate at least one random game
20		output, the gaming system configured to associate an image ID with the at least one random game output;
21		a video server configured to store a plurality of images corresponding to at least one game, the video server configured to retrieve one or more images associated with the image ID, wherein the one or more
22		images are representative of a game output, the video server configured to communicate the one or more images to the network
23 24		a transactional system configured to credit monetary funds to a
24		financial account of the user based on the at least one random game output.
26	(<i>Id.</i> at 17.)	
27	E.	The '116 Patent
28		teractive gaming system for a casino property, the interactive gaming m comprising:

 DOCKET
 Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

1 a wireless device associated with a registered user, wherein the wireless device is used to determine a location of the registered user and the wireless device communicates with a network using at least one wireless networking protocol; 3 a verification system that accesses a registration database having registration data associated with each registered user; 4 a centralized gaming server communicatively coupled to the wireless device; the centralized gaming server generates at least one random game outcome: 5 a memory module that stores a plurality of images corresponding to the at least one game outcome that are communicated to the wireless device; 6 the centralized gaming server accesses the memory module and communicates the plurality of accumulated points associated with a betting activity of accumulated points associated with a betting activity of the registered user, wherein the betting activity of the registered user, wherein the betting activity of the registered user, wherein the betting activity of messages generated by the casino player tracking system that includes, a plurality of messages generated by the casino player tracking system for the wireless device regarding the complementary good or service. 10 a four any goods or services. 11 a plurality of messages generated by the casino player tracking system for the wireless device is aveive, followed by Claim 1 12 a plurality of the '229 patent under the Alice framework as representative of the asserted claims of the '229 patent as representative of the '454 and '406 patents as well. ⁶ The Court then analyzes Claim 1 of the '407 patent under the Alice framework,		Case 3:20-cv-00603-MMD-CLB Document 58 Filed 07/07/21 Page 5 of 21
2 and the wireless device is used to determine a location of the registered user and the wireless networking protocol; 3 a verification system that accesses a registration database having registration data associated with each registered user; 4 a centralized gaming server communicatively coupled to the wireless device, the centralized gaming server generates at least one random game outcome; 5 game, the centralized gaming server accesses the memory module and communicates the pluratily of images corresponding to the at least one game outcome that are communicated to the wireless device; 7 the centralized gaming server accesses the memory module and communicates the pluratily of images corresponding to the random game outcome to the wireless device; and a casino player tracking system that includes, 9 a registered user profile that further includes a plurality of user preferences, 10 a record of a plurality of accumulated points associated with a betting activity of the registered user, wherein the betting activity is associated with the random outcomes generated by the centralized gaming server, at least one complimentary good or service corresponding to the accumulated points associated with the registered user; and a plurality of messages generated by the casino player tracking system for the wireless device regarding the complementary goods or services. 15 (<i>Id.</i> at 20.) 16 III. MOTIONS TO DISMISS 17 The Court begins by reciting the legal standards governing its review of these motions. It then analyzes Claim 1 of the '429 pate	1	a wireless device associated with a registered user wherein the
3 a verification system that accesses a registration database having registration data associated with each registered user; 4 a centralized gaming server communicatively coupled to the wireless device, the centralized gaming server generates at least one random game outcome; 5 memory module that stores a plurality of images corresponding to the at least one game outcome that are communicated to the wireless device; 7 the centralized gaming server accesses the memory module and communicates the plurality of images corresponding to the random game outcome to the wireless device; and a casino player tracking system that includes, 9 a record of a plurality of accumulated points associated with a betting activity of the registered user, wherein the betting activity is associated with the random outcomes generated by the centralized gaming server, at least one complimentary good or service corresponding to the accumulated points associated with the registered user; 10 a record of a plurality of messages generated by the casino player tracking system for the wireless device: regarding the complementary goods or service corresponding to the accumulated points associated with the registered user; 11 and 12 at least one complimentary good or service regarding the complementary goods or services. 14 tracking system for the wireless device regarding the complementary goods or services. 15 (Id. at 20.) 16 III. MOTIONS TO DISMISS 17 The Court begins		wireless device is used to determine a location of the registered user
