

1 Michael J. McCue
Nevada Bar No. 06055
2 Meng Zhong
Nevada Bar No. 12145
3 LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE LLP
3993 Howard Hughes Pkwy, Suite 600
4 Las Vegas, NV 89169-5996
Tel: 702.949.8200
5 E-mail: mmccue@LRRC.com
E-mail: mzhong@LRRC.com

6 Gerson S. Panitch (*pro hac vice*)
7 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP
8 901 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001-4413
9 Tel: 202-408-4080
E-mail: gerson.panitch@finnegan.com

10 *Attorneys for Defendants Playtika Ltd.*
11 *and Playtika Holding Corp.*

12
13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
14 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

15 NEXRF Corp.,

16 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 Playtika Ltd., Playtika Holding Corp., and
Caesars Interactive Entertainment LLC,

19 Defendants.

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

**DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS
OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, FOR A
MORE DEFINITIVE STATEMENT**

ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
113611911.1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

Memorandum and Points of Authorities 1

1. INTRODUCTION 1

2. FACTUAL BACKGROUND 2

 a. Jumbling of Parties, Products, and Patents 2

 i. Two Accused Defendant Groups and Two Accused Product Groups 2

 ii. Five Patents, Two of Which Are Asserted Only Against Gambling Games..... 3

 b. Critical Supporting Facts Missing from Complaint 4

 i. No Factual Support for Infringement Allegations..... 4

 ii. No Factual Support for Allegations of Knowledge and Intent..... 4

 iii. No Specificity in Infringement Allegations 4

3. LEGAL STANDARDS: Insufficient Pleading Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6)..... 4

4. ARGUMENT: NEXRF’s Complaint Does Not Meet Minimum Pleading Standards 5

 a. Counts IV and V Are Inconsistent with and Not Supported by the Alleged Facts 5

 b. By Accusing All Products as One, No Specific Basis Is Provided for Any..... 5

 c. The Infringement Counts Are Impermissibly Devoid of Factual Support..... 7

 d. NEXRF Did Not Properly Plead Willfulness and Indirect Infringement..... 8

5. In the Alternative, NEXRF Must Make a More Definite Statement Under Rule 12(e)..... 10

6. LEGAL STANDARDS: Abstract Ideas Are Not Patent Eligible 11

7. ARGUMENT: NEXRF’s Patents Are Ineligible, and This Suit Should Be Dismissed..... 12

 a. The Three Independent Claims Substantially Overlap..... 12

 b. *Alice* Step 1: The Patents Are Unpatentably Abstract..... 14

 c. *Alice* Step 2: The Patents Fail to Claim an Inventive Concept..... 16

8. This Case Should Be Stayed Until the Resolution of the Rule 12(b)(6) Motion 21

9. Conclusion..... 22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

		Page(s)
1		
2		
3	Cases	
4	<i>Aatrix Software, Inc. v. Green Shades Software, Inc.</i> ,	
5	890 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (en banc)	19
6	<i>Accenture Glob. Servs., GmbH v. Guidewire Software, Inc.</i> ,	
7	728 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	11
8	<i>Addiction & Detoxification Inst. L.L.C. v. Carpenter</i> ,	
9	620 F. App'x 934 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	10
10	<i>Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank Int'l</i> ,	
11	573 U.S. 208 (2014)	1, 11, 12, 15, 16, 19, 20
12	<i>Artrip v. Ball Corp.</i> ,	
13	735 F. App'x 708 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	4-5, 9
14	<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> ,	
15	556 U.S. 662 (2009)	5
16	<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v Twombly</i> ,	
17	550 U.S. 544 (2007)	5
18	<i>Bot M8 LLC v. Sony Corp. of Am.</i> ,	
19	465 F. Supp. 3d 1013 (N.D. Cal. 2020).....	16, 19
20	<i>buySAFE, Inc. v. Google, Inc.</i> ,	
21	765 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	20
22	<i>CG Tech. Dev. LLC v. Zynga, Inc.</i> ,	
23	No. 2:16-cv-00859-RCJ-VCF, 2017 WL 662489 (D. Nev. Feb. 17, 2017)	9
24	<i>CG Techs. Dev., LLC v. FanDuel, Inc.</i> ,	
25	No. 2:16-cv-00801-RCJ-VCF, 2017 WL 58572 (D. Nev. Jan. 4, 2017).....	8
26	<i>Checksum Ventures, LLC v. Dell Inc.</i> ,	
27	412 F. Supp. 3d 906 (N.D. Ill. 2019).....	20
28	<i>Commil USA, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> ,	
	135 S. Ct. 1920 (2015)	9
	<i>Curb Mobility, LLC v. Kaptyn, Inc.</i> ,	
	434 F. Supp. 3d 854 (D. Nev. 2020)	19, 20
	<i>Dropbox, Inc. v. Synchronoss Techs., Inc.</i> ,	
	815 F. App'x 529 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	20
	<i>Elec. Power Grp., LLC v. Alstom S.A.</i> ,	
	830 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	15, 16

