

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

APPISTRY, INC.,
Plaintiff,
v.
AMAZON.COM, INC., et al.,
Defendants.

CASE NO. C15-1416RAJ
ORDER

I. INTRODUCTION

This matter comes before the court on Defendants Amazon.com, Inc. and Amazon Web Services, Inc.’s (collectively “Amazon” or “Defendants”) Motion to Dismiss for Invalidity Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 on the grounds that the two patents asserted by Plaintiff Appistry, Inc.¹ (“Appistry” or “Plaintiff”) cover ineligible subject matter. *See* Dkt. # 36. Having considered the Parties’ arguments, the Court hereby **GRANTS** Amazon’s Motion.

II. BACKGROUND

This case concerns U.S. Patent Nos. 8,682,959 and 9,049,267 (the “’959 Patent” and “’267 Patent,” respectively). The ‘959 Patent is entitled “System and Method for Fault Tolerant Processing of Information Via Networked Computers Including Request Handlers, Process Handlers, and Task Handlers.” *See* Compl. Ex. 1 (’959 Patent). The ‘267 Patent is entitled “System and Method for Processing Information Via Networked

¹ While this Motion was pending, Appistry, LLC substituted as Plaintiff. *See* Dkt. # 47.

1 Computers Including Request Handlers, Process Handlers, and Task Handlers.” *See id.*
2 Ex. 2 (‘267 Patent). Both patents are child patents of U.S. Patent Nos. 8,200,746 and
3 8,341,209 (the “‘746 Patent” and “‘209 Patent,” respectively). *See* ‘959 Patent at 1; ‘267
4 Patent at 1. The ‘746 and ‘209 Patents have since been held to be invalid under 35
5 U.S.C. § 101. *See Appistry, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.* (“*Appistry I*”), No. C15-311 MJP,
6 2015 WL 4210890, at *5 (W.D. Wash. July 9, 2015).

7 The ‘959 and ‘267 Patents have the same inventors, figures, and “Detailed
8 Descriptions” as the ‘746 and ‘209 Patents. *Compare* ‘959 Patent & ‘267 Patent with
9 Case No. C15-311MJP, Dkt. # 1-1 (‘746 Patent) & Dkt. # 1-2 (‘209 Patent). Generally,
10 all four patents relate to using “[a] hive of computing machines . . . to process
11 information.” *See* ‘959 Patent at 8:32-33. To do so, the claimed inventions use a system
12 of “a plurality of networked computers” to “process[] a plurality of processing jobs in a
13 distributed manner.” *See* ‘959 Patent at 31:30-31; ‘267 Patent at 28:8-9. To do so, the
14 claimed systems enlist “a request handler, a plurality of process handlers, and a plurality
15 of task handlers.” *See* ‘959 Patent at 31:32-34; ‘267 Patent at 28:10-12.

16 III. LEGAL STANDARD

17 Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) permits a court to dismiss a complaint for failure to state a
18 claim. The rule requires the court to assume the truth of the complaint’s factual
19 allegations and credit all reasonable inferences arising from those allegations. *Sanders v.*
20 *Brown*, 504 F.3d 903, 910 (9th Cir. 2007). A court “need not accept as true conclusory
21 allegations that are contradicted by documents referred to in the complaint.” *Manzarek v.*
22 *St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co.*, 519 F.3d 1025, 1031 (9th Cir. 2008). The plaintiff must
23 point to factual allegations that “state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Bell*
24 *Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 568 (2007). If the plaintiff succeeds, the complaint
25 avoids dismissal if there is “any set of facts consistent with the allegations in the
26 complaint” that would entitle the plaintiff to relief. *Id.* at 563; *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S.
27 662, 679 (2009).

1 A court typically cannot consider evidence beyond the four corners of the
2 complaint, although it may rely on a document to which the complaint refers if the
3 document is central to the party's claims and its authenticity is not in question. *Marder v.*
4 *Lopez*, 450 F.3d 445, 448 (9th Cir. 2006). A court may also consider evidence subject to
5 judicial notice. *United States v. Ritchie*, 342 F.3d 903, 908 (9th Cir. 2003).