 registration data associated with each registered user; a centralized gaming server communicatively coupled to the wireless device, the centralized gaming server accesses at least one random game outcome; a memory module that stores a plurality of images corresponding to the at least one game outcome that are communicated to the wireless device; the centralized gaming server accesses the memory module and communicates the plurality of images corresponding to the random game outcome to the wireless device; and a casino player tracking system that includes, a registered user profile that further includes a plurality of user preferences, a recistered user profile that further includes a plurality of user preferences, a recistered user profile that further includes a plurality of user preferences, a recistered user profile that gaming server, a recistered user complimentary good or service corresponding to the activity is associated with the random outcomes generated by the centralized gaming server, at least one complimentary good or service corresponding to the accumulated points associated with the registered user; and a plurality of messages generated by the casino player tracking system for the wireless device regarding the complementary goods or services. (<i>Id.</i> at 20.) III. MOTIONS TO DISMISS The Court begins by reciting the legal standards governing its review of these motions. It then analyzes Claim 1 of the '429 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework as representative of the asserted claims of the '454 and '406 patents as well.⁶ The Court then analyzes Claim 1 of the '407 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework, followed by Claim 1 the '116 patent.⁷ Finally, the Court explains that it will not	3	one wireless networking protocol; a verification system that accesses a registration database having
 device, the centralized gaming server generates at least one random game outcome; a memory module that stores a plurality of images corresponding to the at least one game outcome that are communicated to the wireless device; the centralized gaming server accesses the memory module and communicates the plurality of images corresponding to the random game outcome to the wireless device; and a casino player tracking system that includes, a registered user profile that further includes a plurality of user preferences, a registered user profile that further includes a plurality of user preferences, a registered user profile that further includes a plurality of user andom deting activity is associated with the random outcomes generated by the centralized gaming server, a teast one complimentary good or service corresponding to the accumulated points associated with the registered user; and a plurality of messages generated by the casino player tracking system for the wireless device regarding the complementary goods or services. (<i>Id.</i> at 20.) III. MOTIONS TO DISMISS The Court begins by reciting the legal standards governing its review of these motions. It then analyzes Claim 1 of the '429 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework as representative of the asserted claims of the '454 and '406 patents as well.⁶ The Court then analyzes Claim 1 of the '407 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework, followed by Claim 1 the '116 patent.⁷ Finally, the Court explains that it will not grant Plaintiff leave to amend, as amendment would be futile. Again, and as noted, because the Court finds Defendants' ⁶Plaintiff stated that it did "not oppose treating the '229 Patent as representative of the '454 and '406 Patents for the purposes of this § 101 analysis." (ECF No. 47 at 16 ⁷As noted, Plaintiff tisel holds these two claims out as exemplary, so the Court's analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of th		registration data associated with each registered user;
 a memory module that stores a plurality of images corresponding to the at least one game outcome that are communicated to the wireless device; the centralized gaming server accesses the memory module and communicates the plurality of images corresponding to the random game outcome to the wireless device; and a casino player tracking system that includes, a registered user profile that further includes a plurality of user preferences, a record of a plurality of accumulated points associated with a betting activity is associated with the random outcomes generated by the centralized gaming server, at least one complementary good or service corresponding to the accumulated points associated with the registered user; and a plurality of messages generated by the casino player tracking system for the wireless device regarding the complementary goods or services. (<i>Id.</i> at 20.) III. MOTIONS TO DISMISS The Court begins by reciting the legal standards governing its review of these motions. It then analyzes Claim 1 of the '229 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework as representative of the asserted claims of the '454 and '406 patents as well.⁶ The Court the nanalyzes Claim 1 of the '229 patent as representative of as amendment would be futile. Again, and as noted, because the Court finds Defendants' analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of the '229 patent as well. (ECF No. 47 at 16 and '406 Patents for the purposes of this § 101 analysis." (ECF No. 47 at 16 analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of the '229 patent as well. (ECF No. 1 at 7.) 		device, the centralized gaming server generates at least one random
