

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

**SPACETIME3D, INC.,**  
*Plaintiff*

**-VS-**

APPLE INC.,  
*Defendant*

**6-22-CV-00149-ADA**

## MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Before the Court is Defendant Apple Inc.’s (“Apple”) Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff SpaceTime3D, Inc.’s (“SpaceTime”) indirect infringement and willful infringement claims pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). ECF No. 24 (the “Motion”). After careful consideration of the briefs and applicable law, the Court is of the opinion that Apple’s Motion should be **GRANTED-IN-PART** and **DENIED-IN-PART**.

## I. BACKGROUND

On February 10, 2022, SpaceTime sued Apple by alleging infringement of three patents: U.S. Patent Nos. 8,881,048 (the “’048 Patent”), 9,304,654 (the “’654 Patent”), and 9,696,868 (the “’868 Patent”) (collectively “the Asserted Patents”). *See* ECF No. 1 ¶¶ 16–19 (the “Complaint”). The Asserted Patents are alleged to cover “improvements to then-existing computer graphical user interfaces (‘GUIs’), by providing an interactive computing interface and sorting interface comprising information from real-time and static sources.” *Id.* ¶ 21. SpaceTime alleges that Apple both indirectly and willfully infringed the Asserted Patents. *Id.* ¶¶ 57, 82, 109, 135.

Notwithstanding the Complaint, Apple requested that SpaceTime dismiss its willfulness and inducement claims without prejudice, provided that Plaintiff would have the opportunity to take discovery to support the claims at the appropriate time. ECF No. 24. at 2. SpaceTime refused to agree to dismiss its entire willful and indirect claims without prejudice, but SpaceTime did agree to

dismiss its pre-suit willful and indirect claims without prejudice “under terms consistent with Section VII of the April 14, 2022 Standing Order Governing Proceedings (OGP) 4.1 – Patent Cases.” ECF No. 28 at 5. Apple filed its Motion to dismiss it on April 21, 2022. ECF No. 24. Apple’s Motion seeks to dismiss SpaceTime’s indirect and willful infringement claims for the Asserted Patents. *Id.* at 3–11. Since the parties agree to dismiss SpaceTime’s pre-suit claims for indirect and willful infringement, the remaining portion of the Motion that the Court will address is the post-suit claims for willful and indirect infringement. The Motion is now ripe for judgment.

## II. LEGAL STANDARDS

Rule 12(b)(6) requires that a complaint contain sufficient factual matter, if accepted as true, to “state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). To meet this factual plausibility standard, the plaintiff must plead “factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged,” based on “more than a sheer possibility that a defendant has acted unlawfully.” *Id.* “Threadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements, do not suffice.” *Id.* However, in resolving a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim, the question is “not whether [the plaintiff] will ultimately prevail, . . . but whether [the] complaint was sufficient to cross the federal court’s threshold.” *Skinner v. Switzer*, 562 U.S. 521, 530 (2011). “The court’s task is to determine whether the plaintiff has stated a legally cognizable claim that is plausible, not to evaluate the plaintiff’s likelihood of success.” *Lone Star Fund V (U.S.), L.P. v. Barclays Bank PLC*, 594 F.3d 383, 387 (5th Cir. 2010) (citing *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678).

Section 271(b) of the Patent Act provides that “[w]hoever actively induces infringement of a patent shall be liable as an infringer.” 35 U.S.C. § 271(b). To succeed on such a claim, the patentee must show that the accused infringer (1) knowingly induced direct infringement and (2) possessed

“specific intent” to induce that infringement. *See MEMC Electr. Materials, Inc. v. Mitsubishi Materials Silicon Corp.*, 420 F.3d 1369, 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2005). To state a claim for relief for induced patent infringement, “a complaint must plead facts plausibly showing that the accused infringer ‘specifically intended [another party] to infringe [the patent] and knew that the [other party]’s acts constituted infringement.” *Lifetime Indus., Inc. v. Trim-Lok, Inc.*, 869 F.3d 1372, 1376–77 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (quoting *In re Bill of Lading Transmission & Processing Sys. Pat. Litig.*, 681 F.3d 1323, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2012)). To allege indirect infringement, the plaintiff must plead specific facts sufficient to show that the accused infringer had actual knowledge of the patents-in-suit, or was willfully blind to the existence of the patents-in-suit. *Glob.-Tech Appliances, Inc. v. SEB S.A.*, 563 U.S. 754, 766, 769 (2011) (“[I]nduced infringement under § 271(b) requires knowledge that the induced acts constitute patent infringement” or at least “willful blindness” to the likelihood of infringement.); *Commil USA, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.*, 575 U.S. 632, 639 (2015) (“Like induced infringement, contributory infringement requires knowledge of the patent in suit and knowledge of patent infringement.”). A showing of willful blindness requires that “(1) the defendant must subjectively believe that there is a high probability that a fact exists and (2) the defendant must take deliberate actions to avoid learning of that fact.” *Global-Tech*, 563 U.S. at 769.

