

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
TAMPA DIVISION

MADSTAD ENGINEERING, INC.,
a Florida corporation, and
MARK STADNYK, an individual,

Plaintiffs,

v.

U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK
OFFICE, DAVID KAPPOS, in his official
capacity as Director of U.S. PATENT
AND TRADEMARK OFFICE, and the
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendants.

No. 8:12-cv-01589-SDM-MAP

DISPOSITIVE MOTION

DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS
AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

Akamai Ex. 1041

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... i

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii

INTRODUCTION 1

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY3

STANDARD OF REVIEW5

ARGUMENT7

 I. PLAINTIFFS LACK STANDING TO CHALLENGE THE AIA’S FIRST-
 INVENTOR-TO-FILE PROVISIONS.7

 A. The Possible Threat of Invention Theft Is Not a Concrete and Imminent Injury
 Traceable to the AIA’s First-Inventor-To-File Provisions.8

 B. Plaintiffs’ Voluntary Decision to Spend Resources in Anticipation of a Future
 Race to the Patent Office Is Not a Concrete and Imminent Injury Traceable to
 the AIA’s First-Inventor-To-File Provisions.12

 II. THIS COURT SHOULD DISMISS THIS CASE BECAUSE PLAINTIFFS’
 CLAIMS ARE UNRIPE FOR REVIEW.....15

 III. THIS COURT SHOULD DISMISS PLAINTIFFS’ COMPLAINT FOR
 FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM.16

 A. Plaintiffs’ Facial Challenge to the AIA’s First-Inventor-To-File Provisions
 Fails Because They Cannot Show That The AIA Will Operate
 Unconstitutionally In Most Cases.....17

 B. The First-Inventor-To-File Provisions of the AIA Are Constitutional in All
 Cases.....18

CONCLUSION.....25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS**

U.S. Const., art. I, § 8, cl. 8..... 1, 5, 18

CASES

<i>Alexander Milburn Co. v. Davis-Bournonville Co.</i> , 270 U.S. 390 (1926).....	21
<i>Allen v. Wright</i> , 468 U.S. 737 (1984).....	7
<i>Aristocrat Techs. Austl. PTY Ltd. v. Int’l Game Tech.</i> , 543 F.3d 657 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	10
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	6
<i>Bd. of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Jr. Univ. v. Roche Molecular Sys.</i> , 131 S. Ct. 2188 (2011).....	19
<i>Bedford v. Hunt</i> , 3 F. Cas. 37 (C.C.D. Mass. 1817).....	24
<i>Bell Atlantic v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	6
<i>Blanchette v. Connecticut Gen. Ins. Corps.</i> , 419 U.S. 102 (1974).....	16
<i>Bonito Boats, Inc. v. Thunder Craft Boats, Inc.</i> , 489 U.S. 141 (1989).....	22
<i>Brunswick Corp. v. United States</i> , 34 Fed. Cl. 532 (Fed. Cl. 1995)	24
<i>Citizens United v. FEC</i> , 130 S. Ct. 876 (2010).....	8
<i>City of Los Angeles v. Lyons</i> , 461 U.S. 95 (1983).....	13
<i>Dealertrack, Inc. v. Huber</i> , 674 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	10
<i>Eldred v. Ashcroft</i> , 537 U.S. 186 (2003).....	19
<i>Evans v. Eaton</i> , 16 U.S. (3 Wheat.) 454 (1818).....	24
<i>Figueroa v. United States</i> , 466 F.3d 1023 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	18

<i>Friends of the Earth, Inc. v. Laidlaw Envtl. Servs. (TOC), Inc.</i> , 528 U.S. 167 (2000).....	7
<i>Gayler v. Wilder</i> , 51 U.S. (10 How.) 477 (1850)	21, 23
<i>GeorgiaCarry.Org, Inc. v. Georgia</i> , 687 F.3d 1244 (11th Cir. 2012)	18
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	passim
<i>Grant v. Raymond</i> , 31 U.S. (6 Pet.) 218 (1832).....	22
<i>Janklow v. Planned Parenthood, Sioux Falls Clinic</i> , 517 U.S. 1174 (1996).....	17
<i>Kendall v. Winsor</i> , 62 U.S. (21 How.) 322 (1858)	21, 22, 23
<i>Kimberly-Clark Corp. v. Johnson & Johnson</i> , 745 F.2d 1437 (Fed Cir. 1984)	4
<i>Koziara v. City of Casselberry</i> , 392 F.3d 1302 (11th Cir. 2004)	11
<i>Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife</i> , 504 U.S. 555 (1992).....	passim
<i>Mason v. Hepburn</i> , 13 App. D.C. 86 (D.C. Cir. 1898).....	23
<i>Mayo Collab. Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.</i> , 132 S. Ct. 1289 (2012).....	10
<i>McClurg v. Kingsland</i> , 42 U.S. (1 How.) 202 (1843)	18, 20
<i>McConnell v. FEC</i> , 540 U.S. 93 (2003).....	8, 12, 14
<i>Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Fla. v. Fla. State Athletic Comm'n</i> , 226 F.3d 1226 (11th Cir. 2000)	7, 11
<i>Nat'l Park Hospitality Ass'n v. Dep't of the Interior</i> , 538 U.S. 803 (2003).....	15
<i>OddzOn Prods., Inc. v. Just Toys, Inc.</i> , 122 F.3d 1396 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	4
<i>Ohio Forestry Ass'n, Inc. v. Sierra Club</i> , 523 U.S. 726 (1998).....	16
<i>Pennock v. Dialogue</i> , 27 U.S. (2 Pet.) 1 (1829).....	22, 24

Pub. Serv. Comm’n v. Wycoff Co.,
344 U.S. 237 (1952)..... 15

Renne v. Geary,
501 U.S. 312 (1991)..... 6

Scarfo v. Ginsberg,
175 F.3d 957 (11th Cir. 1999) 6

Simon v. E. Ky. Welfare Rights Org.,
426 U.S. 26 (1976)..... 7

Sony Corp. of Am. v. Universal City Studios, Inc.,
464 U.S. 417 (1984)..... 21

Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Env’t,
523 U.S. 83 (1998)..... 5, 6

Texas v. United States,
523 U.S. 296 (1998)..... 15

Toilet Goods Ass’n v. Gardner,
387 U.S. 158 (1967)..... 16

United States v. Salerno,
481 U.S. 739 (1987)..... 17

United States v. Stevens,
130 S. Ct. 1577 (2010)..... 17

Warth v. Seldin,
422 U.S. 490 (1975)..... 7

Washburn & Moen Mfg. Co. v. Beat ‘Em All Barbed-Wire Co.,
143 U.S. 275 (1892)..... 23

Whitmore v. Arkansas,
495 U.S. 149 (1990)..... 7, 11

Young v. Dworkin,
489 F.2d 1277 (C.C.P.A. 1974) 23

STATUTES AND REGULATIONS

28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2202 5

35 U.S.C. § 101..... passim

35 U.S.C. § 102..... 4, 9, 10, 24

35 U.S.C. § 103..... 10

35 U.S.C. § 135..... 4

35 U.S.C. § 282..... 9, 10

5 U.S.C. § 702..... 5

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.