

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION**

UNILOC USA, INC., et al,  
Plaintiffs,

v.

ADP, LLC,

BOX, INC.,

Defendants.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Case No. 2:16-cv-00741-JRG  
LEAD CASE

---

Case No. 2:16-cv-00860-JRG

---

**PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT  
BOX, INC.'S MOTION TO DISMISS**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED ..... 1

II. COMPUTER PROBLEMS ADDRESSED BY THE ASSERTED PATENTS ..... 1

III. LEGAL STANDARDS ..... 5

IV. ARGUMENT ..... 7

    A. Step 1: The Asserted Patents Claim Patentable Subject Matter ..... 7

    B. The Asserted Patents are Directed Toward an Improvement in the Way  
    Computers Operate ..... 16

    C. Step 2: The Claims of the Asserted Patents Add an Inventive Concept ..... 20

        a. The Specific Components Recited in the Claims Perform Specific  
        Functions Within a Network ..... 26

        b. Box has Failed to Sustain its Burden of Showing that Generic  
        Components as Arranged in the Asserted Claims do not Amount to  
        Inventive Concepts ..... 28

V. VENUE IS PROPER UNDER CONTROLLING LAW ..... 29

VI. CONCLUSION ..... 29

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases**

*2-Way Computing, Inc., v. Grandstream Networks, Inc.*,  
2:16-cv-01111-RCJ-PAL (D. Nev. Oct. 18, 2016) ..... 14

*Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank Int’l*,  
134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014) ..... passim

*Amdocs (Isr.) Ltd. v. Opennet Telecom, Inc.*,  
2016 U.S. App. LEXIS 19593 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 1, 2016)..... 25, 26

*Ashcroft v. Iqbal*,  
556 U.S. 662 (2009))..... 5

*Audio MPEG, Inc. v. HP, Inc.*,  
2:15-cv-00073-HCM-RJK (E.D. Va. Jun. 29, 2016) ..... 18

*Bancorp Servs., LLC v. Sun Life Assur. Co. of Canada (U.S.)*,  
687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 7

*Bascom Global Internet Servs. v. AT&T Mobility LLC*,  
2016 U.S. App. Lexis 11687 (Fed. Cir. Jun. 27, 2016) ..... 7, 20, 24, 29

*Core Wireless Lic. S.à.r.l. v. LG Elecs., Inc.*,  
2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 123232 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 8, 2016) ..... 15

*Core Wireless Lic. S.à.r.l. v. LG Elecs., Inc.*,  
2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 35663 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 20, 2016)..... 15

*DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.*,  
773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... passim

*Diamond v. Diehr*,  
450 U.S. 175 (1981)..... 6

*Enfish LLC v. Microsoft Corp.*,  
2016 U.S. App. LEXIS 8699 (Fed. Cir. May 12, 2016) ..... passim

*Genband US LLC v. Metaswitch Networks Ltd.*,  
2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 134659 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 29, 2016) ..... passim

*Gonzalez v. Kay*,  
577 F.3d 600 (5th Cir. 2009)..... 5

*Harrington v. State Farm Fire & Cas. Co.*,  
563 F.3d 141 (5th Cir. 2009)..... 5

*In re BRCA1- & BRCA2-Based Hereditary Cancer Test Pat. Lit.*,  
774 F.3d 755 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 7

*JDS Techs., Inc. v. Exacq Techs.*,  
2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 73622 (E.D. Mich., June 7, 2016)..... 8

*Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.*,  
132 S. Ct. 1289 (2012) ..... 6

*McRo, Inc. v. Bandai Namco Games AM. Inc.*,  
2016 WL 4896481 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 13, 2016)..... 8

*Nystrom v. Trex Co.*,  
424 F.3d 1136 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 7

*Perdiemco, LLC v. Industrack LLC*,  
2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 135667 (E.D. Tex., July 7, 2016)..... passim

*Personalized Media Commc'ns, LLC v. Samsung Elec. Am., Inc.*,  
2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 135669 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 21, 2016) ..... 20

*RPost Holdings, Inc. v. Readnotify.com Pty. Ltd.*,  
No. 2:11-cv-16, 2012 WL 3201898 (E.D. Tex. Jun. 29, 2012) ..... 5

*Turner v. Pleasant*,  
663 F.3d 770 (5th Cir. 2011) ..... 5

**Rules**

35 U.S.C. § 282 ..... 7

35 U.S.C. §101 ..... 1, 18

Plaintiffs, Uniloc USA, Inc. and Uniloc Luxembourg, S.A. (together “Uniloc” or “Plaintiffs”), respectfully submit this opposition to the motion of defendant, Box, Inc. (“Defendant” or “Box”), to dismiss for failure to state a claim or for improper venue (“Motion” or “Mot.”). For the reasons set forth herein, the Motion should be denied.

**I. STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED<sup>1</sup>**

- A. Has Box proved by clear and convincing evidence that the claims of the Asserted Patents are directed to abstract ideas under 35 U.S.C. §101?<sup>2</sup>
- B. If so, has Box proved by clear and convincing evidence that any such claim(s) of the Asserted Patents include no inventive concepts under 35 U.S.C. §101?
- C. Is Venue proper in this District under controlling law?

**II. COMPUTER PROBLEMS ADDRESSED BY THE ASSERTED PATENTS**

As explained in detail below, the Asserted Patents solve particular problems in the computer field, thus rendering them patent eligible. *See Enfish LLC v. Microsoft Corp.*, 2016 U.S. App. LEXIS 8699, at \*21 (Fed. Cir. May 12, 2016) (“claims [that] are directed to a specific implementation of a solution to a problem in the software arts” are not invalid under Section 101). Moreover, the claims of the Asserted Patents are “necessarily rooted in computer technology in order to overcome a problem specifically arising in the realm of computer networks” because they “amount to an inventive concept for resolving this particular Internet-centric problem.” *DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.*, 773 F.3d 1245, 1257 (Fed. Cir. 2014) Thus, contrary to Box’s argument, the claims are patent eligible. *Id.* at 1259.

---

<sup>1</sup> Box did not provide a Statement of the Issues. Therefore, Uniloc includes this Statement pursuant to L.R. 7(c).

<sup>2</sup> The Asserted Patents are U.S. Patent Nos. 6,510,466 (“the ’466 Patent”), 6,324,578 (“the ’78 Patents”) and 7,069,293 (“the ’293 Patent”). The Asserted Patents are all related and share a common specification. Copies of the Asserted Patents were filed with the Complaint. *See* Dkt. No. 1.

# 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.