

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
WACO DIVISION**

JAWBONE INNOVATIONS, LLC,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 6:21-CV-00984-ADA

PATENT CASE

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**DEFENDANT'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS
RENEWED MOTION TO DISMISS FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT
PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P. 12(b)(6) FOR FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. ARGUMENT 1
 - A. Jawbone Innovations Fails to Allege Facts Showing Apple Had Pre-Suit Knowledge of the Asserted Patents 1
 - 1. Jawbone Innovations’s Allegations Regarding Envision IP Do Not Sufficiently Plead Knowledge of the Patents 2
 - 2. Jawbone Innovations’s Allegations That Apple Had Knowledge of the Asserted Patents Based on Apple’s Disclosure of the ’091 Patent to the Patent Office Are Insufficient 3
 - B. Jawbone Innovations Fails to Allege Facts Sufficient to Show Apple Was Willfully Blind to the Existence of the Asserted Patents 6
 - C. Jawbone Innovations Fails to Allege Facts Sufficient to Show Apple Had Specific Intent to Induce Infringement 8
 - D. Jawbone Innovations’s Allegations Do Not Sufficiently Allege Apple Deliberately and Intentionally Infringed the Patents 9
- II. CONCLUSION 9

..

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC v. Toyota Motor N. Am.</i> , No. W:13-CV-365, 2014 WL 2892285 (W.D. Tex. May 12, 2014)	8
<i>Bos. Sci. Corp. v. Nevro Corp.</i> , No. CV 16-1163-CFC, 2021 WL 4262668 (D. Del. Sept. 20, 2021)	1
<i>Corephotonics, Ltd. v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 2018 WL 4772340 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 1, 2018).....	4, 8
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Juniper Networks, Inc.</i> , No. C 17-05659 WHA, 2018 WL 905909 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 14, 2018).....	3
<i>Frac Shack Inc. v. AFT Petroleum (Texas) Inc.</i> , No. 7:19-cv-26-DC, 2019 WL 3818048 (W.D. Tex. June 13, 2019).....	1, 2
<i>Glob.-Tech Appliances, Inc. v. SEB S.A.</i> , 563 U.S. 754 (2011).....	7
<i>Helios Streaming, LLC v. Vudu, Inc.</i> , No. CV 19-1792-CFC-SRF, 2021 WL 254069 (D. Del. Jan. 26, 2021).....	6
<i>Intell. Pixels Ltd. v. Sony Interactive Ent. LLC</i> , No. SACV-20-1422	6
<i>Intell. Ventures I LLC v. Symantec Corp.</i> , 234 F. Supp. 3d 601 (D. Del. 2017), <i>aff'd</i> , 725 F. App'x 976 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	4
<i>Kaneka Corp. v. SKC Kolon PI, Inc.</i> , 198 F. Supp. 3d 1089 (C.D. Cal. 2016)	5, 6
<i>Kewazinga Corp., v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , No. 1:18-CV-4500-GHW, 2021 WL 4066596 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 1, 2021).....	5, 6
<i>Kirsch Research & Dev., LLC v. IKO Indus., Inc.</i> No. 6:20-cv-00317-ADA, 2021 WL 4555608, at *2 (W.D. Tex. Oct. 4, 2021)	<u>3</u>
<i>Longhorn Vaccines & Diagnostics, LLC v. Spectrum Sols. LLC</i> , No. 220CV00827DBBJCB, 2021 WL 4324508 (D. Utah Sept. 23, 2021)	4
<i>Parity Networks, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , No. 6:19-CV-00207-ADA, 2019 WL 3940952 (W.D. Tex. July 26, 2019).....	2, 3

...

In re S. Scrap Material Co., LLC,
541 F.3d 584 (5th Cir. 2008)7

SIMO Holdings Inc. v. Hong Kong uCloudlink Network Tech. Ltd.,
396 F. Supp. 3d 323 (S.D.N.Y. 2019).....5, 6

Software Rsch., Inc. v. Dynatrace LLC,
316 F. Supp. 3d 1112 (N.D. Cal. 2018)6

Tinnus Enters., LLC v. Telebrands Corp.,
846 F.3d 1190 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....8

Ultravision Tech., LLC v. Govision LLC,
No. 2:18-cv-00100-JRG-RP, 2020 WL 1542371 (E.D. Tex.).....7

Other Authorities

Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(b)9

After Jawbone Innovations amended its complaint, the allegations of indirect and willful infringement remained inadequately pled. Apple renewed its motion to dismiss. In its opposition, Jawbone Innovations offers no compelling reason or authority for finding its speculations and conclusory recitals of claim elements suffice. The first amendment complaint (“FAC”) fails to state a claim for willful and indirect infringement at least because the allegations fail to lead to a plausible inference that Apple knew of the asserted patents. The willful infringement claim fails for another reason—the FAC contains no factual allegations that Apple deliberately and intentionally infringed. As for indirect infringement, Jawbone Innovations did not allege Apple had the specific intent to induce infringement, an element separate from knowledge, which Jawbone Innovations also failed to sufficiently plead. Despite having the benefit of Apple’s motion to dismiss the original complaint before it when Jawbone Innovations amended its complaint, the willful and indirect infringement allegations fall far short of the pleading standard. Jawbone Innovations does not deserve a third chance. Apple requests the Court grant the motion to dismiss the claims for willful and indirect infringement with prejudice.

I. ARGUMENT

A. Jawbone Innovations Fails to Allege Facts Showing Apple Had Pre-Suit Knowledge of the Asserted Patents

Jawbone Innovations alleges two theories for how Apple allegedly came to have knowledge of the asserted patents. Neither leads to a plausible inference that Apple knew of the asserted patents—a deficiency that is fatal to its willful and indirect infringement claims.¹

¹ Jawbone Innovations requests the Court apply its reasoning in *Frac Shack Inc. v. AFT Petroleum (Texas) Inc.*, No. 7:19-cv-26-DC, 2019 WL 3818048 , at *2 (W.D. Tex. June 13, 2019), to deny Apple’s motion because the original complaint put Apple on notice of the patents and Jawbone’s infringement theories. (Opp. at 5.) Recently, another court has taken a different approach. *See Bos. Sci. Corp. v. Nevro Corp.*, No. CV 16-1163-CFC, 2021 WL 4262668, at *5 (D. Del. Sept. 20, 2021) (adopting the rule that the operative complaint in a lawsuit fails to state a claim for indirect and willful infringement where the defendant’s alleged knowledge of the asserted patents is based

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.