

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS**

Garmin Switzerland GmbH; and
Garmin Corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

FLIR Maritime US, Inc.,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:16-cv-2806-JWL-JPO

**GARMIN'S OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS THE COMPLAINT**

Plaintiffs Garmin Switzerland GmbH and Garmin Corporation hereby respond in opposition to FLIR Maritime US, Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss. Dkt. 9, 10.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... **II**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES..... **III**

INDEX OF EXHIBITS **V**

I. STATEMENT OF THE NATURE OF THE MATTER 1

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS 3

 A. Plaintiff Garmin 3

 B. U.S. Patent No. 7,268,703—Garmin’s “Auto Guidance” Patent..... 3

 C. U.S. Patent No. 6,459,987—Garmin’s “TracBack®” Patent 9

III. QUESTIONS PRESENTED..... 13

IV. GARMIN’S INVENTIONS ARE PATENT ELIGIBLE 13

 A. Legal Standards..... 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

 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 22

V. ADDITIONAL REASONS WARRANT DENYING DEFENDANT’S MOTION..... 27

VI. VENUE WAS AND IS PROPER..... 29

VII. CONCLUSION..... 30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Cases**

<i>Accenture Global Servs. v. Guidewire Software, Inc.</i> , 728 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	13, 15, 27
<i>Alice Corp. Pty. v. CLS Bank Int’l</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014).....	14, 15, 26, 27
<i>Amdocs (Israel) Ltd. v. Openet Telecom, Inc.</i> , 841 F.3d 1288 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	2, 20, 21, 23
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1229 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	1, 16
<i>ART+COM Innovationpool GmbH v. Google Inc.</i> , 183 F. Supp. 3d 552 (D. Del. 2016).....	22
<i>Bancorp Servs. v. Sun Life Assurance Co. of Canada</i> , 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	27
<i>Bascom Global Internet Servs., Inc. v. AT&T Mobility LLC</i> , 827 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	15, 20, 23, 26
<i>Capstan AG Sys., Inc. v. Raven Indus., Inc.</i> , No. 16-cv-04132, 2017 WL 106839 (D. Kan. Jan. 11, 2017)	13, 20
<i>Card Verification Sols. LLC v. Citigroup Inc.</i> , No. 13-cv-6339, 2014 WL 492254 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 29, 2014).....	13
<i>Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.</i> , 776 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	29
<i>DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.</i> , 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	19
<i>Eagle View Techs., Inc. v. Xactware Solutions, Inc.</i> , No. 1-15-cv-07025, 2016 WL 4154136 (D.N.J. Aug. 2, 2016).....	27
<i>Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 822 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	passim
<i>Equity Bank v. U.S. Bank Nat’l Ass’n</i> , No. 12-cv-1311, 2012 WL 5587854 (D. Kan. Nov. 15, 2012).....	30
<i>F5 Networks, Inc. v. Radware, Inc.</i> , No. 2:16-cv-00480, 2016 WL 6947414 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 14, 2016).....	30
<i>In re TC Heartland LLC</i> , 821 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	29
<i>InVue Sec. Prods. Inc. v. Mobile Tech., Inc.</i> , No. 15-cv-00610, 2016 WL 1465263 (W.D.N.C. April 14, 2016).....	27
<i>KHN Solutions, Inc. v. Vertisense, Inc.</i> , No. 16-cv-962, 2016 WL 5725013 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 30, 2016).....	27
<i>Klaustech, Inc. v. Admob, Inc.</i> , No. 10-cv-05899, 2015 WL 10791915 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 31, 2015)	13
<i>McRO, Inc. v. Bandai Namco Games Am. Inc.</i> , 837 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	passim
<i>SiRF Tech., Inc. v. Int’l Trade Com’n</i> , 601 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	20, 24, 28

Ultramercial, Inc. v. Hulu, LLC,
722 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... 27

VE Holding Corp. v. Johnson Gas Appliance Co.,
917 F.2d 1574 (Fed. Cir. 1990)..... 29

Statutes

28 U.S.C. § 1391(c) 29

28 U.S.C. § 1400(b) 29

28 U.S.C. § 1406(a) 30

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

PX 1, U.S. Patent No. 7,268,703

PX 2, U.S. Patent No. 6,459,987

PX 3, '703 Patent Notice of Allowability

PX 4, '987 Patent Notice of Allowability

PX 5, U.S. Patent No. 5,878,368 (excerpted)

PX 6, U.S. Patent No. 5,559,707 (excerpted)

PX 7, U.S. Patent No. 6,055,478 (excerpted)

PX 8, Marcus Jenkins, *NAVTEQ: Introduction to Route Calculation* (2007)

PX 9, Inchul Yang et al., *Development of Realistic Driving Route Calculation Algorithm Considering Lane-Changing Time* (excerpted)

PX 10, U.S. Patent No. 6,192,314 (excerpted)

PX 11, U.S. Patent No. 6,789,012 (excerpted)

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.