Tyler J. Woods (State Bar No. 232464) 1 twoods@trialnewport.com Tu-Quyen Pham (State Bar No. 260864) tpham@trialnewport.com NEWPÖRT TRIAL GROUP A Professional Corporation 4100 Newport Place, Suite 800 Newport Beach, CA 92660 5 Tel: (949) 706-6464 Fax: (949) 706-6469 6 HIDEN, ROTT & OERTLE, LLP 7 A Limited Liability Partnership **Including Professional Corporations** ERIC M. OVERHOLT, ESQ. (C.S.B. 248762) eoverholt@hrollp.com 2635 Camino del Rio South, Suite 306 San Diego, California 92108 Telephone: (619) 296-5884 Facsimile: (619) 296-5171 11 Attorneys for Plaintiff 2635 Camino Del Rio South, Suite 306 San Diego, California 92108 IEL (619) 296-5884 FAX (619) 296-5171 12 13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 14 15 16 THERMOLIFE INTERNATIONAL, LLC Case No. '13CV2172 LAB RBB 17 Plaintiff, COMPLAINT FOR PATENT 18 INFRINGEMENT VS. 19 LG SCIENCES, 20 JURY TRIAL DEMANDED Defendant. 21 22 23 /// 24 25 /// 26 /// 27 /// 28 ///

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

26

Plaintiff Thermolife International, LLC ("Plaintiff") hereby alleges for its Complaint against LG Sciences ("Defendant"), on personal knowledge as to its own activities and on information and belief as to the activities of others, as follows:

I. THE PARTIES

- Plaintiff is a limited liability company organized and existing under 1. the laws of Arizona, with a place of business at 1811 Ocean Front Walk in Venice, California, 90291.
- 2. Plaintiff is and was at all relevant times the exclusive licensee of the following United States Patents:
 - a. Patent No. 6,646,006, titled "Enhancement of Vascular Function By Modulation of Endogenous Nitric Oxide Production or Activity"; and
 - b. Patent No. 5,891,459, titled "Enhancement of Vascular Function By Modulation of Endogenous Nitric Oxide Production or Activity".
- 3. The above patents are and were owned by The Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University ("Stanford University") and Plaintiff exclusively licenses and licensed the patents from Stanford University.
 - The above patents are referred to herein as the "patents in suit." 4.
- 5. Plaintiff has been given the right by Stanford University to institute suit with respect to past, current, and future infringement of the patents in suit, including this suit against Defendant.
- 6. Defendant is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Nevada with a principal place of business at 4920 S. Rainbow Blvd., Suite 11, in Las Vegas, Nevada, 89118.

///

27 ///

/// 28

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 7. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code. Accordingly, this Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338, and 1367.
- 8. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400.
- 9. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant. By way of example and without limitation, Defendant, directly or through intermediaries (including distributors, retailers, and others), makes, manufactures, ships, distributes, advertises, markets, offers for sale, and/or sells dietary supplement products that infringe on one or more claims of the patents in suit (hereinafter the "accused products"), which include without limitation products sold under the "I-GH-1" and "Anadraulic Pump" brand names, in the United States, the State of California, and the Southern District of California.
- 10. By way of further example and without limitation, Defendant has purposefully and voluntarily placed the accused products into the stream of commerce with the expectation that they will be purchased in the Southern District of California, and the products are actually purchased in the Southern District of California.

III. THE DEFENDANT'S INFRINGEMENTS

11. Defendant has committed the tort of patent infringement within the State of California, and more particularly, within the Southern District of California, by virtue of the fact that Defendant has formulated, made, manufactured, shipped, distributed, advertised, offered for sale, and/or sold the accused products in this District, and continues to do so.