 wireless device; the centralized gaming server accesses the memory module and communicates the plurality of images corresponding to the random game outcome to the wireless device; and a casino player tracking system that includes, a registered user profile that further includes a plurality of user preferences, a record of a plurality of accumulated points associated with a betting activity is associated with the random outcomes generated by the centralized gaming server, at least one complimentary good or service corresponding to the accumulated points associated with the registered user; and a plurality of messages generated by the casino player tracking system for the wireless device regarding the complementary goods or services. (<i>Id.</i> at 20.) III. MOTIONS TO DISMISS The Court begins by reciting the legal standards governing its review of these motions. It then analyzes Claim 1 of the '229 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework as representative of the asserted claims of the '454 and '406 patents as well.⁶ The Court the '116 patent.⁷ Finally, the Court explains that it will not grant Plaintiff leave to amend, as amendment would be futile. Again, and as noted, because the Court finds Defendants' analysis of claim 1 applies to all other '229 patent as exemplary, so the Court's analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of the '229 patent as well, (ECF No. 47 at 16 n.10.) Plaintiff also identifies claim 1 of the '229 patent as wenplary, so the Court's analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of the '229 patent as wenplary, so the Court's analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of these two claims apply to both 		a memory module that stores a plurality of images corresponding to
 game outcome to the wireless device; and a casino player tracking system that includes, a registered user profile that further includes a plurality of user preferences, a record of a plurality of accumulated points associated with a betting activity of the registered user, wherein the betting activity is associated with the random outcomes generated by the centralized gaming server. at least one complimentary good or service corresponding to the accumulated points associated with the registered user; and a plurality of messages generated by the cesino player tracking system for the wireless device regarding the complementary goods or services. (<i>Id.</i> at 20.) III. MOTIONS TO DISMISS The Court begins by reciting the legal standards governing its review of these motions. It then analyzes Claim 1 of the '229 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework as representative of the asserted claims of the '454 and '406 patents as well.⁶ The Court the '116 patent.⁷ Finally, the Court explains that it will not grant Plaintiff leave to amend, as amendment would be futile. Again, and as noted, because the Court finds Defendants' ⁶Plaintiff stated that it did 'not oppose treating the '229 Patent as representative of the '454 and '406 Patents for the purposes of this § 101 analysis." (ECF No. 47 at 16 n. 10.) Plaintiff also identifies claim 1 of the '229 patent as exemplary, so the Court's analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of the '229 patent as exemplary, so the Court's analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of the '229 patent as well. (ECF No. 1 at 7.) ⁷As noted, Plaintiff tiself holds these two claims out as exemplary of the asserted claims of these two patents, so the Court's findings as to these two claims apply to both 		wireless device;
 a registered user profile that further includes a plurality of user preferences, a record of a plurality of accumulated points associated with a betting activity of the registered user, wherein the betting activity is associated with the random outcomes generated by the centralized gaming server, at least one complimentary good or service corresponding to the accumulated points associated with the registered user; and a plurality of messages generated by the casino player tracking system for the wireless device regarding the complementary goods or services. (<i>Id.</i> at 20.) III. MOTIONS TO DISMISS The Court begins by reciting the legal standards governing its review of these motions. It then analyzes Claim 1 of the '229 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework as representative of the asserted claims of the '454 and '406 patents as well.⁶ The Court then analyzes Claim 1 of the '407 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework, followed by Claim 1 the '116 patent.