Similarly, to allege willful infringement, the plaintiff must plausibly allege the “subjective willfulness of a patent infringer, intentional or knowing.” *Halo Electronics, Inc. v. Pulse Electronics, Inc.*, 136 S.Ct. 1923, 1933 (2016). This requires a plaintiff to allege facts plausibly showing that the accused infringer: “(1) knew of the patent-in-suit; (2) after acquiring that knowledge, it infringed the patent; and (3) in doing so, it knew, or should have known, that its conduct amounted to infringement of the patent.” *Parity Networks, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.*, No. 6:19-CV-00207-ADA, 2019 WL 3940952, at \*3 (W.D. Tex. July 26, 2019).

### III. ANALYSIS

Since the parties jointly agree that SpaceTime’s pre-suit indirect and willful claims should be dismissed without prejudice, the Court will now analyze whether SpaceTime has sufficiently pleaded post-suit indirect and willful infringement.

#### **A. Post-Suit Willful Infringement**

Apple insists that SpaceTime must allege “facts making it plausible that Apple engaged in the type of egregious conduct required to support a willfulness claim.” ECF No. 24 at 7. This Court does not require such a showing at the pleading stage. The Federal Circuit has clarified that “under *Halo*, the concept of ‘willfulness’ requires a jury to find no more than deliberate or intentional infringement.” *SRI Int’l, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.*, 14 F.4th 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2021). Instead, “egregiousness” is something for the court to consider in exercising its discretion to enhance damages after the jury finds willfulness. *See SRI Int’l, Inc.*, 14 F.4th at 1329–30 (“To eliminate the confusion created by our reference to the language ‘wanton, malicious, and bad-faith’ in *Halo*, we clarify that it was not our intent to create a heightened requirement for willful infringement. Indeed, that sentence from *Halo* refers to ‘conduct warranting enhanced damages,’ not conduct warranting a finding of willfulness.”).

As for Apple’s argument that SpaceTime failed to allege that Apple “was aware of any of the asserted patents, let alone that Apple knew or should have known that its conduct amounted to infringement of those patents,” the Court disagrees. ECF No. 24 at 4. Instead, the Court finds, when viewing the allegations in a light most favorable to SpaceTime, that the filing of the Complaint establishes the notice required for a plausible inference of willfulness. *BillJCo, LLC v. Apple Inc.*, 583 F. Supp. 3d 769, 778 (W.D. Tex. 2022) (“Serving a complaint will, in most circumstances, notify the defendant of the asserted patent and the accused conduct. So long as the complaint also adequately alleges that the defendant is continuing its purportedly infringing conduct, it will satisfy

all three *Parity* elements and sufficiently plead a post-filing/post-suit willful infringement claim.”). Apple’s motion to dismiss SpaceTime’s post-suit willful infringement claims is therefore denied.

### **B. Post-Suit Indirect Infringement**

Just as with willful infringement, Apple insists that SpaceTime “has not plausibly alleged that Apple had pre-suit knowledge of the asserted patents, let alone had an intent to infringe those patents.” ECF No. 24 at 9. Specifically, Apple is again arguing pre-suit knowledge of the asserted patents is a requirement of an indirect infringement claim. *See id.* As it did in *BillJCo*, the Court rejects this argument and finds that Apple’s arguments that require pleading pre-suit knowledge for post-suit indirect infringement claims unpersuasive. *See* 583 F. Supp. 3d at 779 (“Apple argues that ‘[p]re-suit knowledge of the asserted patents is a requirement of an indirect infringement claim.’ . . . . This Court rejects this proposition in the induced infringement context as it did elsewhere.”).

Apple then argues that SpaceTime has not adequately pleaded indirect infringement because “a claim for induced infringement requires, among other things, factual allegations that the defendant ‘knowingly induced a third-party to infringe the patent [and] had specific intent to induce the patent infringement.’” ECF No. 24 at 9 (citing *Affinity Labs of Tex. LLC v. Toyota Motor N. Am., Inc.*, No. W:13-cv-365, 2014 WL 2892285, at \*2 (W.D. Tex. May 12, 2014)). Apple contends that SpaceTime’s “inducement claims for each Count boil down generically to reciting the legal standard.” *Id.* at 10. Apple quotes SpaceTime’s Complaint at paragraph 79 which states the following:

Apple took active steps, directly and/or through contractual relationships with others, with the specific intent to cause them to use the Accused Products in a manner that infringes claims of the ’048 patent. Such steps by Apple include but is not limited to advising and directing customers and/or end users to use the Accused Products in an infringing manner; advertising and promoting the use of the Accused Products in an infringing manner; and/or distributing instructions that guide end users to use the Accused Products in an infringing manner.



# 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.