26 | ///

27 \| ///

28 1///

A. DIRECT INFRINGEMENTS

- 12. Defendant's employees, agents, representatives and other persons sponsored by or who endorse Defendant and Defendant's products in advertising and marketing activities, have taken, used, and orally administered the accused products.
- 13. The accused products are formulated, made, manufactured, shipped, distributed, advertised, offered for sale, and sold by Defendant to include certain ingredients that, by virtue of their inclusion in the products, infringe one or more claims of one or more of the patents in suit.
- 14. The accused products are formulated, made, manufactured, shipped, distributed, advertised, offered for sale, and sold by Defendant to include specific ingredients for certain purposes that, by virtue of their inclusion in the products for such purposes, infringe one or more claims of one or more of the patents in suit, and as a result, when Defendant's employees, agents, representatives and other persons sponsored by or who endorse Defendant and Defendant's products in advertising and marketing activities orally administer the accused products, they are practicing and they practiced the methods disclosed in those claims.
- 15. The purposes for which these ingredients are included in the accused products are and were, without limitation, to enhance nitric oxide production, to improve nitric oxide activity, to produce nitric oxide, to boost nitric oxide levels in the body, and to enhance physical performance.
- 16. Defendant encouraged and/or is aware of the fact that its employees, agents, representatives and other persons sponsored by Defendant or who endorse Defendant and Defendant's products in advertising and marketing activities orally administered and administer the accused products and practice and practiced the methods disclosed in one or more claim of one or more of the patents in suit, and these employees, agents, representatives and other persons sponsored by Defendant or who endorse Defendant and Defendant's products in advertising and marketing

activities are and were acting under Defendant's direction and control when practicing those methods.

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

26

27

28

Therefore, Defendant is and was a direct infringer of one or more 17. claims of one or more of the patents in suit, and Defendant practices and practiced the methods as set forth in one or more claims of one or more of the patents in suit.

B. INDIRECT INFRINGEMENTS

- End-users of Defendant's accused products were and are also direct 18. infringers of one or more claims of one or more of the patents in suit.
- End-users of Defendant's accused products have taken, used, and 19. orally administered the accused products.
- The accused products are and were formulated, made, manufactured, 20. shipped, distributed, advertised, offered for sale, and/or sold by Defendant to include certain ingredients that, by virtue of their inclusion in the products, infringe and infringed one or more claims of one or more of the patents in suit.
- The accused products are and were formulated, made, manufactured, 21. shipped, distributed, advertised, offered for sale, and/or sold by Defendant to include specific ingredients for certain purposes that, because of their inclusion in the products for such purposes, infringe and infringed one or more claims of one or more of the patents in suit, and as a result, when end-users of Defendant's accused products orally administer and administered the accused products, they are and were practicing the methods disclosed in those claims.
- Defendant's labels and advertising for the accused products explain 22. and explained the elements and essential elements of one or more of the methods disclosed in the patents in suit, and those labels and advertising statements encourage, urge, and induce the accused products' end-users, and did so in the past, to purchase and orally ingest the products to practice those methods, and end-users do and did practice those methods.

- 23. Defendant has therefore specifically intended to cause these end-users to directly infringe the claimed methods of these patents, and in fact urged them to do so.
- 24. The accused products are and were not suitable for non-infringing uses, and none of Defendant's labels or advertisements for the accused products disclose or disclosed any uses for the products, nor for the compounds disclosed in the claimed methods of the patents in suit, that do not infringe upon such methods.
- 25. The inclusion of the specific infringing compounds in the products is and was material to practicing such methods.
- 26. Defendant has and had knowledge that the accused products are and were especially adapted by end-users of the products for the practicing of such methods, and, indeed, Defendant encourages, urges, and induces the accused products' end-users to purchase and orally administer the accused products to practice such methods, and has done so in the past.
- 27. Defendant intentionally and knowingly induced, encouraged, and urged end-users of the accused products to purchase and orally administer the accused products for the purposes of practicing the claimed methods, by having them orally ingest the compounds disclosed in such claims.
- 28. Defendant has and had knowledge of the fact that the accused products, particularly as administered, infringe on one or more claims of the patents in suit.
- 29. Defendant has and had direct, firsthand knowledge of the patents in suit.
- 30. For example and without limitation, Plaintiff believes Defendant has had knowledge of the patents in suit since November 2006, when an ongoing settlement of a patent infringement case relating to at least some of the patents in suit against Herbalife, a well-known company in Defendant's industry, was announced in press releases issued in a highly publicized manner. Plaintiff believes

3

4

5

6

8

12

13

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

28

Defendant's employees, agents, and representatives saw the press releases and were aware of the settlement and thus the patents in suit.

31. By way of further example and without limitation, Defendant sold its products through retailers, including online retailers, and those retailers have sold other companies' products whose labels and/or advertisements have been prominently marked with one or more of the patents in suit, by patent number, including without limitation, upon information and belief, the products manufactured and sold by Herbalife, Daily Wellness, and Vitality Research Labs. Defendant's employees, agents, and representatives have seen these labels and advertisements and, thus, Defendant has and had direct knowledge of the patents in suit.