6 IV. ANALYSIS

7 Before the Court proceeds to whether the '267 and 959 Patents are directed to
8 patent-eligible subject matter, it is necessary to determine whether claim 29 of the '959
9 Patent and claim 1 of the '267 Patent are representative. Plaintiff does not agree that the
10 claims are representative. *See* Dkt. # 38 at 12. Citing a few minute details between these
11 claims and those at issue in *Appistry I*, Plaintiff argues that *all* claims in the '959 and
12 '267 Patents must be independently reviewed. But Plaintiff's own comparison of the
13 independent claims in the '959 and '267 Patents reveals just how similar (and
14 representative) claim 29 and claim 1 are. *See* Dkt. # 39-1. For example, the claims use
15 practically identical language – including, crucially, the “request handlers,” “process
16 handlers,” and “task handlers” utilized to distribute work. The Court finds that the claims
17 are representative² and will proceed on that basis.³

18 Section 101 of the Patent Act defines patent-eligible subject matter, providing that
19 “[w]hoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or

20 ² Certain other independent claims do contain other claim elements. For example, claims 1, 11,
21 27, and 28 of the '959 Patent add the limitation that if a fault exists, the process handler or
22 request handler will initiate a recovery procedure. *See* '959 Patent at 28:6-11, 29:10-16, 30:61-
23 67, 31:21-27. Similarly, claim 123 of the '267 Patent incorporates the limitation that process
handlers “are configured to volunteer for servicing the processing jobs based on their
availabilities.” *See* '267 Patent at 39:58-60.

24 The Court finds that these differences do not make claim 29 of the '959 Patent or claim 1 of the
25 '267 Patent any less representative of the other claims. Ultimately, all of the independent claims
cover systems using the different “handlers” to process information and tasks.

26 ³ The Federal Circuit has already addressed this issue, and held that a court need not address
27 every asserted claim if the claims of the asserted patents “are substantially similar in that they
28 address little more than the same abstract idea” and the selected claims are representative. *See*
Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, Nat'l Ass'n, 776 F.3d 1343, 1348
(Fed. Cir. 2014).

1 composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent
2 therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.” 35 U.S.C. § 101. The
3 Supreme Court has, however, recognized that laws of nature, natural phenomena, and
4 abstract ideas are not patentable. *Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank Int’l*, 134 S. Ct. 2347, 2354
5 (2014) (quoting *Ass’n for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc.*, 133 S. Ct. 2107,
6 2116 (2013)). The purpose of these exceptions is to protect the “basic tools of scientific
7 and technological work.” *Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.*, 132 S.
8 Ct. 1289, 1293 (2012). However, courts must “tread carefully in construing this
9 exclusionary principle lest it swallow all of patent law.” *Alice*, 134 S. Ct. at 2354. In
10 “distinguishing patents that claim laws of nature, natural phenomena, and abstract ideas
11 from those that claim patent-eligible applications of those concepts,” courts apply a two-
12 part test. *Alice*, 134 S. Ct. at 2355. Courts must first “determine whether the claims at
13 issue are directed to one of those patent-ineligible concepts.” *Id.* If so, then courts must
14 examine “[w]hat else is there in the claims before [them]” by considering “the elements
15 of each claim both individually and ‘as an ordered combination’ to determine whether the
16 additional elements ‘transform the nature of the claim’ into a patent-eligible application.”
17 *Id.* The Court has characterized this search as one “‘inventive concept’ — *i.e.*, an
18 element or combination of elements that is ‘sufficient to ensure that the patent in practice
19 amounts to significantly more than a patent upon the [ineligible concept] itself.’” *Id.*
20 (quoting *Mayo*, 132 S. Ct. at 1294).

