

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

<p><b>AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC,</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Plaintiff,</i></p> <p>v.</p> <p><b>HUAWEI DEVICE USA INC., et al.,</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Defendants.</i></p>	§ § § § § § § § § §	<p><b>Civil Action No. 2:17-CV-513-JRG (LEAD CASE)</b></p>
---	--	--

---

<p><b>AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC,</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Plaintiff,</i></p> <p>v.</p> <p><b>APPLE INC.,</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Defendant.</i></p>	§ § § § § § § § §	<p><b>Civil Action No. 2:17-CV-516-JRG (CONSOLIDATED CASE)</b></p>
--	---	--

---

**DEFENDANT APPLE INC.’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF  
INVALIDITY OF U.S. PATENT NOS. 9,467,838; 9,445,251; 9,408,055; AND 9,749,829  
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101**

**F** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Pages</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS .....	1
A. The Present Lawsuit.....	1
B. The Idea Of A Map Room: Situational Awareness, Communications, Command and Control, And Common Operational Picture .....	2
C. The Asserted Patents .....	5
1. The Claimed Software .....	5
2. Hardware Components Recited In The Claims .....	6
3. Prototype Software.....	8
D. The Accused Products.....	8
III. LEGAL STANDARD.....	10
A. Summary Judgment .....	10
B. Subject Matter Eligibility Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 .....	10
IV. STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED BY THE COURT .....	11
V. ARGUMENT .....	11
A. <i>Alice</i> Step One: The Asserted Patents’ Claims Are Directed An Abstract Idea.....	12
1. The Claims Of The Asserted Patents Are Directed To The Abstract Idea Of A Map Room. ....	12
2. The Generic Hardware Recited In The Asserted Patents’ Claims Does Not Make Them Any Less Abstract. ....	14
B. <i>Alice</i> Step Two: The Asserted Claims Lack An Inventive Concept. ....	17
1. The Software Disclosed In The Asserted Patents Does Not Represent An Improvement In Computer Technology.....	18
2. The Dependent Claims Of The Asserted Patents Do Not Contain An Inventive Concept. ....	20



**TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)**

	<u>Pages</u>
VI. CONCLUSION.....	23

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b><u>Pages</u></b>
<b><u>Cases</u></b>	
<i>Alice Corp. Pty. v. CLS Bank Int’l</i> , 573 U.S. 208 (2014).....	passim
<i>Amdocs (Israel) Ltd. v. Opennet Telecom, Inc.</i> , 841 F.3d 1288 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	17
<i>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.</i> , 477 U.S. 242 (1986).....	10
<i>Apple Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1229 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	22
<i>Bascom Global Internet Servs., Inc. v. AT&amp;T Mobility LLC</i> , 827 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	14, 17
<i>Berkheimer v. HP Inc.</i> , 881 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	10
<i>buySAFE, Inc. v. Google, Inc.</i> , 765 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	22
<i>Celotex Corp. v. Catrett</i> , 477 U.S. 317 (1986).....	10
<i>Content Extraction &amp; Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, Nat’l Ass’n</i> , 776 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	15, 21
<i>Data Engine Technologies LLC v. Google LLC</i> , 906 F.3d 999 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	18
<i>DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.</i> , 773 F.3d 1235 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	18
<i>Elec. Power Grp., LLC v. Alstom S.A.</i> , 830 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	14
<i>In re TLI Commc’ns LLC Patent Litig.</i> , 823 F.3d 607 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	14, 17
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Capital One Bank (USA)</i> , 792 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	12, 17



**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (cont'd)**

	<b><u>Pages</u></b>
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Erie Indemnity Co.</i> , 850 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	15, 20
<i>Little v. Liquid Air Corp.</i> , 37 F.3d 1069 (5th Cir. 1994) .....	10
<i>OIP Techs., Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , 788 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	18
<i>RecogniCorp, LLC v. Nintendo Co., Ltd.</i> , 855 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	12, 18, 23
<i>Secured Mail Sols. LLC v. Universal Wilde, Inc.</i> , 873 F.3d 905 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	12
<i>Smart Sys. Innovations, LLC v. Chicago Transit Auth.</i> , 873 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	17
<i>Two-Way Media Ltd. v. Comcast Cable Commc'ns, LLC</i> , 874 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	19

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 101.....	passim
----------------------	--------

**Rules**

Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a) .....	10
-----------------------------	----

# 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.