

Scott G. Seidman, OSB No. 833209
Direct Dial: (503) 802-2021
Direct Fax: (503) 972-3721
Email: scott.seidman@tonkon.com
Jon P. Stride, OSB No. 903887
Direct Dial: (503) 802-2034
Email: jon.stride@tonkon.com
Eric C. Beach, OSB No. 105783
Direct Dial: (503) 802-2182
Email: eric.beach@tonkon.com
TONKON TORP LLP
888 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 1600
Portland, OR 97204

B. Trent Webb (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Aaron Hankel (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Ryan Schletzbaum (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Lauren Douville (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Colman McCarthy (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Beth Larigan (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Telephone: (816) 474-6550
Fax: (816) 421-5547
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Boulevard
Kansas City, Missouri 64108-2613
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF OREGON

PORTLAND DIVISION

GARMIN SWITZERLAND GMBH, a
Swiss Limited Liability Company, and
GARMIN CORPORATION, a Taiwan
Corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

FLIR SYSTEMS, INC., an Oregon
Corporation, and **FLIR MARITIME US,
INC. (F/K/A RAYMARINE, INC.)**, a
Delaware Corporation,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:17-cv-01147-SB

**PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS4

 A. Plaintiff Garmin4

 B. U.S. Patent No. 7,268,703—Garmin’s “Auto Guidance” Patent.....4

 1. Problems in the Art4

 2. Inventions Disclosed and Claimed in the ‘703 Patent5

 3. Claims of The ‘703 Patent7

 4. The ‘703 Patent Specifies the Steps of the Improved Marine Route
 Calculation Algorithm8

 C. U.S. Patent No. 6,459,987—Garmin’s “TracBack®” Patent9

 1. Problems in the Art9

 2. Inventions Disclosed and Claimed in the ‘987 Patent11

 3. Claims of The ‘987 Patent12

III. GARMIN’S INVENTIONS ARE PATENT ELIGIBLE13

 A. Legal Standards.....13

 1. Defendants Bear the Heavy Burden of Proving Invalidity Under §
 101 By Clear and Convincing Evidence.....13

 2. Courts Apply A Two-Step Test In Assessing Patent Eligibility.....13

 B. The ‘703 Patent Is Patent Eligible Because the Claims Are Not “Abstract”
 As The Claims Cover A Tangible Inventive Solution To Known Problem
 In The Art.....15

 1. The ‘703 Patent Claims Improve Upon Existing Computer-Aided
 Navigation Devices By Replacing Subjectivity With Objective,
 Rules-Based Algorithms To Achieve The Specific Result of
 Routing Through “Non-User Selected” Points15

2.	The ‘703 Patent Claims Are Also “Inventive,” As They Are Tailored To A Specific Solution That Does Not Preempt Entire Fields Of Technological Innovation	22
C.	The ‘987 Patent Is Patent Eligible Because the Claims Are Limited To A Specific, Concrete Solution To A Particular Problem Associated With Prior Specialized GPS Systems	25
1.	Claim 11 of the ‘987 Patent Solves A Very Specific Problem In A Very Specific Way and, As Such, Is Not “Abstract”	25
2.	The Asserted Claims Contain an Inventive Concept	28
IV.	ADDITIONAL REASONS WARRANT DENYING DEFENDANTS’ MOTION	29
A.	Defendants Concerns About The Garmin Patents Can and Should Be Resolved On The Merits Through A Formal Claim Construction Process, Not On The Pleadings Based On Defendants’ Litigation-Inspired Factual Positions.....	30
B.	Defendants Only Discuss A Few Claims Rendering Their Motion Improper.....	32
V.	CONCLUSION.....	33

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Accenture Global Servs. v. Guidewire Software, Inc.</i> , 728 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	13, 15, 29
<i>Alice Corp. Pty Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l</i> , 134 S.Ct. 2347 (2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Amdocs (Israel) Ltd. v. Openet Telecom, Inc.</i> , 841 F.3d 1288 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	2, 3, 23, 26
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1229 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	2
<i>ART+COM Innovationpool GmbH v. Google Inc.</i> , 183 F. Supp. 3d 552 (D. Del. 2016).....	24
<i>Bancorp Servs. v. Sun Life Assurance Co. of Canada</i> , 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	29
<i>Bascom Global Internet Servs., Inc. v. AT&T Mobility LLC</i> , 827 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Cal. Inst. of Tech. v. Hughes Commc’ns Inc.</i> , 59 F.Supp.3d 974 (C.D. Cal. 2014)	17
<i>Capstan AG Sys., Inc. v. Raven Indus., Inc.</i> , No. 16-cv-04132, 2017 WL 106839 (D. Kan. Jan. 11, 2017)	13, 22, 23
<i>Card Verification Sols. LLC v. Citigroup Inc.</i> , No. 13-cv-6339, 2014 WL 492254 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 29, 2014).....	13
<i>Cave Consulting Grp., Inc. v. Truven Health Analytics Inc.</i> , No. 15-cv-02177, 2016 WL 283478 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 25, 2016).....	32
<i>DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.</i> , 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	22
<i>Eagle View Techs., Inc. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc.</i> , No. 1-15-cv-07025, 2016 WL 4154136 (D.N.J. Aug. 2, 2016).....	32
<i>Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 822 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	<i>passim</i>

Fitbit Inc. v. AliphCom,
 No. 16-cv-00118, 2017 WL 819235 (N.D. Cal. 2017)17

InfoGation Corp. v. ZTE Corp.,
 No.16-1901, 2017 WL 1135638 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 27, 2017)17, 18, 19, 25

InVue Sec. Prods. Inc. v. Mobile Tech., Inc.,
 No. 15-cv-00610, 2016 WL 1465263 (W.D.N.C. April 14, 2016).....32

JSDQ Mesh Techs. LLC v. Fluidmesh Networks, LLC,
 No. 16-CV-212-GMS, 2016 WL 4639140 (D. Del. Sept. 6, 2016).....32

KHN Solutions, Inc. v. Vertisense, Inc.,
 No. 16-cv-962, 2016 WL 5725013 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 30, 2016).....32

Klaustech, Inc. v. Admob, Inc.,
 No. 10-cv-05899, 2015 WL 10791915 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 31, 2015)13

Liquid Dynamics Corp. v. Vaughn Co., Inc.,
 355 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....32

Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.,
 566 U.S. 66 (2012).....1

McRO, Inc. v. Bandai Namco Games Am. Inc.,
 837 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... *passim*

Minelab Electronics Pty. Ltd. v. XP Metal Detectors,
 No. 16-cv-1594201715

Orbcomm Inc. v. Calamp Corp.,
 215 F. Supp. 3d 499 (E.D. Va. 2016)26

Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.,
 810 F.2d 1561 (Fed. Cir. 1987).....13

Prisua Eng'g Corp. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.,
 No. 16-cv-21761, 2017 WL 1041571 (S.D. Fla. Mar. 9, 2017)16

SiRF Tech., Inc. v. Int'l Trade Com'n,
 601 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....22, 26, 31

StoneEagle Servs., Inc. v. Pay-Plus Sols., Inc.,
 No. 13-cv-2240, 2015 WL 518852 (M.D. Fla. Feb. 9, 2015).....32

Thales Visionix Inc. v. US,
 850 F.3d 1343 (2017)..... *passim*

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.