21 The first step in the Court’s analysis is to “determine whether the claims at issue
22 are directed to one of those patent-ineligible concepts.” *Alice*, 134 S. Ct. at 2355. Some
23 courts have characterized the first step as distilling “the gist of the claim.” *See Open Text*
24 *S.A. v. Box, Inc.*, 78 F. Supp. 3d 1043, 1046 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (citing cases). The *Appistry*
25 *I* court confronted claims virtually identical to those asserted here and found that they
26 were directed to “the abstract idea of distributed processing akin to the military’s
27
28

1 command and control system.” See 2015 WL 4210890 at *2. The Court finds that the
2 claims in the ‘959 and ‘267 Patents are also directed to that abstract idea.

3 As a preliminary matter, Plaintiff simply does not explain how the claims in these
4 patents are any different from those asserted in *Appistry I*. That is not surprising. As
5 discussed, *supra*, the patents share the same terminology and central idea: that of
6 distributing tasks through a hierarchical structure.

7 To be sure, there are a few differences between the claims in the ‘959 and ‘267
8 Patents and those in the ‘209 and ‘746 Patents. However, those differences are minor.
9 For example, the ‘959 and ‘267 Patents require that the “process handlers” and “task
10 handlers” be resident on “different networked computers.” See ‘959 Patent at 31:34-37;
11 ‘267 Patent at 28:12-15 (“the process handlers being resident on a plurality of different
12 networked computers, the task handlers being resident on a plurality of different
13 networked computers.”). And the ‘209 and ‘746 Patents require no such thing. See ‘746
14 Patent at 26:53-61 (“wherein a plurality of the hive engines within the at least one
15 territory are configured to perform the processing job in a distributed manner such that
16 the processing tasks of the processing job are distributed to a plurality of hive engines
17 within the at least one territory for execution thereby”).

18 The ‘959 and ‘267 Patents also differ in that they include the claim element “the
19 processing jobs having a plurality of associated process flows, the process flows
20 including . . . (2) logic configured to define a relationship between the processing tasks of
21 the same process flow.” See ‘959 Patent at 31:37-41; ‘267 Patent at 28:15-19. But that
22 element appears to simply provide for a sequence of delegating tasks. See ‘959 Patent at
23 24:26-28 (“One embodiment uses a logical hierarchy of hive engines for delegation of
24 performing administrative and/or other hive related tasks”).

25 Finally, as to the claim elements calling for receiving, storage, or communicating
26 data, those are “undisputably well-known” and do not distinguish the claims of the ‘959
27 and ‘267 Patents from those found to be directed to abstract ideas. See *Content*

1 *Extraction*, 776 F.3d at 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2014); *buySAFE, Inc. v. Google, Inc.*, 765 F.3d
2 1350, 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (“That a computer receives and sends the information over a
3 network—with no further specification—is not even arguably inventive.”); *see also*
4 *Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc. v. Dickstein Shapiro LLP*, 128 F. Supp. 3d 103, 112-13
5 (D.D.C. 2015) (collecting cases and holding that “[t]he abstract concept of collecting,
6 storing, and retrieving data simply is not patent-eligible”).

7 Still, Plaintiff contends that the claims here are not directed to abstract ideas, but
8 instead to a new computer (or, more specifically, a more efficiently and reliably
9 distributed configuration of multiple computers), resulting in better performance. *See*
10 Dkt. # 38 at 15. There is at least some basis for this argument. The Federal Circuit held
11 that where a “claimed solution is necessarily rooted in computer technology in order to
12 overcome a problem specifically arising in the realm of computer networks,” it is not
13 necessarily directed to an abstract idea. *See DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.*, 773
14 F.3d 1245, 1257 (Fed. Cir. 2014).

15 But the Court disagrees with Plaintiff’s application here. Plaintiff relies heavily
16 on the specification of the ‘959 Patent to show that the patents are directed to such a new
17 computer. *See id.* at 16. That same portion of the specification was first presented –
18 verbatim – in the ‘746 and ‘209 Patents, which were of course invalidated in *Appistry I*.
19 *See* ‘746 Patent at 5:11-15; ‘209 Patent at 5:15-19.