⁷ Finally, the Court explains that it will not grant Plaintiff leave to amend, as amendment would be futile. Again, and as noted, because the Court finds Defendants' ⁶Plaintiff stated that it did 'not oppose treating the '229 Patent as representative of the '454 and '406 Patents for the purposes of this § 101 analysis." (ECF No. 47 at 16 n. 10.) Plaintiff also identifies claim 1 of the '229 patent as exemplary, so the Court's analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of the '229 patent as exemplary, so the Court's analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of the '229 patent as exemplary, so the Court's analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of the '229 patent as exemplary, so the Court's analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of the '229 patent as exemplary, bo the claims of these two patents, so the Court's findings as to these two claims apply to both 	8	game outcome to the wireless device; and a casino player tracking
 a record of a plurality of accumulated points associated with a betting activity of the registered user, wherein the betting activity is associated with the random outcomes generated by the centralized gaming server, at least one complimentary good or service corresponding to the accumulated points associated with the registered user; and a plurality of messages generated by the casino player tracking system for the wireless device regarding the complementary goods or services. (<i>Id.</i> at 20.) III. MOTIONS TO DISMISS The Court begins by reciting the legal standards governing its review of these motions. It then analyzes Claim 1 of the '229 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework as representative of the asserted claims of the '454 and '406 patents as well.⁶ The Court then analyzes Claim 1 of the '454 and '406 patents as well.⁶ The Court the '116 patent.⁷ Finally, the Court explains that it will not grant Plaintiff leave to amend, as amendment would be futile. Again, and as noted, because the Court finds Defendants' ⁶Plaintiff stated that it did "not oppose treating the '229 Patent as representative of the '454 and '406 Patents for the purposes of this § 101 analysis." (ECF No. 4.7 at 16 n.10.) Plaintiff also identifies claim 1 of the '229 patent as well. (ECF No. 4.7 at 16 n.10.) Plaintiff also identifies claim 1 of the '229 patent as well. (ECF No. 1 at 7.) ⁷As noted, Plaintiff thelds these two claims out as exemplary of the asserted claims of the '229 patent as well. (ECF No. 1 at 7.) 	9	a registered user profile that further includes a plurality of user
11 activity is associated with the random outcomes generated by the centralized gaming server, at least one complimentary good or service corresponding to the accumulated points associated with the registered user; and a plurality of messages generated by the casino player tracking system for the wireless device regarding the complementary goods or services. 15 (<i>Id.</i> at 20.) 18 MOTIONS TO DISMISS 17 The Court begins by reciting the legal standards governing its review of these motions. It then analyzes Claim 1 of the '229 patent under the Alice framework as representative of the asserted claims of the '454 and '406 patents as well. ⁶ The Court 10 the '116 patent. ⁷ Finally, the Court explains that it will not grant Plaintiff leave to amend, as amendment would be futile. Again, and as noted, because the Court finds Defendants' 12 ⁶ Plaintiff stated that it did "not oppose treating the '229 Patent as representative of the '454 and '406 Patents for the purposes of this § 101 analysis." (ECF No. 47 at 16 n.10.) Plaintiff also identifies claim 1 of the '229 patent as well. (ECF No. 1 at 7.) 12 ⁷ As noted, Plaintiff itself holds these two claims out as exemplary of the asserted claims of these two patents, so the Court's findings as to these two claims apply to both	10	a record of a plurality of accumulated points associated with a
12 at least one complimentary good or service corresponding to the accumulated points associated with the registered user; and a plurality of messages generated by the casino player tracking system for the wireless device regarding the complementary goods or services. 14 tracking system for the wireless device regarding the complementary goods or services. 15 (<i>Id.</i> at 20.) 18 MOTIONS TO DISMISS 17 The Court begins by reciting the legal standards governing its review of these motions. It then analyzes Claim 1 of the '229 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework as representative of the asserted claims of the '454 and '406 patents as well. ⁶ The Court then analyzes Claim 1 of the '407 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework, followed by Claim 1 20 the '116 patent. ⁷ Finally, the Court explains that it will not grant Plaintiff leave to amend, as amendment would be futile. Again, and as noted, because the Court finds Defendants' 23 ⁶ Plaintiff stated that it did "not oppose treating the '229 Patent as representative of the '454 and '406 Patents for the purposes of this § 101 analysis." (ECF No. 47 at 16 n.10.) Plaintiff also identifies claim 1 of the '229 patent as exemplary, so the Court's analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of the '229 patent as well. (ECF No. 1 at 7.) 7As noted, Plaintiff tiself holds these two claims out as exemplary of the asserted claims of these two patents, so the Court's findings as to these two claims apply to both	11	activity is associated with the random outcomes generated by
