

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION**

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 2:12-cv-02831 – JPM – tmp

**APPLE'S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO DISMISS UNDER FED. R. CIV. P. 12(b)(6) AND
MOTION TO STRIKE UNDER FED. R. CIV. P. 12(f)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. STATEMENT OF FACTS	1
II. APPLE’S COUNTERCLAIMS ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE AS INTERPRETED BY <i>TWOMBLY/IQBAL</i> AND HAVE THE SAME LEVEL OF SPECIFICITY AS PLAINTIFF’S COMPLAINT.	2
A. Apple’s counterclaims are adequately stated under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.	2
B. Apple’s counterclaims are properly pleaded under the <i>Twombly/Iqbal</i> standard.	4
C. Apple’s counterclaims are pleaded with specificity equal to plaintiff’s claims.	7
III. APPLE’S AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES GIVE FAIR AND ADEQUATE NOTICE OF THE ISSUES TO BE TRIED.	9
A. The <i>Twombly/Iqbal</i> standard should not apply to affirmative defenses.	9
B. Apple’s answer and affirmative defenses give B.E. adequate notice of the issues to be tried.	13
IV. APPLE’S AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES SHOW A PLAUSIBLE BASIS TO DENY PLAINTIFF’S REQUESTED RELIEF AND MEET THE <i>TWOMBLY/IQBAL</i> STANDARD.	15
V. B.E. WILL NOT BE UNDULY PREJUDICED BY APPLE’S AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES AS PLEADED.	16
VI. CONCLUSION.	16

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	passim
<i>ASUSTeK Computer Inc. v. AFTG-TG LLC</i> , No. 5:CV 11-00192-EJD, 2011 WL 6845791 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 29, 2011).....	6
<i>Bayer CropScience AG v. Dow AgroSciences LLC</i> , Civil No. 10-1045 RMB/JS, 2011 WL 6934557 (D. Del. Dec. 30, 2011).....	12
<i>Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	passim
<i>Chiancone v. City of Akron</i> , No. 5:11CV337, 2011 WL 4436587 (N.D. Ohio Sep. 23, 2011)	10
<i>Damron v. ATM Central LLC</i> , No. 1:10-cv-01210, 2010 WL 6512345 (W.D. Tenn. Oct. 29, 2010).....	9, 10
<i>Driessen v. Sony Music Entm't</i> , 904 F. Supp. 2d 1196 (D. Utah 2012).....	4
<i>Dysart v. Remington Rand, Inc.</i> , 31 F. Supp. 296 (D. Conn. 1939).....	12
<i>Eastman Kodak Co. v. McAuley</i> , 2 F.R.D. 21 (S.D.N.Y. 1941)	12
<i>Elan Microelectronics Corp. v. Apple, Inc.</i> , No. C 09-01531 RS, 2009 WL 2972374 (N.D. Cal. Sep. 14, 2009).....	3
<i>Elan Pharma International Ltd. v. Lupin Ltd.</i> , Civil Action No. 09-1008 (JAG), 2010 WL 1372316 (D.N.J. Mar. 31, 2010).....	6
<i>Ferring B.V. v. Watson Labs., Inc. - (FL)</i> , No. 3:11-cv-00481-RCJ-VPC, 2012 WL 607539 (D. Nev. Feb. 24, 2012)	11, 13
<i>Graphic Packaging Int'l, Inc. v. C.W. Zumbiel Co.</i> , Civil Action No. 1:10-cv-3008-AT, 2011 WL 5829674 (N.D. Ga. Aug. 1, 2011)	6, 7
<i>HCRI TRS Acquirer, LLC v. Iwer</i> , 708 F. Supp. 2d 687 (N.D. Ohio 2010).....	10

Holley Performance Prods., Inc. v. Quick Fuel Tech., Inc.,
Civil Action No. 1:07-CV-00185-JHM, 2011 WL 3159177 (W.D. Ky. July 26, 2011).....10

In re Bill of Lading Transmission and Processing Sys. Patent Litig.,
681 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....3, 4

Indem. Ins. Co. of N. Am. v. Pan Am. Airways, Inc.,
58 F. Supp. 338 (S.D.N.Y. 1944)12

Int’l Outdoor, Inc. v. City of Southgate,
No. 2:11-CV-14719, 2012 WL 2367160 (E.D. Mich. Apr. 26, 2012)10

Joao Control & Monitoring Sys. of Cal., LLC v. Sling Media, Inc.,
No. C-11-6277 EMC, 2012 WL 3249510 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 7, 2012).....4

K-Tech Telecomm., Inc. v. Time Warner Cable, Inc.,
714 F.3d 1277 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....3

Kilgore-Wilson v. Home Depot U.S.A.,
No. 2:11-cv-02601-JTF-cgc, 2012 WL 4062663 (W.D. Tenn. Sep. 14, 2012).....9

Knowles Elec., LLC v. Analog Devices, Inc.,
No. 11 C 6804, 2012 WL 1405735 (N.D. Ill. Apr. 23, 2012).....8

Kontrick v. Ryan,
540 U.S. 443 (2004).....13

Lone Star Document Mgmt., LLC v. Atalasoft, Inc.,
Civil Action No. 2:11-CV-00319-JRG, 2012 WL 4033322 (E.D. Tex. Sep. 12, 2012).....4

Mark IV Indus. Corp. v. TransCore, L.P.,
C. A. No. 09-418 GMS, 2009 WL 4828661 (D. Del. Dec. 2, 2009)5

Memory Control Enter. LLC v. Edmunds.com,
No. CV 11-7658 PA (JCx), 2012 WL 681765 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 8, 2012).....11, 12

Montgomery v. Wyeth,
580 F.3d 455 (6th Cir. 2009)9, 10, 13

Nixson v. The Health Alliance,
No. 1:10–CV–00338, 2010 WL 5230867 (S.D. Ohio Dec. 16, 2010).....10

Pfizer Inc. v. Apotex Inc.,
726 F. Supp. 2d 921 (N.D. Ill. 2010)6

Safeco Ins. Co. of Am. v. O’Hara Corp.,
No. 08-CV-10545, 2008 WL 2558015 (E.D. Mich. June 25, 2008)10

Select Retrieval, LLC v. L.L. Bean, Inc.,
Civil no. 2:12-cv-00003-NT, 2012 WL 5381503 (D. Me. Oct. 31, 2012)4

Sewell v. Allied Interstate, Inc.,
No. 3:10-CV-113, 2011 WL 32209 (E.D. Tenn. Jan. 5, 2011).....10

Shane v. Bunzl Distrib. USA, Inc.,
200 F. App'x 397 (6th Cir. 2006)8

Sony/ATV Music Pub. LLC v. D.J. Miller Music Distrib., Inc., No. 3:09-cv-01098, 2011 WL 4729807
(M.D. Tenn. Oct. 7, 2011)10

Teirstein v. AGA Med. Corp.,
Civil Action No. 6:08cv14, 2009 WL 704138 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 16, 2009)..... passim

Tyco Fire Prods. LP v. Victaulic Co.,
777 F. Supp. 2d 893 (E.D. Pa. 2011)11, 12, 13, 16

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 282(b) (2012)15

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Advisory Comm. on Rules for Civil Procedure, *Report of Proposed Amendments to Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States* (1946)4, 12

Charles Alan Wright & Arthur R. Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure* (3d ed. 2004)9

Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2).....10

Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(b)(1)(A).....10

Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(c)(1).....10

Fed. R. Civ. P. 84.....2, 3

Fed. R. Civ. P. 84 note3

Fed. R. Civ. P. app. Form 30.2, 13

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.