

1 Ekwan E. Rhow - State Bar No. 174604
erhow@birdmarella.com
2 Grace W. Kang - State Bar No. 271260
gkang@birdmarella.com
3 A. Howard Matz - State Bar No. 55892
hmatz@birdmarella.com
4 BIRD, MARELLA, BOXER,
WOLPERT, NESSIM,
5 DROOKS, LINCENBERG &
RHOW, P.C.
6 1875 Century Park East, 23rd Floor
Los Angeles, California 90067-2561
7 Telephone: (310) 201-2100
Facsimile: (310) 201-2110

8 Nicholas Groombridge (*pro hac vice*)
ngroombridge@paulweiss.com
9 Jenny C. Wu (*pro hac vice*)
jcwu@paulweiss.com
10 PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND,
WHARTON & GARRISON LLP
11 1285 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10019-6064
12 Telephone: (212) 373-3000
13 Facsimile: (212) 757-3990

David J. Ball, Jr. (*pro hac vice*)
dball@paulweiss.com
J. Steven Baughman (*pro hac vice*)
sbaughman@paulweiss.com
PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND,
WHARTON & GARRISON LLP
2001 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-1047
Telephone: (202) 223-7300
Facsimile: (202) 223-7420

14
15 Attorneys for Defendant Twitter, Inc.

16 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
17 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION**

18
19 BLACKBERRY LIMITED, a Canadian
corporation,
20
21 Plaintiff,
22 vs.
23 TWITTER, INC., a Delaware
corporation,
24 Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:19-cv-01444-GW (KSx)

**REPLY MEMORANDUM OF
POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN
FURTHER SUPPORT OF
DEFENDANT TWITTER, INC.'S
MOTION TO DISMISS PURSUANT
TO FED. R. CIV. P. 12(B)(6)**

Date: September 5, 2019
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Crtrm.: 9D

Assigned to Hon. George H. Wu

28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 ARGUMENT.....	2
3 I. Recurrent Flaws In BlackBerry’s Arguments	2
4 A. Asserting a Technological Field of Use and Benefits Cannot Render Claims	
5 Patent Eligible.....	2
6 B. Asserting Unclaimed Features Cannot Render Claims Patent Eligible	4
7 C. Asserting Purported Novelty Cannot Make Abstract Ideas Patentable.....	6
8 D. BlackBerry Cannot Avoid Dismissal With Conclusory Assertions About	
9 Dependent Claims That are Not Referenced in the FAC	8
10 E. BlackBerry Cannot Avoid Dismissal With Conclusory Assertions About	
11 Unspecified Factual or Claim Construction Disputes	10
12 II. The ’089 Patent.....	11
13 A. The ’089 Patent Claims Are Directed to the Abstract Idea of Flagging New	
14 Messages Until an Inbox Has Been Checked.....	11
15 B. The ’089 Patent Claims Add No Inventive Concept.....	12
16 III. The ’182 Patent.....	13
17 A. The ’182 Patent Claims Are Directed to the Abstract Idea of Inferring the	
18 Status of Messages in a Conversation	13
19 B. The ’182 Patent Claims Add No Inventive Concept.....	15
20 IV. The ’059 Patent.....	15
21 A. The ’059 Patent Claims Are Directed to the Abstract Idea of	
22 Communicating Availability of Content Through a Networked Hub.....	15
23 B. The ’059 Patent Claims Add No Inventive Concept.....	17
24 V. The ’777 Patent.....	18
25 A. The ’777 Patent Claims Are Directed to the Abstract Idea of Screening	
26 Repetitive Content When It Becomes Excessive	18
27	
28	