 and a plurality of messages generated by the casino player tracking system for the wireless device regarding the complementary goods or services. (<i>Id.</i> at 20.) III. MOTIONS TO DISMISS The Court begins by reciting the legal standards governing its review of these motions. It then analyzes Claim 1 of the '229 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework as representative of the asserted claims of the '454 and '406 patents as well.⁶ The Court then analyzes Claim 1 of the '407 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework, followed by Claim 1 the '116 patent.⁷ Finally, the Court explains that it will not grant Plaintiff leave to amend, as amendment would be futile. Again, and as noted, because the Court finds Defendants' ⁶Plaintiff stated that it did "not oppose treating the '229 Patent as representative of the '454 and '406 Patents for the purposes of this § 101 analysis." (ECF No. 47 at 16 n.10.) Plaintiff also identifies claim 1 of the '229 patent as exemplary, so the Court's analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of the '229 patent as well. (ECF No. 1 at 7.) ⁷As noted, Plaintiff itself holds these two claims out as exemplary of the asserted claims of these two patents, so the Court's findings as to these two claims apply to both	12	at least one complimentary good or service corresponding to
 tracking system for the wireless device regarding the complementary goods or services. (<i>Id.</i> at 20.) III. MOTIONS TO DISMISS The Court begins by reciting the legal standards governing its review of these motions. It then analyzes Claim 1 of the '229 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework as representative of the asserted claims of the '454 and '406 patents as well.⁶ The Court then analyzes Claim 1 of the '407 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework, followed by Claim 1 the '116 patent.⁷ Finally, the Court explains that it will not grant Plaintiff leave to amend, as amendment would be futile. Again, and as noted, because the Court finds Defendants' ⁶Plaintiff stated that it did "not oppose treating the '229 Patent as representative of the '454 and '406 Patents for the purposes of this § 101 analysis." (ECF No. 47 at 16 n.10.) Plaintiff also identifies claim 1 of the '229 patent as exemplary, so the Court's analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of the '229 patent as well. (ECF No. 1 at 7.) ⁷As noted, Plaintiff itself holds these two claims out as exemplary of the asserted claims of these two claims apply to both	13	and
 (<i>Id.</i> at 20.) III. MOTIONS TO DISMISS The Court begins by reciting the legal standards governing its review of these motions. It then analyzes Claim 1 of the '229 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework as representative of the asserted claims of the '454 and '406 patents as well.⁶ The Court then analyzes Claim 1 of the '407 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework, followed by Claim 1 the '116 patent.⁷ Finally, the Court explains that it will not grant Plaintiff leave to amend, as amendment would be futile. Again, and as noted, because the Court finds Defendants' ⁶Plaintiff stated that it did "not oppose treating the '229 Patent as representative of the '454 and '406 Patents for the purposes of this § 101 analysis." (ECF No. 47 at 16 n.10.) Plaintiff also identifies claim 1 of the '229 patent as exemplary, so the Court's analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of the '229 patent as well. (ECF No. 1 at 7.) ⁷As noted, Plaintiff itself holds these two claims out as exemplary of the asserted claims of these two patents, so the Court's findings as to these two claims apply to both 	14	tracking system for the wireless device regarding the
The Court begins by reciting the legal standards governing its review of these motions. It then analyzes Claim 1 of the '229 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework as representative of the asserted claims of the '454 and '406 patents as well. ⁶ The Court then analyzes Claim 1 of the '407 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework, followed by Claim 1 the '116 patent. ⁷ Finally, the Court explains that it will not grant Plaintiff leave to amend, as amendment would be futile. Again, and as noted, because the Court finds Defendants' ⁶ Plaintiff stated that it did "not oppose treating the '229 Patent as representative of the '454 and '406 Patents for the purposes of this § 101 analysis." (ECF No. 47 at 16 n.10.) Plaintiff also identifies claim 1 of the '229 patent as exemplary, so the Court's analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of the '229 patent as well. (ECF No. 1 at 7.) ⁷ As noted, Plaintiff itself holds these two claims out as exemplary of the asserted claims of these two patents, so the Court's findings as to these two claims apply to both	15	
