

EXHIBIT A

1 Matthias A. Kamber (SB # 232147)
matthiaskamber@paulhastings.com
2 PAUL HASTINGS LLP
101 California Street, 48th Floor
3 San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 856-7000
4 Facsimile: (415) 856-7100

5 Robert W. Unikel (*pro hac vice*)
robertunikel@paulhastings.com
6 John A. Cotiguala (*pro hac vice*)
johncotiguala@paulhastings.com
7 Matthew R. Lind (*pro hac vice*)
mattlind@paulhastings.com
8 Grayson S. Cornwell (*pro hac vice*)
graysoncornwell@paulhastings.com
9 PAUL HASTINGS LLP
71 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 4500
10 Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 499-6000
11 Facsimile: (312) 499-6100

12 [ADDITIONAL COUNSEL LISTED ON SIGNATURE
13 PAGE]

14 Attorneys for Defendant
GOOGLE LLC

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
17 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
18

19 VOIP-PAL.COM, INC.,

20 Plaintiff,

21 vs.

22 GOOGLE LLC,

23 Defendant.
24
25

CASE NO. 3:22-cv-05419-JD

**DEFENDANT GOOGLE LLC'S NOTICE
AND MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF ITS
MOTION FOR JUDGMENT ON THE
PLEADINGS**

Date: January 26, 2023
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Place: Courtroom 11, 19th Floor
Judge: The Hon. James Donato

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

I. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED 1

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS 1

III. LEGAL STANDARDS 2

 A. Collateral Estoppel..... 2

 B. 35 U.S.C. § 101..... 3

IV. ARGUMENT 4

 A. VoIP-Pal is collaterally estopped from challenging patent ineligibility here. 4

 B. The asserted claims are patent-ineligible under Section 101..... 6

 1. *Alice* step one: Claim 1 is directed to an abstract idea..... 6

 a. Claim 1 uses broad, functional terms..... 6

 b. Claim 1 is analogous to preexisting call routing practices. 7

 c. Claim 1 uses only known technology to perform routine functions..... 8

 2. *Alice* step two: Claim 1 lacks an inventive concept..... 10

 a. The individual claim elements do not provide an inventive concept. 10

 b. The ordered combination does not provide an inventive concept. 11

 C. Claim 1 is representative and no other asserted claim is patent-eligible. 12

 D. Dismissal with prejudice is appropriate..... 15

V. CONCLUSION..... 15

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

| | | |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | <i>Affinity Labs of Tex., LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , | |
| 6 | 838 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... | 7 |
| 7 | <i>Affinity Labs of Tex., LLC v. DIRECTV, LLC</i> , | |
| 8 | 838 F.3d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... | 14 |
| 9 | <i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank. Int’l</i> , | |
| 10 | 573 U.S. 208 (2014)..... | 3, 10 |
| 11 | <i>Broadcom Corp. v. Netflix Inc.</i> , | |
| 12 | No. 3:20-cv-04677-JD, 2022 WL 1105073 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 13, 2022)..... | 3, 4 |
| 13 | <i>BroadSoft Inc. v. CallWave Commc’ns, LLC</i> , | |
| 14 | 282 F. Supp. 3d 771 (D. Del. 2017)..... | 9, 10 |
| 15 | <i>Burnett v. Panasonic Corp.</i> , | |
| 16 | 741 F. App’x 777 (Fed. Cir. 2018) | 15 |
| 17 | <i>Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, Nat’l. Ass’n</i> , | |
| 18 | 776 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... | 12 |
| 19 | <i>Control v. Digit. Playground, Inc.</i> , | |
| 20 | No. 12-cv-6781 (RJS), 2016 WL 5793745 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 30, 2016) | 4 |
| 21 | <i>Cyberfone Sys., LLC v. CNN Interactive Grp., Inc.</i> , | |
| 22 | 558 F. App’x 988 (Fed. Cir. 2014) | 11 |
| 23 | <i>Dropbox, Inc. v. Synchronoss Techs., Inc.</i> , | |
| 24 | 815 F. App’x 529 (Fed. Cir. 2020) | 12 |
| 25 | <i>Elec. Power Grp., LLC v. Alstom S.A.</i> , | |
| 26 | 830 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... | 14 |
| 27 | <i>Foman v. Davis</i> , | |
| 28 | 371 U.S. 178 (1962)..... | 15 |
| | <i>Glasswall Sols. Ltd. v. Clearswift Ltd.</i> , | |
| | 754 F. App’x 996 (Fed. Cir. 2018) | 9 |
| | <i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Cap. One Bank (USA)</i> , | |
| | 792 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... | 14 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(Continued)

| | | Page(s) |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | Cases | |
| 4 | <i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Cap. One Fin. Corp.</i> , | |
| 5 | 850 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... | 3 |
| 6 | <i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Symantec Corp.</i> , | |
| 7 | 838 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... | 8 |
| 8 | <i>Juniper Networks Inc. v. Swarm Tech. LLC</i> , | |
| 9 | No. 3:20-cv-03137-JD, 2022 WL 3031211 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 1, 2022) | 11 |
| 10 | <i>Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs.</i> , | |
| 11 | Inc., 566 U.S. 66 (2012)..... | 11 |
| 12 | <i>McRO, Inc. v. Bandai Namco Games Am. Inc.</i> , | |
| 13 | 837 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... | 9 |
| 14 | <i>Mortg. Application Techs., LLC v. MeridianLink, Inc.</i> , | |
| 15 | 839 F. App'x 520 (Fed. Cir. 2021) | 15 |
| 16 | <i>NetSoc, LLC v. Oath Inc.</i> , | |
| 17 | No. 18-CV-12267 (RA), 2020 WL 419469 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 24, 2020), <i>appeal</i> | |
| 18 | <i>dismissed</i> , 832 F. App'x 703 (Fed. Cir. 2020)..... | 4, 5 |
| 19 | <i>Ohio Willow Wood Co. v. Alps S., LLC</i> , | |
| 20 | 735 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... | 2, 3, 4 |
| 21 | <i>Oyeniran v. Holder</i> , | |
| 22 | 672 F.3d 800 (9th Cir. 2012) | 2, 4 |
| 23 | <i>RecogniCorp, LLC v. Nintendo Co.</i> , | |
| 24 | 855 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... | 10, 14 |
| 25 | <i>RingCentral, Inc. v. Dialpad, Inc.</i> , | |
| 26 | 372 F. Supp. 3d 988 (N.D. Cal. 2019) | 8 |
| 27 | <i>Smart Sys. Innovations, LLC v. Chi. Transit Auth.</i> , | |
| 28 | 873 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... | 14 |
| | <i>In re TLI Commc'ns LLC Patent Litig.</i> , | |
| | 823 F.3d 607 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... | 9 |
| | <i>Twilio, Inc. v. Telesign Corp.</i> , | |
| | 249 F. Supp. 3d 1123 (N.D. Cal. 2017) | 9 |
| | <i>Two-Way Media Ltd. v. Comcast Cable Commc'ns, LLC</i> , | |
| | 874 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... | 7, 9, 11, 12 |

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.