

**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-741-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-863-JRG
Plaintiffs,	§	CONSOLIDATED CASE
	§	
v.	§	
	§	
ZENDESK, INC.,	§	
	§	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
Defendant.	§	

**PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT ZENDESK, INC.'S
MOTION TO DISMISS THE COMPLAINT FOR
FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....1

III. LEGAL STANDARDS5

IV. ARGUMENT.....7

 A. Step 1: The Asserted Patents Claim Patentable Subject Matter7

 i) The '466 Patent8

 ii) The '578 Patent12

 iii) The '293 Patent15

 B. The Asserted Patents are Directed Toward Improvements in the Way
 Computers Operate17

 C. Step 2: The Claims of the Asserted Patents Add Inventive Concepts20

 i) The Specific Components Recited in the Claims Perform
 Specific Functions Within a Networks24

 ii) Zendesk has Failed to Sustain its Burden of Showing that the
 Generic Components, as Arranged in the Claims, do not Amount
 To Inventive Concepts26

V. CONCLUSION27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

2-Way Computing, Inc., v. Grandstream Networks, Inc.,
2:16-cv-01111-RCJ-PAL (D. Nev. Oct. 18, 2016).....16, 17

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

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, 1273 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....7

BASCOM Global Internet Servs. v. AT&T Mobility LLC,
827 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....7, 20, 24, 26

Core Wireless Lic. S.à.r.l. v. LG Elecs., Inc.,
2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 35663 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 20, 2016).....9, 13, 16

Core Wireless Lic. S.à.r.l. v. LG Elecs., Inc.,
2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 123232 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 8, 2016)11

DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.,
954 F. Supp. 2d 509 (E.D. Tex. 2014).....16

DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.,
773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....1, 13, 22, 23, 26

Diamond v. Diehr,
450 U.S. 175 (1981).....5

Enfish LLC v. Microsoft Corp.,
822 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....1, 7, 8, 17

Genband US LLC v. Metaswitch Networks Ltd.,
2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 134659 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 29, 2016).....8, 9, 24, 25, 26

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

Microsoft Corp. v. i4i Ltd. P’ship,
564 U.S. 91 (2011).....6

Perdiemco, LLC v. Industrack LLC,
2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 135667 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 21, 2016),
adopted by Perdiemco, LLC v. GPS Logic, LLC, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 134654
(E.D. Tex. Sept. 29, 2016) passim

Personalized Media Comm.’s, LLC v. Apple Inc.,
2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 135672 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 13, 2016).....26, 27

Personalized Media Comm.’s, LLC v. Samsung Elec. Am., Inc.,
2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 135669 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 21, 2016)20

Prescriber, LLC v. Adv. Data Sys. Corp.,
2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 177436 (E.D. Tex. Jun. 29, 2015).....7

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

I. STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED¹

Has Zendesk proved by clear and convincing evidence that the claims of the Asserted Patents are directed to abstract ideas under 35 U.S.C. § 101/*Alice*.²

If so, has Zendesk 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/*Alice*.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

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.*, 822 F.3d 1327, 1338 (Fed. Cir. 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). Even assuming, however that the Asserted Patent are directed to an abstract idea, the facts of this case are like those in *DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.*, 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014). In *DDR Holdings*, the Federal Circuit upheld a claim as a patent-eligible inventive concept where the claimed solution was “necessarily rooted in computer technology in order to overcome a problem specifically arising in the realm of computer networks” because “it amount[ed] to an inventive concept for resolving this particular Internet-centric problem.” *Id.* at 1259.

¹ Zendesk did not provide a Statement of the Issues. Therefore, Uniloc includes this Statement pursuant to L.R. 7(c).

² The Asserted Patents are U.S. Patent Nos. 6,510,466 (“the ‘466 Patent”), 6,324,578 (“the ‘578 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.