20 Even beyond that, however, it is clear that the networked computers utilized in the
21 ‘959 and ‘267 Patents are merely generic computers⁴ tasked with performing generic
22 functions. The specification itself clarifies that “[t]he term ‘computer’ is used generically

23
24 ⁴ The Court also disagrees with Plaintiff’s contention that the machine or transformation test is
25 helpful in this case. *See* Dkt. # 38 at 23-24. “[T]hat test may be a useful and important clue or
26 investigative clue” in determining “whether an invention is patent-eligible.” *See Bilski*, 561 U.S.
27 at 594. However, even in the context of this test, “after *Alice*, there can remain no doubt:
28 recitation of generic computer limitations does not make an otherwise ineligible claim patent-
eligible.” *DDR Holdings*, 773 F.3d at 1256 (citing *Alice*, 134 S. Ct. at 2358). “The bare fact that
a computer exists in the physical rather than purely conceptual realm ‘is beside the point.’” *Id.*
Similarly, here, the fact that the inventions here necessarily apply to generic computers is
irrelevant because there simply is no inventive concept embodied within them.

1 herein to describe any number of computers, including, but not limited to personal
2 computers, embedded processing elements and systems” See ‘959 Patent at 8:47-51;
3 ‘267 Patent at 9:1-5. Nor are the claimed systems or methods limited to a particular type
4 of process or task – the patents specify that “[t]he terms ‘task’ and process are used
5 generically herein to describe any type of running program, including, but not limited to a
6 computer process, task, thread, executing application, operating system, user process,
7 device driver, native code, machine or other language, etc. . . .” See ‘959 Patent at 8:57-
8 66; ‘267 Patent at 9:11-20. In other words, the claims are not directed to solving a
9 technological problem or solve a challenge particular to a specific environment, nor do
10 they contemplate some “new” type of computer.

11 The Court also rejects Plaintiff’s argument that the claims here are not directed to
12 abstract ideas because they do not claim solutions to mathematical equations or business
13 problems. See Dkt. # 38 at 17-18. The *Appistry I* court already rejected this argument for
14 reasons this Court also finds convincing. Simply put, “the operative question is whether
15 or not the patent claims are directed toward an abstract idea, and *not* whether or not the
16 invention could be classified into one of Plaintiff’s three categories.” See *Appistry I*,
17 2015 WL 4210890 at *2 (citing *Alice*, 134 S. Ct. at 2356-57).

18 Plaintiff also contends that the claims here are not directed to abstract ideas
19 because they cannot be performed by humans. See Dkt. # 38 at 17-18. But the fact that
20 inventions here are implemented on computers or only exist in the computing realm does
21 not save them. See *Bancorp Servs., L.L.C. v. Sun Life Assurance Co. of Canada (U.S.)*,
22 687 F.3d 1266, 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (citing *SiRF Tech., Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n*, 601
23 F.3d 1319, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2010)) (“Bancorp seeks to analogize its case to *SiRF*,
24 contending that a computer ‘plays a significant part’ in its claims because they require
25 ‘precise and repetitive calculation.’ . . . That misses the point.”); see also *Cyberfone Sys.,*
26 *LLC v. CNN Interactive Grp., Inc.*, 558 F. App’x 988, 992 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (citing *Bilski*

1 *v. Kappos*, 561 U.S. 593, 610 (2010)) (“the category of patent-ineligible abstract ideas is
2 not limited to methods that can be performed in the human mind.”).

3 Having determined that the ‘959 and ‘267 Patents’ claims are “directed to” an
4 abstract idea, the Court must next determine if its claims are nevertheless patentable
5 because they contain an “inventive concept” sufficient to “transform the claimed abstract
6 idea into a patent-eligible application.” *Alice*, 134 S. Ct. at 2357. To do so, courts are
7 instructed to consider the elements of the claims – both individually and in an ordered
8 combination – to assess whether the elements transform the nature of the claims into a
9 patent-eligible inventive concept. *See Content Extraction*, 776 F.3d at 1347.

