

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

NEXRF CORP.,

Plaintiff,

v.

PLAYTIKA LTD., *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:20-cv-00603-MMD-CLB

ORDER

I. SUMMARY

Plaintiff NEXREF Corp. sued Defendants Playtika Ltd., Playtika Holding Corp. (collectively, “Playtika”) and Caesars Interactive Entertainment (“Caesars”) for allegedly infringing five patents¹ by offering online slot machine games. (ECF No. 1.) The Court granted Defendants’ motions to dismiss because the asserted patents are invalid under *Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l*, 573 U.S. 208 (2014), and its progeny. (ECF No. 58 (“*Alice Order*”).)² Before the Court is Playtika’s motion for attorneys’ fees (ECF No. 62 (“*Motion*”))³ and two related motions to seal certain exhibits to the Motion (ECF Nos. 63, 72, 73).⁴ Because, considering the totality of the circumstances, the Court does not find

¹The five patents are U.S. Patent Nos. 8,747,229 (the ’229 patent), 8,506,406 (the ’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.)

²Plaintiff appealed this order (ECF No. 60), and that appeal is currently pending.

³Plaintiff filed a response (ECF No. 68) and Playtika filed a reply (ECF No. 71). Playtika requested oral argument (ECF Nos. 62 at 1, 71 at 1), but the Court denies the request as it finds oral argument unnecessary. See LR 78-1 (“All motions may be considered and decided with or without a hearing.”).

⁴In these motions, Playtika seeks to seal its attorneys’ billing records submitted in support of its Motion and corresponding reply as trade secrets because the records reveal their negotiated billing rates. ECF Nos. 72 and 73 are identical except that ECF No. 73 has an unredacted exhibit attached to it. Thus, the Court treats ECF Nos. 72 and 73 as one motion. No other parties oppose any of these motions to seal. The Court grants both

1 this case stands out from others—and as further explained below—the Court will deny the
2 Motion.

3 **II. BACKGROUND**

4 Plaintiff filed its Complaint in October 2020. (ECF No. 1.) The motions to dismiss
5 the Court ultimately granted in the *Alice* Order were the first motions filed in this case, in
6 February 2021. (ECF Nos. 26, 28.) Playtika concurrently filed a motion to stay the case
7 pending the outcome of the motions to dismiss (ECF No. 29) that United States Magistrate
8 Judge Carla L. Baldwin granted in early April 2021 (ECF No. 50).

9 Playtika filed a motion for Rule 11 sanctions against Plaintiff in early May 2021
10 (ECF No. 53) that the Court also denied in the *Alice* Order in July 2021 (ECF No. 58 at
11 18-20). The Court primarily denied Playtika’s motion for sanctions because “the Court has
12 not ruled on the merits of Playtika’s noninfringement arguments [raised in the sanctions
13 motion], instead agreeing with Defendants that this entire case is properly disposed of
14 under *Alice* and its progeny.” (*Id.* at 19-20.) The Motion followed shortly after the *Alice*
15 Order on July 21, 2021.

16 Plaintiff represents, and Playtika does not dispute, that this case was the first time
17 Plaintiff asserted the asserted patents. (ECF No. 68 at 7; *see also* ECF No. 71 (declining
18 to dispute this).) Plaintiff also proffered evidence that Playtika offered to settle this case
19 for \$207,000—or the amount that it would cost Playtika to petition the United States Patent
20 and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) for *inter partes review* of the asserted patents—on May
21 11, 2021, or after Judge Baldwin granted the motion to stay but before the Court issued
22 the *Alice* Order. (ECF No. 68 at 7; *see also* ECF No. 68-1.) Plaintiff also states that it
23 reached a settlement in late June 2021 “with another infringer for several times Playtika’s
24 offer.” (ECF No. 68 at 8.)

25
26 _____
27 motions (ECF Nos. 63, 72, 73) because it agrees with Playtika that these billing records
28 “contain confidential negotiated billing rates which are generally not available to the public
or competitors.” *Nike, Inc. v. Fujian Jialaimeng Shoes Co.*, Case No. 2:17-cv-00516-GMN-
GWF, 2020 WL 137382, at *3 (D. Nev. Jan. 13, 2020) (granting motion to seal under
analogous circumstances).

1 III. LEGAL STANDARD

2 Playtika claims it is entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees as the prevailing party
3 under 35 U.S.C. § 285. (ECF No. 62.) Section 285 of the Patent Act allows for courts to
4 award reasonable fees to the prevailing party in "exceptional cases." 35 U.S.C. § 285. In
5 *Octane Fitness, LLC v. ICON Health & Fitness, Inc.* ("Octane"), 572 U.S. 545 (2014), the
6 Supreme Court held that "an 'exceptional case' is simply one that stands out from others
7 with respect to the substantive strength of a party's litigating position (considering both the
8 governing law and the facts of the case) or the unreasonable manner in which the case
9 was litigated." *Id.* at 554. *Octane* further urges "[d]istrict courts [to] determine whether a
10 case is 'exceptional' in the case-by-case exercise of their discretion, considering the
11 totality of the circumstances."⁵ *Id.* Furthermore, a party must prove its § 285 motion by a
12 preponderance of the evidence. *Id.* at 557. Thus, the Court must determine whether this
13 was an "exceptional case," considering the totality of the circumstances under a
14 preponderance of the evidence standard, to determine whether Playtika has satisfied its
15 burden of showing it is entitled to recover its attorneys' fees and expenses.

