

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

UNILOC USA, INC., and	§	
UNILOC LUXEMBOURG, S.A.,	§	
	§	Civil Action No. 2:16-cv-00741-JRG
Plaintiffs,	§	LEAD CASE
	§	
v.	§	
	§	
ADP, LLC,	§	
	§	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
Defendant.	§	

UNILOC USA, INC., and	§	
UNILOC LUXEMBOURG, S.A.,	§	
	§	Civil Action No. 2:16-cv-00859-JRG
Plaintiffs,	§	
	§	
v.	§	
	§	
BLACKBOARD INC.,	§	
	§	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
Defendant.	§	

**PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT BLACKBOARD INC.'S
MOTION TO DISMISS FOR FAILURE TO STATE CLAIM
AND IMPROPER VENUE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

II. RESPONSE TO STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES.....2

III. THE ASSERTED PATENTS2

IV. LEGAL STANDARDS.....5

V. ARGUMENT.....8

A. Step 1: the Asserted Patents Claim Patentable Subject Matter.8

 i. '466 Patent9

 ii. '578 Patent13

 iii. '293 Patent16

 iv. As in *Enfish*, the Asserted Patents are Directed Toward Improvements
 in the Way Computers Operate.....18

B. Step 2: The Claims of the Asserted Patents Add Inventive Concepts.....21

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

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

VI. VENUE IS PROPER UNDER CONTROLLING LAW29

VII. CONCLUSION29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

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

Ashcroft v. Iqbal,
556 U.S. 662 (2009)..... 6

Audio MPEG, Inc. v. HP, Inc.,
2:15-cv-00073-HCM-RJK (E.D. Va. Jun. 29, 2016)..... 19

Bancorp Servs., LLC v. Sun Life Assur. Co. of Canada (U.S.),
687 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 8

Bascom Global Internet Servs. v. AT&T Mobility LLC,
2016 U.S. App. Lexis 11687 (Fed. Cir. Jun. 27, 2016) 8, 21, 28

Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly,
550 U.S. 544 (2007)..... 6

Core Wireless Lic. S.à.r.l. v. LG Elecs., Inc.,
2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 35663 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 20, 2016)..... 11, 14

Core Wireless Lic. S.à.r.l. v. LG Elecs., Inc.,
2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 123232 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 8, 2016) 10, 13

DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.,
954 F. Supp. 2d 527 (E.D. Tex. 2013).....18

DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.,
773 F. 3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....2, 14, 18, 24, 25, 27

Diamond v. Diehr,
450 U.S. 175 (1981)..... 7

Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.,
2016 U.S. App. LEXIS 8699 (E.D. Tex. May 12, 2016).....1, 2, 9, 18

Genband US LLC v. Metaswitch Networks Ltd.,
2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 134659 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 29, 2016) 9, 11, 15, 26, 27

Gonzalez v. Kay,
577 F.3d 600, 603 (5th Cir. 2009) 6

Harrington v. State Farm Fire & Cas. Co.,
563 F.3d 141, 147 (5th Cir. 2009) 6

In re Apple, Inc.,
581 Fed. Appx. 886 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....4

In re Bill of Lading Transmission & Proc. Sys. Patent Lit.,
681 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 5

In re BRCA1- & BRCA2-Based Hereditary Cancer Test Pat. Lit.,
774 F.3d 755 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 8

In re Morgan Stanley,
417 Fed. Appx. 947 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....2

JDS Techs., Inc. v. Exacq Techs.,
2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 73622 (E.D. Mich., June 7, 2016)..... 9

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

McRo, Inc. v. Bandai Namco Games Am., Inc.,
2016 WL 4896481 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 13, 2016)..... 9

Perdiemco, LLC v. Industrack LLC,
2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 135667 (E.D. Tex. Jul. 7, 2016).....1, 8, 10, 13, 16, 20

Personalized Media Commc’ns, LLC v. Apple Inc.,
No. 2:15-cv-1366-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex. Sept. 13, 2016)..... 28

Personalized Media Commc’ns, LLC v. Samsung Elec. Am., Inc.,
2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 135669 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 21, 2016)..... 22

RPost Holdings, Inc. v. Readnotify.com Pty. Ltd.,
No. 2:11-cv-16, 2012 WL 3201898 (E.D. Tex. Jun. 29, 2012)..... 6

Script Sec. Solutions L.L.C. v. Amazon.com, Inc.,
2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1055827 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 16, 2016) 6

Skinner v. Spitzer,
562 U.S. 521 (2011)..... 6

Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Distinctive Dev. Ltd.,
964 F. Supp. 2d 638 (E.D. Tex. 2013)..... 3, 5

Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Sony Corp. of Am.,
2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 155927 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 20, 2011)..... 4

2-Way Computing, Inc., v. Grandstream Networks, Inc.,
2:16-cv-0111-RCJ-PAL (D. Nev. Oct. 18, 2016)..... 18

STATUTES AND RULES

28 U.S.C. § 1391(c)2
28 U.S.C. § 1400(b)2
35 U.S.C. § 101.....1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 15, 20, 24
35 U.S.C. § 282.....8
Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2).....6
Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6).....6

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.