1 *Ericsson Inc. v. TCL Commc'n Tech. Holdings Ltd.*,
955 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....16

2

3 *ESCO Corp. v. Cashman Equip. Co.*,
158 F. Supp. 3d 1051 (D. Nev. 2016)8

4 *Exergen Corp. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*,
575 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....8

5

6 *Finn v. City of Boulder City*,
No. 2:14-cv-1835-JAD-GWF, 2015 WL 2186497 (D. Nev. May 6, 2015).....10

7 *Genetic Techs. Ltd. v. Merial L.L.C.*,
818 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....11

8

9 *Glob. Cash Access, Inc. v. NRT Tech. Corp.*,
No. 2:15-cv-00822-MMD-GWF, 2016 WL 1181669 (D. Nev. Mar. 25, 2016).....21

10 *Halo Elecs., Inc. v. Pulse Elecs., Inc.*,
136 S. Ct. 1923 (2016)8, 9

11

12 *Hypermedia Navigation LLC v. Google LLC*,
No. 18-cv-06137-HSG, 2019 WL 1455336 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 2, 2019).....9

13 *Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Capital One Bank (USA)*,
792 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... 11-12

14

15 *Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Symantec Corp.*,
838 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 15, 20

16 *Internet Patents Corp. v. Active Network, Inc.*,
790 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....11, 21

17

18 *NantWorks, LLC v. Niantic, Inc.*,
No. 20-cv-06262-LB, 2021 WL 24850 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 4, 2021).....8

19 *Planet Bingo, LLC v. VKGS LLC*,
576 F. App'x 1005 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....15, 21

20

21 *Pure Parlay, LLC v. Stadium Tech. Grp., Inc.*,
No. 2:19-cv-00834-GMN-BNW, 2020 WL 569880 (D. Nev. Feb. 5, 2020).....5, 6, 7, 8

22 *RecogniCorp, LLC v. Nintendo Co.*,
855 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... 16-17

23

24 *Secured Mail Sols. LLC v. Universal Wilde, Inc.*,
873 F.3d 905 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... 16

25 *Shortridge v. Found. Constr. Payroll Serv., LLC*,
No. 3:14-cv-04850-JCS, ECF No. 73 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 14, 2015)15

26

27 *Silver State Intellectual Techs., Inc. v. FourSquare Labs, Inc.*,
No. 2:12-cv-01308-GMN-PAL, 2013 WL 5437363 (D. Nev. Sept. 26, 2013).....9

28

1 *Simio, LLC v. FlexSim Software Prods., Inc.*,
 983 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2020)17

2

3 *Slot Speaker Techs., Inc. v. Apple, Inc.*,
 No. 13-cv-01161-HSG, 2017 WL 4354999 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 29, 2017)9

4 *In re Smith*,
 815 F.3d 816 (Fed. Cir. 2016)15, 21

5

6 *Sprewell v. Golden State Warriors*,
 266 F.3d 979 (9th Cir. 2001)5

7 *Two-Way Media Ltd. v. Comcast Cable Commc'ns, LLC*,
 874 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2017)17

8

9 *Universal Secure Registry LLC v. Apple Inc.*,
 469 F. Supp. 3d 231 (D. Del. 2020)21

10 *Veltmann v. Walpole Pharmacy, Inc.*,
 928 F. Supp. 1161 (M.D. Fla. 1996)10

11

12 *Voggenthaler v. Md. Square, LLC*,
 No. 2:08-CV-1618-RCJ-GWF, 2010 WL 2998253 (D. Nev. July 22, 2010).....10

13 *Voter Verified, Inc. v. Election Sys. & Software LLC*,
 887 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2018)14

14

15 *Zapfraud, Inc. v. FireEye, Inc.*,
 No. 19-1688-CFC, 2020 WL 6822972 (D. Del. Nov. 20, 2020)14

16 **Rules**

17 Fed. R. Civ. P. 116

18 Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) *passim*

19 Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(e).....1, 10, 22

20 **Statutes**

21 35 U.S.C. § 1011, 3, 11, 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

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.