16 IV. DISCUSSION

17 Contrary to Playtika's arguments in its Motion, the Court does not find that this was
18 an exceptional case and will accordingly deny the Motion.⁶ To start, Playtika primarily
19 raises arguments that the Court has not previously ruled on to argue that this is an
20 exceptional case. (ECF No. 62 at 8-11 (arguing the Complaint was devoid of a factual
21 basis), 11-13 (arguing Plaintiff fabricated allegations of white labelling), 13-19 (arguing
22

23 ⁵A nonexclusive list of factors that courts may consider consists of "frivolousness,
24 motivation, objective unreasonableness (both in the factual and legal components of the
25 case) and the need in particular circumstances to advance considerations of
compensation and deterrence." *Id.* at 554 n.6 (citations and internal quotes omitted).

26 ⁶Plaintiff asks the Court to wait until the United States Court of Appeals for the
27 Federal Circuit adjudicates its appeal to rule on the Motion, but the Court finds it
28 appropriate to rule on the Motion now. (ECF No. 68 at 25.) "Although a notice of appeal
has been filed, a district court in this circuit retains jurisdiction to rule upon a request for
attorney fees." *League of Women Voters of California v. F.C.C.*, 751 F.2d 986, 990 (9th
Cir. 1985) (citation omitted).

1 Plaintiff failed to conduct an adequate pre-suit investigation).) However, the Court declines
2 to address these arguments for the first time in the context of Playtika’s Motion.

3 The Federal Circuit has made it “abundantly clear that district courts have wide
4 latitude ‘to *refuse* to add to the burdens of litigation by opening up issues that have not
5 been litigated but are asserted as bases for a fee award.’” *Munchkin, Inc. v. Luv n’ Care,*
6 *Ltd.*, 960 F.3d 1373, 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2020) (citations omitted). Were the Court to add to
7 the burdens of this litigation by addressing for the first time the majority of the arguments
8 Playtika raises in its Motion, the Federal Circuit instructs that the Court would have to offer
9 “a fuller explanation of the court’s assessment of a litigant’s position” to support an award
10 of attorneys’ fees. *Id.* (citation omitted). The Court declines to do so here.

11 Fed. R. Civ. P. 1 instructs the Court that the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure should
12 “be construed, administered, and employed by the court and the parties to secure the just,
13 speedy, and inexpensive determination of every action and proceeding.” *Id.* The Court
14 followed this instruction by finding the asserted patents invalid in the *Alice* Order and
15 declining to address the noninfringement arguments raised for the first time in Playtika’s
16 Rule 11 motion—the Court went right to the dispositive Section 101 issue with the asserted
17 patents and resolved this case approximately 10 months after it was filed, and before
18 significant discovery occurred because Judge Baldwin granted Playtika’s motion to stay.
19 (ECF Nos. 50, 58.) Indeed, the Court views this case as an example of *Alice* working as
20 intended—Playtika was able to get an early and complete dismissal of this case on a
21 motion to dismiss.

22 Expanding this case by diving into Playtika’s arguments based upon grounds other
23 than *Alice* would undermine the efficiency and elegance of the resolution of this case the
24 Court has been able to achieve up to this point. It would also contravene the spirit of Rule
25 1, because finding this case exceptional based on most of the arguments raised in
26 Playtika’s Motion would require the Court to examine them for the first time and then rule
27 in Playtika’s favor. Said otherwise, the Court will not “conduct the trial it never had” in the
28 first instance on Playtika’s Motion—and Federal Circuit precedent does not require it to.

1 *Spineology, Inc. v. Wright Med. Tech., Inc.*, 910 F.3d 1227, 1230 (Fed. Cir. 2018). Indeed,
2 if the Court did, the Court would be required to offer a ‘fuller explanation’ of whether and
3 why it agreed with Playtika’s arguments, taking more time, and further detracting from the
4 relatively efficient resolution of this case so far achieved. See *Munchkin*, 960 F.3d at 1378.
5 The Court accordingly declines to address three of the four grounds Playtika raises in its
6 Motion as to why this case is exceptional in the first instance in this order. (ECF No. 62 at
7 8-19.)

8 But Playtika also argues this case is exceptional because Plaintiff took a weak
9 Section 101 position contradicted by cases directly on point. (ECF No. 62 at 20-22.)
10 Plaintiff counters that the Court’s invalidity findings in the *Alice* Order do not require an
11 exceptional case finding, pointing both to Federal Circuit precedent and two of the Court’s
12 prior cases where the Court invalidated patents based on *Alice* and its progeny but then
13 declined to award attorneys’ fees. (ECF No. 68 at 21.) Plaintiff further argues it presented
14 reasonable Section 101 arguments and simply lost on them, which does not merit an
15 exceptional case designation in and of itself. (*Id.* at 21-25.) Plaintiff also attempts to
16 distinguish the cases Playtika relies on to argue Plaintiff’s Section 101 arguments were so
17 weak that this is an exceptional case. (*Id.*) On balance, the Court agrees with Plaintiff.

18 The unrebutted evidence before the Court suggests that this is the first case Plaintiff
19 ever filed to assert the asserted patents, Plaintiff only obtained one settlement from one
20 other alleged infringer, and Playtika made Plaintiff a non-nuisance value settlement even
21 after Judge Baldwin granted Playtika’s motion to stay. (*Id.* at 7-8.) Judge Baldwin took a
22 “preliminary peek” at the underlying motions to dismiss before granting Playtika’s motion
23 to stay, suggesting that Playtika had a strong Section 101 argument. (ECF No. 50 at 2
24 (issued April 7, 2021).) However, Playtika still offered Plaintiff \$207,000 to settle the case
25 shortly thereafter. (ECF No. 68-1 at 2 (dated May 11, 2021).) The Court can reasonably
26 infer from this settlement offer—and its timing—that Playtika did not view this case as
27 frivolous and thus potentially exceptional until it achieved a full dismissal in the *Alice* Order.

28 ///

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.