

NOTE: This disposition is nonprecedential.

**United States Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit**

CHIKEZIE OTTAH,
Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

BRACEWELL LLP,
Defendant-Appellee

2022-1876

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York in No. 1:21-cv-00455-KPF, Judge Katherine Polk Failla.

Decided: November 8, 2022

CHIKEZIE OTTAH, Elmont, NY, pro se.

DAVID JOHN BALL, Bracewell LLP, New York, NY, for defendant-appellee.

Before MOORE, *Chief Judge*, LOURIE and PROST, *Circuit Judges*.

LOURIE, *Circuit Judge*.

Chikezie Ottah appeals from a decision of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York granting Bracewell LLP's ("Bracewell's") motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim of patent infringement and dismissing Ottah's complaint with prejudice. Bracewell is a law firm representing an entity asserted to have been involved in infringing activity. *See Ottah v. Bracewell LLP*, No. 21 Civ. 455, 2021 WL 5910065 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 10, 2021) ("*Decision*"). *We affirm.*

BACKGROUND

Ottah owns U.S. Patent 7,152,840 ("the '840 patent"), which is directed to a "book holder removably attachable to a vehicle or structure such as a stroller, walker, wheelchair or car seat for mobile applications." '840 patent, abstract; S.A. 94.¹ Claim 1 of the '840 patent reads as follows:

1. A book holder for removeable attachment, the book holder comprising:

a book support platform, the book support platform comprising a front surface, a rear surface and a plurality of clamps, the front surface adapted for supporting a book, the plurality of clamps disposed on the front surface to engage and retain the book to the book support platform, the rear surface separated from the front surface;

a clasp comprising a clip head, a clip body and a pair of resilient clip arms, the clip arms adjustably mounted on the clip head, the clip head attached to the clip body; and

an arm comprising a first end and a second end and a telescoping arrangement, the clasp on the first end, the second end pivotally attached to the book

¹ "S.A." refers to the Supplemental Appendix filed with Bracewell's brief.

support platform, the telescoping arrangement interconnecting the first end to[] the second end, the clasp spaced from the book support platform wherein the book holder is removably attached and adjusted to a reading position by the telescoping arrangement axially adjusting the spaced relation between the book support platform and the clasp and the pivotal connection on the book support platform pivotally adjusting the front surface with respect to the arm.

'840 patent col. 6 ll. 14–38.

In March 2014, Ottah sent a letter to the New York Metropolitan Transit Authority (“MTA”) alleging that a camera mounting system he had observed on MTA buses and other vehicles infringed the '840 patent. S.A. 37. In August 2014, a Bracewell partner sent a letter to Ottah on behalf of Bracewell’s client, UTC Building & Industrial Systems (“UTC”), the entity responsible for supplying to MTA the mobile camera mounting systems that Ottah had identified in his letter. S.A. 84–86. In the August 2014 letter, Bracewell refuted Ottah’s claims that UTC or MTA should have acquired a license to the '840 patent for the camera systems and highlighted that at least two federal courts had already found that the '840 patent did not cover “a camera mounting system [that] is fixed in place and cannot be removed without tools.” *Id.*; *See Decision*, 2021 WL 5910065, at *2 (compiling unsuccessful lawsuits brought by Ottah relating to alleged infringement of the '840 patent).

On January 15, 2021, Ottah sued Bracewell in the District Court for the Southern District of New York, alleging infringement of the '840 patent. Bracewell filed a motion to dismiss on July 23, 2021. The court granted the motion, dismissing Ottah’s infringement claims with prejudice. Specifically, the court held that the plain terms of the '840 patent contradicted Ottah’s proffered construction of the claim language, and that similar arguments had been

unequivocally rejected by multiple courts that had already adjudicated the scope of the '840 patent. *Decision*, 2021 WL 5910065, at *7.

The district court separately dismissed Ottah's claim for induced patent infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b), that claim being based on Bracewell's failure to acquire a license to the '840 patent for its then-client UTC. In its explanation, the court held that Ottah had failed to state a claim for direct infringement, which necessarily foreclosed an inducement claim. The court further held that Bracewell could not be held liable for legal advice that it rendered to UTC, absent allegations of misconduct that were not present in the complaint. *Id.* at *10. The court dismissed the action with prejudice after determining that any amendment to the complaint, although not requested by Ottah, would be futile. *Id.* at *11.

Ottah appeals the district court's grant of Bracewell's motion to dismiss. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1295(a)(1).

DISCUSSION

We review a grant or denial of a motion to dismiss by applying the law of the regional circuit. *See Lyda v. CBS Corp.*, 838 F.3d 1331, 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2016). In the Second Circuit, “[t]o survive a motion to dismiss under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6), a complaint must allege sufficient facts, taken as true, to state a plausible claim for relief.” *Johnson v. Priceline.com, Inc.*, 711 F.3d 271, 275 (2d Cir. 2013) (citing *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555–56 (2007)). A plaintiff must plead “factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged” to satisfy the plausibility standard. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009).

For a pro se litigant, the pleadings must be “construe[d] . . . broadly, and interpret[ed] . . . to raise the strongest arguments that they suggest.” *Cruz v. Gomez*,

202 F.3d 593, 597 (2d Cir. 2000) (quoting *Graham v. Henderson*, 89 F.3d 75, 79 (2d Cir. 1996)). But a pro se litigant's factual allegations must still "be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level." *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555.

To prove direct infringement, "one or more claims of the patent [must] read on the accused device literally or under the doctrine of equivalents." *Cross Med. Prods., Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.*, 424 F.3d 1293, 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2005). A finding of literal patent infringement "requires that each and every limitation set forth in a claim appear in an accused product." *V-Formation, Inc. v. Benetton Grp. SpA*, 401 F.3d 1307, 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2005). But, under the doctrine of equivalents, "a product or process that does not literally infringe upon the express terms of a patent claim may nonetheless be found to infringe if there is 'equivalence' between the elements of the accused product or process and the claimed elements of the patented invention." *DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamore Danek, Inc.*, 469 F.3d 1005, 1016 (Fed. Cir. 2006) (citing *Warner-Jenkinson Co. v. Hilton Davis Chem. Co.*, 520 U.S. 17, 21 (1997)).

Under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b), "[w]hoever actively induces infringement of a patent shall be liable as an infringer." But finding liability for induced infringement requires a predicate finding of direct patent infringement. See *Vanda Pharms Inc. v. W.-Ward Pharms. Int'l Ltd.*, 887 F.3d 1117, 1129 (Fed. Cir. 2018).

On appeal, it appears that Ottah argues that Bracewell is liable for direct and induced patent infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271.

As a threshold matter, Bracewell contends that Ottah's allegations do not satisfy the *Twombly* plausibility standard and that Ottah's complaint contains no plausible allegations that Bracewell, a law firm, infringed the '840 patent. Even interpreting Ottah's pleadings "broadly. . . to

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.