

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
FLORIDA

Cal Bridge, Inc. v. OneCal

Cal Bridge · No. 24-cv-22361-ALTMAN · Decided January 24, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida partially grants and partially denies OneCal’s motion to dismiss Cal Bridge, Inc.’s amended complaint. The court allows the patent-infringement claim concerning the ’739 patent to proceed, finding that patent eligibility cannot be resolved at this stage, but strikes the false-advertising and unfair-competition claims as an impermissible shotgun pleading and because they are inadequately pleaded. Cal Bridge is granted an opportunity to amend those claims.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Roy K. Altman
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida
DECIDED	January 24, 2026
DOCKET	24-cv-22361-ALTMAN
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) to dismiss the amended complaint, challenging patent eligibility, the sufficiency of the Lanham Act and Florida-law claims, shotgun pleading, and federal patent-law preemption.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the court accepts well-pleaded factual allegations as true and views them in the plaintiff's favor, but does not assume the truth of unsupported legal conclusions. Patent eligibility may be resolved at the pleading stage only when no factual allegations, taken as true, prevent resolving eligibility as a matter of law.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion
PARTIES	Cal Bridge, Inc. v. OneCal

TOPICS

patent eligibility

motions to dismiss

pleadings

trademark infringement

deceptive trade practices

PRACTICE AREAS

intellectual property

patent law

civil procedure

trademark law

consumer protection

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 11,461,739 were patent-ineligible under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and the Alice framework at the Rule 12(b)(6) stage.
2. Whether Counts II through IV were impermissible shotgun pleadings under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) and 10(b).
3. Whether Count II plausibly stated Lanham Act claims for false advertising, reverse passing off, or trade-dress infringement.
4. Whether Counts III and IV were inadequately separated from the patent-infringement theory and vulnerable to federal patent-law preemption.

HOLDINGS

1. At the pleading stage, OneCal failed to show that the asserted patent claims were patent-ineligible. The allegations plausibly showed that Claim 11 was directed to a specific improvement in computer functionality—bridging incompatible calendar hosts through rule-based synchronization—and plausibly alleged an inventive concept under Alice Step Two.
2. Counts II through IV constituted an impermissible shotgun pleading because each incorporated all preceding allegations, including the allegations of the patent-infringement count, without adequately separating the factual bases for the different causes of action.
3. Count II did not plausibly state a Lanham Act false-advertising claim because it alleged deception, materiality, consumer impact, and injury largely in conclusory terms. The reverse-passing-off and trade-dress theories also failed as pleaded.
4. The court did not decide whether Counts III and IV were preempted. It held only that the counts, as pleaded, were vulnerable to a preemption challenge because they incorporated the patent-infringement allegations wholesale and did not clearly identify the non-patent conduct supporting the state-law claims.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The unifying characteristic of all types of shotgun pleadings is that they fail to one degree or another, and in one way or another, to give the defendants adequate notice of the claims against them and the grounds upon which each claim rests.” (Section II)

