


the patents' recitations of distinct memory types. However, in ruling on the instant motion, the Court recognized that the patents recite several different memory types throughout the claims—as opposed to simply generic computer memory. This is one element among the combination of limitations that provides an inventive concept. Recognizing that the claims do more than recite generic computer memory does not contradict a finding that some claims require “logically separate” storage of certain data types.

The Court hereby adopts the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment Regarding Invalidity Pursuant to § 101 (6:13CV447, Doc. Nos. 266; 6:13CV448, Doc. No. 320) are DENIED.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 13th day of February, 2015.



RODNEY GILSTRAP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE