

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, LLC,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Case No. 2:12-cv-02783-JPM-cgc
)	
v.)	JURY DEMAND
)	
TWITTER, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

**DEFENDANT TWITTER INC.'S MEMORANDUM IN
OPPOSITION TO B.E.'S MOTION TO DIMISS AND STRIKE**

Glen G. Reid, Jr. (#8184)
greid@wyattfirm.com
Mark Vorder-Bruegge, Jr. (#06389)
mvorder-bruegge@wyattfirm.com
WYATT, TARRANT & COMBS, LLP
The Renaissance Center
1715 Aaron Brenner Dr., Suite 800
Memphis, TN 38120-4367
(901) 537-1000

Counsel for Defendant
TWITTER, INC.

J. David Hadden
dhadden@fenwick.com
Darren F. Donnelly
ddonnelly@fenwick.com
Saina S. Shamilov
sshamilov@fenwick.com
Ryan J. Marton
rmarton@fenwick.com
Clifford Webb
cwebb@fenwick.com
Justin Hulse
jhulse@fenwick.com
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street, 6th Floor
Mountain View, CA 94041
(650) 988-8500

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	2
III. ARGUMENT	3
A. Twitter’s Counterclaims Are Sufficiently Pled and Should Not Be Dismissed.....	3
1. Twitter’s Counterclaims Meet the Requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for Patent-Related Claims.	4
2. Twitter’s Counterclaims Are Sufficient Under <i>Twombly</i> and <i>Iqbal</i> and are Pled with the Level of Specificity Anticipated by this District’s Local Patent Rules.....	6
B. Twitter’s Affirmative Defenses Are Sufficiently Pled and Should Not Be Stricken.....	10
1. <i>Twombly</i> and <i>Iqbal</i> Do Not Apply to Affirmative Defenses.	11
2. Twitter’s Affirmative Defenses Are Adequately Pled Under the Applicable “Fair Notice” Standard.	15
3. Twitter’s Failure to State a Claim Defense and Reservation of Affirmative Defenses Are Proper.	17
4. B.E. is Not Prejudiced by Twitter’s Affirmative Defenses.	17
IV. CONCLUSION.....	19

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
CASES	
<i>Ailey v. Midland Funding,</i> LLC, No. 3:11-cv-77, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 81028 (E.D. Tenn. July 25, 2011).....	12
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal,</i> 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>ASUSTeK Computer Inc. v. AFTG-TG LLC,</i> No. 5:CV 11-000192-EJD, 2011 WL 6845791 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 29, 2011).....	8
<i>Bayer CropScience AG v. Dow AgroSciences LLC,</i> No. 10-1045 RMB/JS, 2011 WL 6934557 (D. Del. Dec. 30, 2011).....	14
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly,</i> 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. U.S.,</i> 201 F.2d 819 (6th Cir. 1953)	10
<i>Damron v. ATM Central LLC,</i> No. 1:10-cv-01210, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 142812 (W.D. Tenn. Oct. 29, 2010)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Davis v. Sun Oil Co.,</i> 148 F.3d 606 (6th Cir. 1998)	11
<i>Driessen v. Sony Music Entm't,</i> 904 F. Supp. 2d 1196 (D. Utah 2012).....	5
<i>Dysart v. Remington Rand, Inc.,</i> 31 F. Supp. 296 (D. Conn. 1939).....	15
<i>Eastman Kodak Co. v. McAuley,</i> 2 F.R.D. 21 (S.D.N.Y. 1941)	15
<i>Elan Pharma Int'l Ltd. v. Lupin Ltd.,</i> No. 09-1008, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 32306 (D. N.J. Mar. 31, 2010).....	3, 7, 8
<i>Falley v. Friends Univ.,</i> 787 F. Supp. 2d 1255 (D. Kan. 2011).....	13
<i>Ferring B.V. v. Watson Labs., Inc.,</i> No. 3:11-cv-00481-RCJ-VPC, 2012 WL 607539 (D. Nev. Feb. 24, 2012)	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(Continued)