1 B. The '777 Patent Claims Add No Inventive Concept.....21
2 VI. The '351 and '929 Patents (the “Advertising Patents”)..... 22
3 A. The Advertising Patent Claims Are Directed to the Abstract Idea of
4 Assembling Targeted Advertising 22
5 B. The Advertising Patents Claims Add No Inventive Concept..... 24
6 VII. The '120 Patent..... 27
7 A. The '120 Patent Claims Are Directed to the Abstract Idea of Sorting,
8 Analyzing, and Presenting New Messages 27
9 B. The '120 Patent Claims Add No Inventive Concept 29
10 CONCLUSION..... 30
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

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

Page(s)

CASES

Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC v. DIRECTV, LLC,
838 F.3d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 2, 7

Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l, 573 U.S. 208 (2014) 7, 9

BASCOM Global Internet Servs. v. AT&T Mobility LLC,
827 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 30

Berkheimer v. HP Inc.,
881 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2018) 14, 30

Bilski v. Kappos,
561 U.S. 593 (2010) 21-22

BlackBerry Ltd. v. Facebook, Inc.,
No. 18-cv-01844-GW(KSx), 2018 WL 4847053 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 21,
2018) 9, 27

Blonder-Tongue Labs., Inc. v. Univ. of Ill. Found.,
402 U.S. 313 (1971) 27

Bridge and Post, Inc. v. Verizon Commc’ns, Inc.,
No. 2018-1697, __ F. App’x __, 2019 WL 2896449
(Fed. Cir. July 5, 2019) passim

BSG Tech LLC v. Buyseasons, Inc.,
899 F.3d 1281 (Fed. Cir. 2018) passim

Cellspin Soft, Inc. v. Fitbit, Inc.,
927 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2019) 26

ChargePoint, Inc. v. SemaConnect, Inc.,
920 F.3d 759 (Fed. Cir. 2019) passim

Content Extraction and Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.,
776 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014) 10

Core Wireless Licensing S.A.R.L. v. LG Elecs, Inc., 880 F.3d 1356
(Fed. Cir. 2018) 24

1 *Data Engine Techs. LLC v. Google Inc.*,
 2 211 F. Supp.3d 669 (D. Del. 2016) 10

3 *Data Engine Techs. LLC v. Google Inc.*,
 4 906 F.3d 999 (Fed. Cir. 2018) 10

5 *Diamond v. Diehr*,
 6 450 U.S. 175 (1981) 1, 7, 27

7 *Dynamic Digital Depth Research PTY Ltd. v. LG Elecs., Inc.*,
 8 No. 15-5578-GW(Ex), 2016 WL 7444561 (C.D. Cal. June 6, 2016) 8, 9

9 *Elec. Power Grp., LLC v. Alstom S.A.*,
 10 830 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 3, 25

11 *FairWarning IP, LLC v. Iatric Sys, Inc.*, 839 F.3d 1089 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 13, 29

12 *Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Capital One Bank*,
 13 792 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2015) 19-20, 23

14 *Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Symantec Corp.*,
 15 838 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2016) passim

16 *Internet Patents Corp. v. Active Network*,
 17 790 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2015) 9

18 *Interval Licensing LLC v. AOL, Inc.*,
 19 896 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2018) 21

20 *Prod. Ass’n Techs. LLC v. Clique Media Grp.*,
 21 No. CV 17-05463-GW(PJWx), 2017 WL 5664986 (C.D. Cal. Oct.
 22 12, 2017), *aff’d*, 738 F. App’x 1021 (Fed. Cir. 2018)..... 1, 8, 10, 11

23 *Return Mail, Inc. v. United States Postal Service*,
 24 868 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017), *rev’d on other grounds*, 139 S. Ct.
 25 1853 (2019)..... 4

26 *SAP Am., Inc. v. INVESTPIC, LLC*,
 27 898 F.3d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 2018) 3, 17, 18

28 *Solutran, Inc. v. Elavon, Inc.*,
 ___ F.3d ___, 2019 WL 3418471 (Fed. Cir. July 30, 2019) 7, 24

Synopsys, Inc. v. Mentor Graphics Corp.,
 839 F.3d 1138 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 5

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.