 motions. It then analyzes Claim 1 of the '229 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework as representative of the asserted claims of the '454 and '406 patents as well.⁶ The Court then analyzes Claim 1 of the '407 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework, followed by Claim 1 the '116 patent.⁷ Finally, the Court explains that it will not grant Plaintiff leave to amend, as amendment would be futile. Again, and as noted, because the Court finds Defendants' ⁶Plaintiff stated that it did "not oppose treating the '229 Patent as representative of the '454 and '406 Patents for the purposes of this § 101 analysis." (ECF No. 47 at 16 n.10.) Plaintiff also identifies claim 1 of the '229 patent as exemplary, so the Court's analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of the '229 patent as well. (ECF No. 1 at 7.) ⁷As noted, Plaintiff itself holds these two claims out as exemplary of the asserted claims of these two patents, so the Court's findings as to these two claims apply to both 	16	III. MOTIONS TO DISMISS
 representative of the asserted claims of the '454 and '406 patents as well.⁶ The Court then analyzes Claim 1 of the '407 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework, followed by Claim 1 the '116 patent.⁷ Finally, the Court explains that it will not grant Plaintiff leave to amend, as amendment would be futile. Again, and as noted, because the Court finds Defendants' ⁶Plaintiff stated that it did "not oppose treating the '229 Patent as representative of the '454 and '406 Patents for the purposes of this § 101 analysis." (ECF No. 47 at 16 n.10.) Plaintiff also identifies claim 1 of the '229 patent as well. (ECF No. 1 at 7.) ⁷As noted, Plaintiff itself holds these two claims out as exemplary of the asserted 		
 then analyzes Claim 1 of the '407 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework, followed by Claim 1 the '116 patent.⁷ Finally, the Court explains that it will not grant Plaintiff leave to amend, as amendment would be futile. Again, and as noted, because the Court finds Defendants' as amendment would be futile. Again, and as noted, because the Court finds Defendants' ⁶Plaintiff stated that it did "not oppose treating the '229 Patent as representative of the '454 and '406 Patents for the purposes of this § 101 analysis." (ECF No. 47 at 16 n.10.) Plaintiff also identifies claim 1 of the '229 patent as exemplary, so the Court's analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of the '229 patent as well. (ECF No. 1 at 7.) ⁷As noted, Plaintiff itself holds these two claims out as exemplary of the asserted claims of these two patents, so the Court's findings as to these two claims apply to both 		The Court begins by reciting the legal standards governing its review of these
 the '116 patent.⁷ Finally, the Court explains that it will not grant Plaintiff leave to amend, as amendment would be futile. Again, and as noted, because the Court finds Defendants' ⁶Plaintiff stated that it did "not oppose treating the '229 Patent as representative of the '454 and '406 Patents for the purposes of this § 101 analysis." (ECF No. 47 at 16 n.10.) Plaintiff also identifies claim 1 of the '229 patent as exemplary, so the Court's analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of the '229 patent as well. (ECF No. 1 at 7.) ⁷As noted, Plaintiff itself holds these two claims out as exemplary of the asserted claims of these two patents, so the Court's findings as to these two claims apply to both 	17	
 as amendment would be futile. Again, and as noted, because the Court finds Defendants' as amendment would be futile. Again, and as noted, because the Court finds Defendants' ⁶Plaintiff stated that it did "not oppose treating the '229 Patent as representative of the '454 and '406 Patents for the purposes of this § 101 analysis." (ECF No. 47 at 16 n.10.) Plaintiff also identifies claim 1 of the '229 patent as exemplary, so the Court's analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of the '229 patent as well. (ECF No. 1 at 7.) ⁷As noted, Plaintiff itself holds these two claims out as exemplary of the asserted claims of these two patents, so the Court's findings as to these two claims apply to both 	17 18	motions. It then analyzes Claim 1 of the '229 patent under the Alice framework as
 ⁶Plaintiff stated that it did "not oppose treating the '229 Patent as representative of the '454 and '406 Patents for the purposes of this § 101 analysis." (ECF No. 47 at 16 n.10.) Plaintiff also identifies claim 1 of the '229 patent as exemplary, so the Court's analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of the '229 patent as well. (ECF No. 1 at 7.) ⁷As noted, Plaintiff itself holds these two claims out as exemplary of the asserted claims of these two patents, so the Court's findings as to these two claims apply to both 	17 18 19	motions. It then analyzes Claim 1 of the '229 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework as representative of the asserted claims of the '454 and '406 patents as well. ⁶ The Court