10 The Court must disregard “‘well-understood, routine, conventional activit[ies]’
11 previously known to the industry” at this step of the analysis. *See Alice*, 134 S. Ct. at
12 2359 (quoting *Mayo*, 132 S. Ct. at 1299) (alterations in original). “A conventional
13 element may be one that is ubiquitous in the field, insignificant or obvious.” *Cal. Inst. of*
14 *Tech. v. Hughes Commc’ns Inc.*, 59 F. Supp. 3d 974, 992 (C.D. Cal. 2014) (citing *Mayo*,
15 132 S. Ct. at 1298). Such a “conventional element may also be a necessary step, which a
16 person or device must perform in order to implement the abstract idea.” *Id.* Although
17 “conventional elements and prior art may overlap,” “conventional elements do not
18 constitute everything in prior art.” *Id.*

19 The Court finds that whether viewed individually or as an ordered combination,
20 the claims of the ‘959 and ‘267 Patents do not contain an inventive concept.

21 As discussed, *supra*, the claims here do little more than task generic computers
22 with generic functions. Even the central idea of the claims – the use of a “network” of
23 computers – uses a generic network. *See* ‘959 Patent at 9:12-20 (“the terms ‘network’
24 and ‘communications mechanism’ are used generically herein to describe one or more
25 networks, communications mediums or communications systems, including, but not
26 limited to the Internet, private or public telephone, cellular, wireless, satellite, cable, local
27 area, metropolitan area and/or wide area networks . . . etc.”); ‘267 Patent at 9:33-41.

1 Simply put, the claims here simply provide for completing a task or process by
2 distributing it downward via a hierarchical series of “handlers” located on generic
3 computers spread throughout a generic network. There is nothing inventive about that.

4 But Plaintiff holds fast to its contention that as an ordered whole, the claims in the
5 ‘959 and ‘267 Patents improve computer function by allowing increased “availability,
6 scalability, performance, and reliability.” See Dkt. # 38 at 23. That may be possible, but
7 simply limiting this abstract idea of distributed processing to the networked computer
8 field does not alter the analysis or render the idea any more inventive than before. See
9 *buySAFE, Inc.*, 765 F.3d at 1354 (quoting *Alice*, 134 S. Ct. at 2358) (“Neither ‘attempting
10 to limit the use of [the idea] to a particular technological environment’ nor a ‘wholly
11 generic computer implementation’ is sufficient” to add an inventive concept”).

12 In fact, the *Appistry I* court addressed the same argument – that the inventions
13 were technological improvements to distributed computing because they permitted
14 improved speed, efficiency, and reliability – and rejected it. See 2015 WL 4210890 at
15 *4. The court found that “the actual systems and methods claimed-through which
16 efficiency and reliability are achieved-are well understood, routine, and purely
17 conventional, and do not supply an inventive concept separate from the underlying
18 abstract idea.” *Id.* That analysis remains true for the ‘959 and ‘267 Patents.

19 The system claimed by the ‘267 Patent, for example, uses several networked
20 computers separated into tiered “handlers,” including a “request handler,” “process
21 handlers,” and “task handlers.” See ‘267 Patent at 28:7-19. The processing jobs handled
22 by this system have discrete tasks, as well as a sequence for processing those tasks. See
23 *id.* at 28:15-19. The request handler is instructed to receive a job request, store
24 information about that job, and then to communicate it to process handlers. See *id.* at
25 28:20-24. The process handlers are instructed to analyze information to determine
26 whether any tasks remain to be done and the task handlers are programmed to perform
27 processing tasks. See ‘267 Patent at 28:25-41.

1 None of this is inventive. Receiving, storing, and sending task data are, of course,
2 “well-understood, routine, conventional activit[ies]’ previously known to the industry.”
3 *See OIP Techs., Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, 788 F.3d 1359, 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (quoting
4 *Alice*, 134 S. Ct. at 2359)); *see also buySAFE, Inc.*, 765 F.3d at 1355 (“That a computer
5 receives and sends the information over a network—with no further specification—is not
6 even arguably inventive.”). The other tasks delegated to the process handlers and task
7 handlers do little more than simply check if any tasks remain to be done (*see* ‘267 Patent
8 at 28:25-39) or simply (and without elaboration) do the assigned task (*see* ‘267 Patent at
9 28:40-41). *See Hewlett Packard Co. v. ServiceNow, Inc.*, No. 14-CV-00570-BLF, 2015
10 WL 1133244, at *10 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 10, 2015) (finding that claim limitation that
11 instructed that “merely instructs that the workflow be verified” did not add an inventive
12 concept). These are not inventive and do little more than simply state the abstract idea –
13 distributed processing through a hierarchical, military-like command structure – and add
14 the words “apply it with a computer.” *See Alice*, 134 S. Ct. at 2358.