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>Forman v. Davis</i> , 371 U.S. 178 (1962).....	9
<i>FTC v. Hope Now Modifications, LLC</i> , No. 09-1204 (JBS/JS), 2011 WL 883202 (D.N.J. Mar. 10, 2011)	14
<i>Graphic Packaging Int’l, Inc. v. C.W. Zumbiel Co.</i> , No. 1:10-cv-3008-AT, 2011 WL 5829674 (N.D. Ga. Aug. 1, 2011)	8
<i>Hahn v. Best Recovery Services, LLC</i> , No. 10-12370, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 116136 (E.D. Mich. Nov. 1, 2010).....	13
<i>In re Bill of Lading Transmission and Processing Sys. Patent Litig.</i> , 681 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	4, 5
<i>Indem. Ins. Co. of N. Am. v. Pan Am. Airways, Inc.</i> , 58 F. Supp. 338 (S.D.N.Y. 1944)	15
<i>Int’l Outdoor, Inc. v. City of Southgate</i> , No. 2:11-cv-14719, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 85952 (E.D. Mich. Apr. 26, 2012).....	17
<i>Jeeper’s of Auburn, Inc. v. KWJB Enter., L.L.C.</i> , No. 10-13682, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 53492 (E.D. Mich. Mar. 16, 2011)	11, 12, 17
<i>Joao Control & Monitoring Sys. Of Cal., LLC v. Sling Media, Inc.</i> , No. C-11-6277 EMC, 2012 WL 3249510 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 7, 2012).....	5
<i>Kilgore-Wilson v. Home Depot U.S.A.</i> , No. 2:11-cv-02601-JTF, 2012 WL 4062663 (W.D. Tenn. Sept. 14, 2012).....	10, 12, 17
<i>Lawrence v. Chabot</i> , 182 Fed. App’x. 442 (6th Cir. 2006)	11
<i>Leatherman v. Tarrant Cnty., Narcotics Intel. & Coordination Unit</i> , 507 U.S. 163 (1992).....	5
<i>Lone Star Document Mgmt., LLC v. Atalashoft, Inc.</i> , No. 2:11-cv-00319-JRG, 2012 WL 4033322 (E.D. Tex. Sep. 12, 2012)	6

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(Continued)

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>Mark IV Indus. Corp. v. TransCore, L.P.</i> , No. 09-418 GMS, 2009 WL 4828661 (D. Del. Dec. 2, 2009).....	6
<i>McLemore v. Regions Bank</i> , Nos. 3:08-cv-0021; 3:08-cv-1003, 2010 WL 1010092 (M.D. Tenn. Mar. 18, 2010), <i>aff'd</i> , 682 F.3d 414 (6th Cir. 2012).....	13
<i>McZeal v. Sprint Nextel Corp.</i> , 501 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	5
<i>Memory Control Enter. LLC v. Edmunds.com</i> , No. CV 11-7658 PA, 2012 WL 681765 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 8, 2012).....	14, 15
<i>Montgomery v. Wyeth</i> , 580 F.3d 455 (6th Cir. 2009)	12
<i>Overnite Trans. Co. v. Int'l Bhd. of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of Am., AFL-CIO</i> , 168 F. Supp. 2d 826 (W.D. Tenn. 2001).....	10
<i>Palmetto Pharms. LLC v. Astrazeneca Pharms. LP</i> , No. 2:11-cv-00807, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 177185 (D. S.C. Nov. 6, 2012)	3, 7, 8
<i>Pfizer Inc. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 726 F. Supp. 2d 921 (N.D. Ill. 2010)	8
<i>Recticel Automobilsysteme GmbH v. Auto Components Holdings, LLC</i> , No. 2:10-cv-14097-SFC, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 127261 (E.D. Mich. Nov. 3, 2011)	16
<i>Select Retrieval, LLC v. L.L. Bean, Inc.</i> , No. 2:12-cv-00003-NT, 2012 WL 5381503 (D. Me. Oct. 31, 2012).....	6
<i>Sewell v. Allied Interstate, Inc.</i> , No. 3:10-cv-113, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 983 (E.D. Tenn. Jan. 5, 2011)	10, 12
<i>Shane v. Bunzl Distrib. USA, Inc.</i> , 200 Fed. App'x. 397 (6th Cir. 2006)	9

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.