 ⁶Plaintiff stated that it did "not oppose treating the '229 Patent as representative of the '454 and '406 Patents for the purposes of this § 101 analysis." (ECF No. 47 at 16 n.10.) Plaintiff also identifies claim 1 of the '229 patent as exemplary, so the Court's analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of the '229 patent as well. (ECF No. 1 at 7.) ⁷As noted, Plaintiff itself holds these two claims out as exemplary of the asserted claims of these two patents, so the Court's findings as to these two claims apply to both 	17 18 19 20	motions. It then analyzes Claim 1 of the '229 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework as representative of the asserted claims of the '454 and '406 patents as well. ⁶ The Court then analyzes Claim 1 of the '407 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework, followed by Claim 1
 ⁶Plaintiff stated that it did "not oppose treating the '229 Patent as representative of the '454 and '406 Patents for the purposes of this § 101 analysis." (ECF No. 47 at 16 n.10.) Plaintiff also identifies claim 1 of the '229 patent as exemplary, so the Court's analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of the '229 patent as well. (ECF No. 1 at 7.) ⁷As noted, Plaintiff itself holds these two claims out as exemplary of the asserted claims of these two patents, so the Court's findings as to these two claims apply to both 	17 18 19 20 21	motions. It then analyzes Claim 1 of the '229 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework as representative of the asserted claims of the '454 and '406 patents as well. ⁶ The Court then analyzes Claim 1 of the '407 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework, followed by Claim 1 the '116 patent. ⁷ Finally, the Court explains that it will not grant Plaintiff leave to amend,
 the '454 and '406 Patents for the purposes of this § 101 analysis." (ECF No. 47 at 16 n.10.) Plaintiff also identifies claim 1 of the '229 patent as exemplary, so the Court's analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of the '229 patent as well. (ECF No. 1 at 7.) ⁷As noted, Plaintiff itself holds these two claims out as exemplary of the asserted claims of these two patents, so the Court's findings as to these two claims apply to both 	17 18 19 20 21 22	motions. It then analyzes Claim 1 of the '229 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework as representative of the asserted claims of the '454 and '406 patents as well. ⁶ The Court then analyzes Claim 1 of the '407 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework, followed by Claim 1 the '116 patent. ⁷ Finally, the Court explains that it will not grant Plaintiff leave to amend,
 n.10.) Plaintiff also identifies claim 1 of the '229 patent as exemplary, so the Court's analysis of claim 1 applies to all other claims of the '229 patent as well. (ECF No. 1 at 7.) ⁷As noted, Plaintiff itself holds these two claims out as exemplary of the asserted claims of these two patents, so the Court's findings as to these two claims apply to both 	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	motions. It then analyzes Claim 1 of the '229 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework as representative of the asserted claims of the '454 and '406 patents as well. ⁶ The Court then analyzes Claim 1 of the '407 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework, followed by Claim 1 the '116 patent. ⁷ Finally, the Court explains that it will not grant Plaintiff leave to amend,
 ⁷As noted, Plaintiff itself holds these two claims out as exemplary of the asserted claims of these two patents, so the Court's findings as to these two claims apply to both 	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	motions. It then analyzes Claim 1 of the '229 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework as representative of the asserted claims of the '454 and '406 patents as well. ⁶ The Court then analyzes Claim 1 of the '407 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework, followed by Claim 1 the '116 patent. ⁷ Finally, the Court explains that it will not grant Plaintiff leave to amend, as amendment would be futile. Again, and as noted, because the Court finds Defendants'
28 claims of these two patents, so the Court's findings as to these two claims apply to both	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	motions. It then analyzes Claim 1 of the '229 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework as representative of the asserted claims of the '454 and '406 patents as well. ⁶ The Court then analyzes Claim 1 of the '407 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework, followed by Claim 1 the '116 patent. ⁷ Finally, the Court explains that it will not grant Plaintiff leave to amend, as amendment would be futile. Again, and as noted, because the Court finds Defendants'
	 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 	motions. It then analyzes Claim 1 of the '229 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework as representative of the asserted claims of the '454 and '406 patents as well. ⁶ The Court then analyzes Claim 1 of the '407 patent under the <i>Alice</i> framework, followed by Claim 1 the '116 patent. ⁷ Finally, the Court explains that it will not grant Plaintiff leave to amend, as amendment would be futile. Again, and as noted, because the Court finds Defendants'

DOCKET A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

DOCKET A L A R M



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.