

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

UNILOC USA, INC., and UNILOC LUXEMBOURG, S.A., Plaintiffs, V. ADP, LLC. Defendant.	CASE NO. 2:16-cv-00741-JRG (CONSOLIDATED CASE) JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
UNILOC USA, INC., and UNILOC LUXEMBOURG, S.A., Plaintiffs, V. BIG FISH GAMES, INC., Defendant.	CASE NO. 2:16-cv-00858-JRG (INDIVIDUAL CASE) JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**DEFENDANT BIG FISH GAMES, INC.'S MOTION TO DISMISS
THE COMPLAINT FOR FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
BACKGROUND	1
A. The '578 Patent	2
B. The '466 Patent	3
C. The '293 Patent	4
D. Disclosed Hardware	5
ARGUMENT	6
The Patents-In-Suit Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 101	6
A. Legal Standards.....	6
B. <i>Alice</i> Step One: The Patents-In-Suit Are Directed To Abstract Ideas	8
1. The '578 Patent Claims Are Directed To The Abstract Idea Of Providing Two-Tiered Customization	8
2. The '466 Patent Claims Are Directed To The Abstract Idea Of Centralized Offering Of Products.....	13
3. The '293 Patent Claims Are Directed To The Abstract Idea Of On- Demand Distribution Of Information	16
C. <i>Alice</i> Step Two: The Claims Fail To Recite Innovative Concepts	18
CONCLUSION.....	24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Page(s)****Cases**

<i>Accenture Glob. Servs., GmbH v. Guidewire Software, Inc.</i> , 728 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	12, 15, 18, 19
<i>Affinity Labs of Tex. v. Amazon.com Inc.</i> , --- F.3d ---, 2016 WL 5335502 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 23, 2016)	22
<i>Affinity Labs of Tex. v. DirecTV, LLC</i> , --- F.3d ---, 2016 WL 5335501 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 23, 2016)	7, 20, 21
<i>Alice Corp. Pty. v. CLS Bank Int'l</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Bancorp Servs., LLC v. Sun Life Assurance Co. of Can.</i> , 687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	21
<i>Bascom Glob. Internet Servs., Inc. v. AT&T Mobility LLC</i> , 827 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	7, 23, 24
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 561 U.S. 593 (2010)	11
<i>buySAFE, Inc. v. Google, Inc.</i> , 765 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	20
<i>Clear with Computers, LLC v. Altec Indus.</i> , No. 14-cv-79, 2015 WL 993392 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 3, 2015), <i>aff'd</i> , 636 F. App'x 1015 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, Nat'l Ass'n</i> , 776 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.</i> , 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	23, 24
<i>Device Enhancement LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2016 WL 2899246 (D. Del. May 17, 2016)	7, 10, 14
<i>Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 822 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	7, 23, 24
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Capital One Bank (USA)</i> , 792 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	11, 15, 20

Internet Patents Corp. v. Active Network, Inc.,
790 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....8

Loyalty Conversion Sys. Corp. v. Am. Airlines, Inc.,
66 F. Supp. 3d 829 (E.D. Tex. 2014)8, 21

Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.,
132 S. Ct. 1289 (2012)6, 7

McRO, Inc. v. Bandai Namco Games Am. Inc.,
--- F.3d ---, 2016 WL 4896481 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 13, 2016)23, 24

Mortg. Grader, Inc. v. First Choice Loan Servs. Inc.,
811 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....19, 20

NexusCard, Inc. v. Kroger Co.,
173 F. Supp. 3d 462 (E.D. Tex. 2016)6, 17, 24

OIP Techs., Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.,
788 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....6, 8, 21

Rothschild Location Techs. LLC v. Geotab USA, Inc.,
No. 15-CV-682-RWS-JDL, 2016 WL 3584195 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 4, 2016).....19

Sound View Innov’ns, LLC v. Facebook, Inc.,
--- F.3d ---, 2016 WL 4535345 (D. Del. Aug. 30, 2016)..... *passim*

In re TLI Commc’ns LLC Patent Litig.,
823 F.3d 607 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....14, 19, 22

Tranxition, Inc. v. Lenovo (US) Inc.,
No. 12-cv-01065-HZ, 2015 WL 4203469 (D. Or. July 9, 2015)11, 20

Ultramercial, Inc. v. Hulu, LLC,
772 F.3d 709 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....2, 18, 19

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 101 *passim*

Other Authorities

Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6).....1, 8

Local Rule CV-5(a)(3)27

Plaintiffs Uniloc USA, Inc. and Uniloc Luxembourg, S.A. (together, “Uniloc”) accuse Defendant Big Fish Games, Inc. (“Big Fish”) of infringing three U.S. patents, each of which purports to claim configurations of servers and clients in a networked environment. But each asserted patent simply claims a known, abstract, and conventional technique for information management. In *Alice Corp. Pty. v. CLS Bank Int’l*, 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014), the Supreme Court made clear that such techniques are unpatentable as a matter of law, and numerous decisions (including decisions of this Court) have applied *Alice* at the pleading stage to dismiss cases asserting similar patents.

Because all claims of the asserted patents are invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 101, Big Fish respectfully moves this Court for dismissal of the complaint under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) for failure to state a claim.¹

BACKGROUND

Big Fish is a Seattle, Washington-based company that provides market-leading games, including “board” games, arcade games, and social casino games, to users around the world via online platforms and mobile applications for PC, Mac, iPad, iPhone, and Android devices. Uniloc is a Luxembourg-based patent-assertion entity that filed this action against Big Fish on August 2, 2016, for allegedly infringing U.S. Patent Nos. 6,324,578 (the “’578 Patent”); 6,510,466 (the “’466 Patent”); and 7,069,293 (the “’293 Patent”) (collectively, the “Patents-in-Suit”). The three patents claim a priority date of December 14, 1998, and were allegedly assigned to Uniloc from the original owner, IBM, in 2016. Plaintiffs are currently asserting one or more of these or related patents against nearly twenty unrelated companies, including Big Fish.

¹ The arguments presented here are substantially similar to those presented in the motions to dismiss filed by Defendant ADP, LLC at ECF No. 17 in Case No. 2:16-cv-741[JRG] and Defendant Salesforce.com, Inc. at ECF No. 24 in Case No. 2:16-cv-744[JRG].

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.