

1 John V. Picone III, Bar No. 187226  
jpicone@hopkinscarley.com  
2 Jeffrey M. Ratinoﬀ, Bar No. 197241  
jratinoﬀ@hopkinscarley.com  
3 HOPKINS & CARLEY  
A Law Corporation  
4 The Letitia Building  
70 South First Street  
5 San Jose, CA 95113-2406

6 ***mailing address:***

P.O. Box 1469  
7 San Jose, CA 95109-1469  
Telephone: (408) 286-9800  
8 Facsimile: (408) 998-4790

9 Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Counter-Defendants  
10 NEO4J, INC. and NEO4J SWEDEN AB

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

13 NEO4J, INC., a Delaware corporation,  
14 NEO4J SWEDEN AB, a Swedish  
corporation

15 Plaintiffs,

16 v.

17 PURETHINK LLC, a Delaware limited  
liability company, IGOV INC., a Virginia  
18 corporation, and JOHN MARK SUHY, an  
individual,

19 Defendants.  
20

CASE NO. 5:18-cv-07182-EJD

**REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE IN  
SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO  
STRIKE**

Date: February 11, 2021  
Time: 9:00 a.m.  
Dept.: Courtroom 4, 5th Floor  
Judge: Hon. Edward J. Davila

1 **TO ALL PARTIES AND TO THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

2 Plaintiffs Neo4j, Inc. (“Neo4j USA”) hereby submits this Request for Judicial Notice in  
3 Support of its Motion to Strike Defendants’ Answer to the Third Amended Complaint. The  
4 documents are attached as Exhibit 3 through Exhibit 6 to the Declaration of Jeffrey M. Ratinoff in  
5 support of Neo4j USA’s Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings (“Ratinoff Declaration”).

6 Pursuant to Rule 201(b) of the Federal Rules of Evidence, courts may take judicial notice  
7 of adjudicative facts that are “not subject to reasonable dispute.” Fed. R. Evid. 201(b). Facts are  
8 indisputable only if they are either “generally known” or “capable of accurate and ready  
9 determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot be reasonably questioned.” *Id.* In ruling  
10 on a motion to dismiss filed pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), the Court may  
11 consider documents that are attached to the challenged pleading or incorporated by reference when  
12 their authenticity is not contested, or are otherwise properly the subject to judicial notice. *See*  
13 *Tellabs, Inc. v. Makor Issues & Rights, Ltd.*, 551 US 308, 322, 127 S.Ct. 2499 (2007) (court ruling  
14 on motion to dismiss must consider entire complaint and other sources incorporated by reference  
15 as well as judicially noticeable matters).

16 Given the centrality of each exhibit to the allegations in the Answer to the Third Amended  
17 Complaint filed by Defendants John Mark Suhy, PureThink LLC, and iGov Inc. (collectively  
18 “Defendants”), and given that each exhibit’s authenticity is not subject to reasonable dispute,  
19 judicial notice is proper under applicable law. Consideration of these exhibits fits squarely within  
20 the Ninth Circuit’s precedent for judicial notice, and it is consistent with the consideration given  
21 by many other courts to similar documents when evaluating such a motion. Thus, each may be  
22 properly considered as part of Neo4j USA’s Motion to Strike, without converting that motion into  
23 one for summary judgment.

24 Neo4j USA respectfully submits this Request for Judicial Notice for the following  
25 documents:

26 1. United State Patent and Trademark Office Registration Certificate for the “Neo4j”  
27 trademark, Registration No. 4,784,280, a true and correct copy of which is attached as **Exhibit 3**  
28 to the Ratinoff Declaration. Documents issued by a the United States Patent and Trademark

842/3636311.1

Office (USPTO) are in the public record and are not subject to reasonable dispute. *See Autodesk, Inc. v. Dassault Sys. SolidWorks Corp.*, No. 08-04397, 2008 WL 6742224, at \*2 n.1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2008) (taking judicial notice of trademark registrations and applications publicly available on USPTO website) (citing *Hoganas AB v. Dresser Indus., Inc.*, 9 F.3d 948, 954 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). Accordingly, this document is a public record created and issued by the United States Patent and Trademark office showing the application date of April 30, 2014, a fact which is not subject to reasonable dispute and capable of accurate and ready determination. As such, the Court may take judicial notice of such filings.

2. Neo4j's webpages from Wayback Machine archival website (<https://archive.org/>) dated August 23, 2011 and March 26, 2014 showing Neo4j USA's use of the NEO4J® mark in commerce, a true and correct copies of which are attached as **Exhibits 4-7** to the Ratinoff Declaration. *See Erickson v. Nebraska Mach. Co.*, 2015 WL 4089849, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. July 6, 2015) (“[c]ourts have taken judicial notice of the contents of web pages available through the Wayback Machine as facts that can be accurately and readily determined from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned”); *see also U.S. ex. Rel. v. Newport Sensors, Inc.*, 2016 WL 8929246, at \*3 (C.D. Cal. May 19, 2016) (recognizing that “district courts in this circuit have routinely taken judicial notice of content from the Internet Archive’s Wayback Machine pursuant to this rule, as we do here.” (citations omitted)). These webpages show use of the NEO4J® mark by Neo4j USA on August 23, 2011 and March 26, 2014, facts which are not subject to reasonable dispute and capable of accurate and ready determination. As such, the Court may take judicial notice of such filing and those dates.

Dated: October 30, 2020

HOPKINS & CARLEY  
A Law Corporation

By: /s/ Jeffrey M. Ratinoff

Jeffrey M. Ratinoff  
Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counter-  
Defendants  
NEO4J, INC. and NEO4J SWEDEN AB