

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

SYNKLOUD TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,

Defendant.

C.A. No. 20-007-RGA

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

REDACTED VERSION

**MICROSOFT CORPORATION'S OPPOSITION TO SYNKLOUD'S
MOTION TO DISMISS PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P. 12(b)(1), 12(h)(3),
LACK OF STANDING AND 12(b)(6)**

OF COUNSEL:

Richard A. Cederoth
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
One South Dearborn
Chicago, IL 60603
(312) 853-7000

Ching-Lee Fukuda
Ketan V. Patel
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
787 Seventh Avenue
New York, NY 10019
(212) 839-5300

Kelly E. Farnan (#4395)
Farnan@rlf.com
Travis S. Hunter (#5350)
Hunter@rlf.com
RICHARDS, LAYTON & FINGER, P.A.
920 N. King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
302-651-7700

Attorneys for Plaintiff Microsoft Corporation

Dated: April 20, 2020

CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. NATURE AND STAGE OF PROCEEDINGS 2

III. SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT 2

IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS 4

V. LEGAL STANDARD..... 7

VI. ARGUMENT..... 8

A. SynKloud’s Motion to Dismiss Microsoft’s Complaint for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction Should Be Denied..... 8

1. [REDACTED] 8

2. SynKloud Has Effectively Accused Microsoft of Indirect Infringement 9

3. SynKloud Has Effectively Accused Microsoft of Direct Infringement..... 12

4. Subject Matter Jurisdiction Also Exists for Patents Closely Related to the ’526, ’254, ’780 and ’225 Patents 14

5. Microsoft is Willing to Dismiss the ’7880 Patent..... 18

B. SynKloud’s Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Standing Should be Denied..... 18

C. SynKloud’s Motion to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim Should Be Denied... 18

D. Microsoft Should Be Given Leave to Amend to Address Any Pleading Deficiencies Found by the Court 20

VII. CONCLUSION..... 20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Arkema Inc. v. Honeywell Int’l., Inc.</i> , 706 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	3, 14, 15
<i>Arris Grp, Inc. v. British Telecomm. PLC</i> , 639 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Dow Jones & Company, Inc. v. Ablaise Ltd.</i> , 583 F.Supp.2d 41 (D.D.C. 2008)	15
<i>Dror v. Kenu, Inc.</i> , C.A. No. 19-3043-LB, 2019 WL 5684520 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 1, 2019)	3, 14
<i>Foman v. Davis</i> , 371 U.S. 178 (1962).....	20
<i>Gammino v. American Tel. & Tel Co.</i> , Civ. No. 12–666–LPS, 2013 WL 6154569 (D. Del. Nov. 22, 2013).....	3, 4, 18
<i>Gould Elecs. Inc. v. United States</i> , 220 F.3d 169 (3d Cir. 2000).....	7
<i>Intel Corp. v. Future Link Sys., LLC</i> , C.A. No. 14-377-LPS-CJB, 2015 WL 649294 (D. Del. Feb. 12, 2015).....	3, 13, 20
<i>Kuhn Constr. Co. v. Diamond State Port Corp.</i> , C.A. No. 10-637, 2011 WL 1576691 (D. Del. Apr. 26, 2011).....	7
<i>Medgraph, Inc. v. Medtronic, Inc.</i> , 111 F. Supp. 3d 346 (W.D.N.Y. 2015).....	19
<i>MedImmune, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , 549 U.S. 118 (2007).....	8
<i>Micron Tech., Inc. v. MOSAID Techs., Inc.</i> , 518 F.3d 897 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	17, 18
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. DataTern, Inc.</i> , 755 F.3d 899 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	9, 10, 12
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. GeoTag, Inc.</i> , C.A. No. 11-175, 2014 WL 4312167 (D. Del. Aug. 29, 2014)	8, 12

<i>Miics & Partners Am. Inc. v. Toshiba Electric Co.</i> , C.A. No. 14-803-RGA (D. Del.).....	20
<i>In re Mobile Telecomm. Techs., LLC</i> , 247 F. Supp. 3d 456 (D. Del. 2017).....	12, 17
<i>Petter Investments, Inc. v. Hydro Eng'g, Inc.</i> , 828 F. Supp. 2d 924 (W.D. Mich. 2011)	15
<i>Philips v. ASUSTek Computer Inc.</i> , C.A. No. 15-1125-GMS, 2016 WL 6246763 (D. Del. Oct. 25, 2016)	3, 18
<i>PPS Data, LLC v. Allscripts Healthcare Sols., Inc.</i> , C.A. No. 11-273, 2012 WL 243346 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 25, 2012)	19
<i>SanDisk Corp. v. STMicroelectronics, Inc.</i> , 480 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	8
<i>Sanofi-Aventis U.S. LLC et al v. Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp.</i> , C.A. No. 16-812-RGA (D. Del.).....	20
<i>Seaboard Int'l, Inc. v. Cameron Int'l Corp.</i> , No. 13-00281-MLH-SKO, 2013 WL 3936889 (E.D. Cal. July 30, 2013)	16
<i>Softech Worldwide, LLC v. Internet Tech. Broad. Corp.</i> , C.A. No. 10-651-JCC, 2010 WL 4645791 (E.D. Va. Nov. 8, 2010).....	19
<i>Sprint Commc'ns Co., L.P. v. Charter Commc'ns, Inc., et al.</i> , C.A. No. 17-1734-RGA (D. Del.).....	20
<i>SynKloud Techs., LLC v. Adobe Inc.</i> , No. 19-00527-ADA (W.D. Tex. Sept. 6, 2019).....	7
<i>SynKloud Techs., LLC v. BLU Prods., Inc.</i> , C.A. No. 19-553-RGA, D.I. 1 (D. Del. Mar. 22, 2019).....	4, 5
<i>SynKloud Techs., LLC v. Dropbox, Inc.</i> , C.A. No. 19-00525-ADA (W.D. Tex. Sept. 6, 2019)	7
<i>SynKloud Techs., LLC v. Dropbox, Inc.</i> , No. 19-00526-ADA (W.D. Tex. Sept. 6, 2019).....	7
<i>SynKloud Techs., LLC v. HP Inc.</i> , C.A. No. 19-1360-RGA, D.I. 1 (D. Del. July 16, 2019).....	6, 7
<i>Tesco Corp. v. Weatherford Int'l, Inc.</i> , C.A. No. 08-2531, 2009 WL 497134 (S.D. Tex. Feb. 26, 2009)	15

<i>TSMC Tech., Inc. v. Zond, LLC</i> , C.A. No. 14-721-LPS-CJB, 2014 WL 7498398 (D. Del. Jan. 8, 2014)	3, 18
<i>Wistron Corp. v. Phillip M. Adams & Assocs., LLC</i> , C.A. No. 10-4458, 2011 WL 1654466 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 28, 2011)	19
<i>Xilinx, Inc. v. Invention Inv. Fund I LP</i> , C.A. No. 11-0671, 2011 WL 3206686 (N.D. Cal. July 27, 2011)	19
Statutes	
28 U.S.C. § 2201(a)	2, 8
35 U.S.C. 271(c)	10
35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103	19

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.