“We therefore ORDER and ADJUDGE as follows:” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Cal Bridge developed and patented a cloud-based system for synchronizing events between incompatible electronic calendar hosts using database and synchronization services, API notifications, configurable propagation rules, and commands issued to a second calendar host. It alleged that OneCal's founder accessed the CalendarBridge service, later launched a competing calendar-synchronization service, and marketed it as a CalendarBridge alternative. Cal Bridge also alleged that OneCal copied aspects of its interface and made false or misleading statements about CalendarBridge's features and pricing.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Cal Bridge filed an amended complaint asserting patent infringement, Lanham Act false advertising and related theories, Florida common-law unfair competition, and FDUTPA claims. OneCal moved to dismiss. The court denied the motion as to the patent-infringement count, struck Counts II through IV as shotgun pleadings, and permitted Cal Bridge one opportunity to file a second amended complaint within fourteen days.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Megladon, Inc. v. Village of Pinecrest, 661 F. Supp. 3d 1214, 1221 (S.D. Fla. 2023)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Dusek v. JPMorgan Chase & Co., 832 F.3d 1243, 1246 (11th Cir. 2016)
- Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank International, 573 U.S. 208 (2014)
- Association for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc., Association for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc., 569 U.S. 576, 589 (2013)
- Customedia Technologies, LLC v. Dish Network Corp., 951 F.3d 1359, 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2020)
- Data Engine Technologies LLC v. Google LLC, 906 F.3d 999, 1007–08 (Fed. Cir. 2018)
- Core Wireless Licensing S.A.R.L. v. LG Electronics, Inc., 880 F.3d 1356, 1361–63 (Fed. Cir. 2018)
- Monsanto Co. v. Syngenta Seeds, Inc., 503 F.3d 1352, 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2007)
- McRO, Inc. v. Bandai Namco Games America Inc., 837 F.3d 1299, 1312–15 (Fed. Cir. 2016)
- RecogniCorp, LLC v. Nintendo Co., 855 F.3d 1322, 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2017)
- Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp., 822 F.3d 1327, 1335–39 (Fed. Cir. 2016)
- FairWarning IP, LLC v. Iatric Systems, Inc., 839 F.3d 1089, 1094–95 (Fed. Cir. 2016)
- Elec. Power Group, LLC v. Alstom S.A., 830 F.3d 1350, 1353–54 (Fed. Cir. 2016)
- University of Florida Research Foundation, Inc. v. General Electric Co., 916 F.3d 1363, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2019)
- Rapid Litigation Management Ltd. v. CellzDirect, Inc., 827 F.3d 1042, 1050 (Fed. Cir. 2016)
- Wanker v. United States, 146 Fed. Cl. 582, 594 (Fed. Cl. 2020)
- Cellspin Soft, Inc. v. Fitbit, Inc., 927 F.3d 1306, 1317–18 (Fed. Cir. 2019)
- Berkheimer v. HP Inc., 881 F.3d 1360, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2018)
- Amdocs (Israel) Ltd. v. Openet Telecom, Inc., 841 F.3d 1288, 1300–01 (Fed. Cir. 2016)

- BASCOM Global Internet Services, Inc. v. AT&T Mobility LLC, 827 F.3d 1341, 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2016)
- DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P., 773 F.3d 1245, 1258–59 (Fed. Cir. 2014)
- xLoyalty, Inc. v. Maritz Holdings Inc., 986 F.3d 1367, 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2021)
- Weiland v. Palm Beach County Sheriff's Office, 792 F.3d 1313, 1320–23 (11th Cir. 2015)
- Embree v. Wyndham Worldwide Corp., 779 F. App'x 658, 662 (11th Cir. 2019)
- Craighead v. Austal USA, LLC, 2017 WL 6559917, at *2 n.3 (S.D. Ala. Dec. 21, 2017)
- Amin v. Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC, 349 F. Supp. 3d 1338, 1354 (N.D. Ga. 2018)
- Wagner v. First Horizon Pharmaceutical Corp., 464 F.3d 1273, 1279 (11th Cir. 2006)
- Edward v. BAC Home Loans Servicing, L.P., 534 F. App'x 888, 891 (11th Cir. 2013)
- Muhammad v. Muhammad, 654 F. App'x 455, 457 (11th Cir. 2016)
- Amf Bruns of America, L.P. v. Valeda Co., LLC, 2025 WL 2499758, at *2 (S.D. Fla. Apr. 24, 2025)
- Resolution Trust Corp. v. Dunmar Corp., 43 F.3d 587, 599 (11th Cir. 1995)
- Barrocos of Florida v. Elmassian, 2011 WL 13223913, at *4 (S.D. Fla. Sept. 29, 2011)
- Portionpac Chemical Corp. v. Sanitech Systems, Inc., 217 F. Supp. 2d 1238, 1251 (M.D. Fla. 2002)
- Miller's Ale House, Inc. v. Boynton Carolina Ale House, LLC, 702 F.3d 1312, 1322 (11th Cir. 2012)
- Dippin' Dots, Inc. v. Frosty Bites Distribution, LLC, 369 F.3d 1197, 1202 (11th Cir. 2004)
- BearBox LLC v. Lancium LLC, 125 F.4th 1101, 1112 (Fed. Cir. 2025)
- Dow Chemical Co. v. Exxon Corp., 139 F.3d 1470, 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1998)
- Webster v. Dean Guitars, 955 F.3d 1270, 1277 (11th Cir. 2020)
- Viridis Corp. v. TCA Global Credit Master Fund, LP, 721 F. App'x 865, 876 n.13 (11th Cir. 2018)
- Sommers Oil Co. v. United States, 241 F.3d 1375, 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2001)