15 Finally, the Court addresses several procedural issues that Plaintiff raises.⁵

16 First, as Plaintiff notes, its Complaint includes the declaration of Dr. Matthew
17 Green (or other allegations regarding the same topics), who opines that the claims of the
18 ‘959 and ‘267 Patents cover “a new and novel mechanism, system, and/or method over
19 the prior art for distributed computing.” *See* Dkt. # 1-3 (Green Decl.) ¶¶ 13-16. Plaintiff
20 argues that the Court must accept these conclusions as true. *See* Dkt. # 38 at 19-20. That
21 is nonsense. *See Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678-79 (“the tenet that a court must accept as true all
22 of the allegations contained in a complaint is inapplicable to legal conclusions”); *Adams*
23 *v. Johnson*, 355 F.3d 1179, 1183 (9th Cir. 2004) (citing *Sprewell v. Golden State*

24
25
26 ⁵ Plaintiff also argues that the inventions do not preempt the entire abstract idea. *See* Dkt. # 38 at
27 24-25. Even if that position is true, it is irrelevant. *See Ariosa Diagnostics, Inc. v. Sequenom,*
28 *Inc.*, 788 F.3d 1371, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (“While preemption may signal patent ineligible
subject matter, the absence of complete preemption does not demonstrate patent eligibility.”).

1 *Warriors*, 266 F.3d 979, 988 (9th Cir. 2001)) (“conclusory allegations of law and
2 unwarranted inferences are insufficient to defeat a motion to dismiss”).⁶

3 Second, Plaintiff argues that a “clear and convincing” standard applies to the § 101
4 inquiry. See Dkt. # 38 at 8-9. That is not necessarily incorrect. See *Netflix, Inc. v. Rovi*
5 *Corp.*, 114 F. Supp. 3d 927, 938 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (citing *Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.*, 480
6 F.3d 1348, 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2007)). And many courts have recognized a split in authority
7 on this question. See *Papst Licensing GmbH & Co. KG v. Xilinx Inc.*, No. 16-CV-00925-
8 LHK, 2016 WL 3196657, at *7 (N.D. Cal. June 9, 2016) (collecting cases). But in this
9 Court’s view, the standard is irrelevant as the outcome would be the same under any
10 standard. Under either standard, Defendants have clearly shown that the claims of the
11 ‘959 and ‘267 Patents are directed to an abstract idea.

12 ///

13 ///

14 ///

26 ⁶ Plaintiff’s position is absurd. Requiring the Court to accept such facts or legal conclusions
27 (even in the form of an early expert declaration) would permit any plaintiff to circumvent the §
28 101 inquiry on an early motion to dismiss or motion for judgment on the pleadings simply by
including a few lines attesting to the novelty of the invention.

1 Finally, Plaintiff suggests that claim construction is necessary before the Court can
2 decide the instant Motion. *See* Dkt. # 38 at 11. The Court disagrees. Federal Circuit
3 precedent clearly provides that courts may determine whether claims are directed to
4 patent-eligible subject matter at the pleading stage without conducting claim construction
5 or permitting the parties to conduct discovery. *See Content Extraction*, 776 F.3d at 1349
6 (citing *Ultramercial, Inc. v. Hulu, LLC*, 772 F.3d 709, 714 (Fed. Cir. 2014); *Bancorp*,
7 687 F.3d at 1273).

8 **V. CONCLUSION**

9 For the reasons stated above, the Court **GRANTS** Amazon's Motion. Dkt. # 36.
10 Accordingly, the Court dismisses Appistry's complaint with prejudice.

11
12 DATED this 19th day of July, 2016.

13
14
15 

16
17 The Honorable Richard A. Jones
18 United States District Judge
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27