

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

QUEST NETTECH CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

C.A. No. 2:19-cv-00118-JRG

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**APPLE INC.'S MOTION TO DISMISS UNDER  
FEDERAL RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 12(b)(6)**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

INTRODUCTION ..... 1

ISSUES TO BE DECIDED ..... 2

LEGAL STANDARD..... 2

ANALYSIS..... 2

I. THE '137 PATENT IS INVALID UNDER § 101 ..... 2

    A. Background of the '137 Patent ..... 3

        1. The '137 Patent Specification..... 3

        2. The '137 Patent Claims..... 5

    B. Patent Eligibility Under § 101 ..... 7

    C. *Alice* Step 1: The Claims are Directed to the Patent-Ineligible Concept of Storing  
        Financial Transaction Records in a Portable and Organized Manner..... 9

        1. The Claims Preempt Electronic Storage of Financial Transaction Records in a  
            Portable and Organized Manner ..... 12

        2. The Claims Are Not Directed to an Improvement in Computer Functionality  
            ..... 14

    D. *Alice* Step 2: No Claim Elements Transform the Claims Into Patent-Eligible Subject  
        Matter..... 15

        1. The Independent Claims Recite Only “Well-Understood, Routine, [or]  
            Conventional” Computer Components and are Not Transformative..... 16

        2. Many Dependent Claims Only Add Generic Computer Structure ..... 19

        3. All Other Dependent Claims Merely Adapt the Abstract Idea to a Particular  
            Technological Environment..... 21

II. NETTECH’S CLAIMS FOR INDIRECT AND WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT SHOULD  
    BE DISMISSED..... 22

    A. NetTech’s Indirect and Willful Infringement Allegations..... 22

    B. NetTech Does Not Allege that Apple Knew of the '137 Patent Before It Expired .... 23

    C. NetTech Does Not Adequately Allege Specific Intent for Indirect Infringement ..... 25

CONCLUSION..... 26

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Aatrix Software, Inc. v. Green Shades Software, Inc.</i> , 882 F.3d 1121 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	9
<i>Affinity Labs of Texas v. Amazon.com Inc.</i> , 838 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	13
<i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Intl.</i> , 134 S.Ct. 2347 (2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Am. Vehicular Scis. LLC v. Mercedes-Benz U.S. Int’l, Inc.</i> , No. 6:13cv307 MHS-JDL, 2014 WL 10291478 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 7, 2014) .....	2, 26
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1229 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	12
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	2
<i>Automated Tracking Sols., LLC v. Coca-Cola Co.</i> , 723 F. App’x 989 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	9
<i>Babbage Holdings, LLC v. Activision Blizzard, Inc.</i> , No. 2:13-cv-750, 2014 WL 2115616 (E.D. Tex. May 14, 2014) .....	24, 25
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 561 U.S. 593 (2010).....	8, 21
<i>buySAFE, Inc. v. Google, Inc.</i> , 765 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Clinicomp Int’l, Inc. v. Cerner Corp.</i> , No. 17cv2479-GPC(BLM), 2018 WL 2229364 (S.D. Cal. May 16, 2018).....	24, 25
<i>Coinstar, Inc. v. Coinbank Automated Sys., Inc.</i> , 998 F. Supp. 1109 (N.D. Cal. 1998) .....	17
<i>Content Extraction &amp; Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, Nat’l Ass’n</i> , 776 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Core Wireless Licensing S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , No. 6:14-cv-752-JRG-JDL, 2015 WL 4910427 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 14, 2015) .....	25, 26
<i>DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.</i> , 773 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	14

*Digitech Image Techs., LLC v. Elecs. For Imaging, Inc.*,  
758 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....8

*Electric Power Grp., LLC v. Alstom S.A.*,  
830 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....9, 10, 13

*Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.*,  
822 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....14

*Global-Tech Appliances, Inc. v. SEB S.A.*,  
563 U.S. 754 (2011).....23

*Halo Elecs., Inc. v. Pulse Elecs., Inc.*,  
136 S. Ct. 1923 (2016).....23

*Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Capital One Bank (USA)*,  
792 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....9

*Intellectual Ventures II LLC v. Sprint Spectrum, L.P.*,  
No. 2:17-cv-00662-JRG-RSP, 2019 WL 1987172 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 4, 2019).....23

*Internet Patents Corp. v. Active Network, Inc.*,  
790 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....9

*Interval Licensing LLC v. AOL, Inc.*,  
896 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....9, 13

*Laguna Hermosa Corp. v. United States*,  
671 F.3d 1284 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....2

*Mass. Inst. of Tech. v. Abacus Software, Inc.*,  
No. 5:01-cv-344, 2004 WL 5268128 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 24, 2004).....24, 25

*Maxon, LLC v. Funai Corp., Inc.*,  
726 F. App'x 797 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....9

*Mortg. Grader, Inc. v. First Choice Loan Servs. Inc.*,  
811 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....15

*NobelBiz, Inc. v. Insidesales.com, Inc.*,  
No. 6:13-cv-360-MHS, 2014 WL 12378804 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 14, 2014).....23, 26

*O'Connor v. Uber Techs., Inc.*,  
58 F. Supp. 3d 989 (N.D. Cal. 2014) .....17

*OIP Techs., Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*,  
788 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... *passim*

<i>Parker v. Flook</i> , 437 U.S. 584 (1978).....	21
<i>Preservation Wellness Technologies LLC v. Allscripts Healthcare Solutions</i> , No. 2:15-CV-1559-WCB, 2016 WL 2742379 (E.D. Tex. May 10, 2016).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Pure Data Sys., LLC v. Ubisoft, Inc.</i> , 329 F. Supp. 3d 1054 (N.D. Cal. 2018).....	24, 25
<i>SAP Am. Inc. v. Investpic, LLC</i> , 898 F.3d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	9
<i>Smart Sys. Innovations, LLC v. Chicago Transit Auth.</i> , 873 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Standard Havens Prods., Inc. v. Gencor Indus., Inc.</i> , 897 F.2d 511 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....	17
<i>Superior Indus., LLC v. Thor Global Enters. Ltd.</i> , 700 F.3d 1287 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	26
<i>In re TLI Communs. LLC Patent Litig.</i> , 823 F.3d 607 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>TriDim Innovations LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , 207 F.Supp.3d 1073 (N.D. Cal. 2016).....	13
<i>Ultramercial, Inc. v. Hulu, LLC</i> , 772 F.3d 709 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	19
<i>Voter Verified, Inc. v. Election Sys. &amp; Software LLC</i> , 887 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	9
<b>Statutes</b>	
35 U.S.C. § 101.....	<i>passim</i>
35 U.S.C. § 154(a)(2).....	22, 25
<b>Other Authorities</b>	
Fed. R. Evid. 201 .....	17
Fed. R. Civ. Prod. 12.....	1, 2, 17

# 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.