- By way of further example and without limitation, Defendant received 32. written notice of the patents in suit from Plaintiff in April 2013.
- Defendant brazenly and willfully decided to infringe the patents in suit 33. despite knowledge of the patents' existence and its knowledge of the accused products' infringements of the patents.
- At a minimum, and in the alternative, Plaintiff pleads that Defendant willfully blinded itself to the infringing nature of the accused products' sales.
- 35. Defendant did not cease its own direct infringement, nor its contributory infringement or inducement of infringement by end-users, despite its knowledge of the patents in suit and the end-users' infringing activities with respect to the patents in suit.

IV. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,646,006

36. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges the allegations of the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- In addition to the fact that Defendant makes, uses, sells, and offers for 38. sale the accused products, and did so in the past, further examples of Defendant's direct infringements include, without limitation, the fact that Defendant encouraged and/or is aware of the fact that its employees, agents, representatives and other persons sponsored by or who endorse Defendant and Defendant's products in advertising and marketing activities orally administer the accused products and practice the methods disclosed in one or more claims of United States Patent No. 6,646,006, and these employees, agents, representatives and other persons sponsored by or who endorse Defendant and Defendant's products in advertising and marketing activities acted under Defendant's direction and control when practicing those methods.
- Defendant encouraged and was aware of these persons' administration of the accused products for these purposes, these persons are acting under Defendant's direction and control, and therefore Defendant directly practiced the methods disclosed in United States Patent No. 6,646,006.
- End-users of Defendant's accused products were also direct infringers 40. of one or more claims of United States Patent No. 6,646,006.
- End-users of Defendant's accused products have taken, used, and 41. orally administered the accused products.
- The accused products were formulated, made, manufactured, shipped, 42. distributed, advertised, offered for sale, and sold by Defendant to include certain ingredients that, by virtue of their inclusion in the products, infringed one or more claims of United States Patent No. 6,646,006.

- 43. The accused products were formulated, made, manufactured, shipped, distributed, advertised, offered for sale, and sold by Defendant to include specific ingredients for purposes that, by their inclusion in the products for such purposes, infringed one or more claims of United States Patent No. 6,646,006, and as a result, when end-users of Defendant's accused products orally administered the accused products, they were practicing the methods disclosed in one or more claims of that patent.
- 44. Defendant's labels and advertising for the accused products explained the elements and essential elements of the methods disclosed in United States Patent No. 6,646,006, and those labels and advertising statements encouraged, urged, and induced the accused products' end-users to purchase and orally ingest the products to practice those methods, and end-users did practice those methods.
- 45. Defendant therefore specifically intended to cause these end-users to directly infringe the claimed methods of United States Patent No. 6,646,006, and had in fact urged them to do so.
- 46. The accused products were not suitable for non-infringing uses, and none of Defendant's labels or advertisements for the accused products disclosed any uses for the products, nor for the compounds disclosed in the claimed methods, that did not infringe upon such methods.
- 47. The inclusion of these specific infringing compounds in the products was material to practicing such methods.
- 48. Defendant had knowledge that the accused products were especially adapted by end-users of the products for the practicing of such methods, and, indeed, Defendant encouraged, urged, and induced the accused products' end-users to purchase and orally administer the accused products to practice such methods.
- 49. Defendant intentionally and knowingly induced, encouraged, and urged end-users of the accused products to purchase and orally administer the accused products for the purposes disclosed in one or more claims of United States

Patent No. 6,646,006, by having them orally ingest the compounds disclosed in such claims.

- 50. Defendant had knowledge of the fact that the accused products, particularly as administered, infringed on one or more claims of United States Patent No. 6,646,006.
- 51. Defendant also had direct, firsthand knowledge of United States Patent No. 6,646,006 itself.
- 52. Defendant's activities were without express or implied license by Plaintiff.
- 53. As a result of Defendant's acts of infringement, Plaintiff suffered and will continue to suffer damages in an amount to be proved at trial.
- 54. Defendant's past infringements and/or continuing infringements have been deliberate and willful, and this case is therefore an exceptional case, which warrants an award of treble damages and attorneys' fees in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 285.

V. <u>SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION</u>

Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 5,891,459

- 55. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges the allegations of the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.
- 56. Defendant has in the past literally and directly infringed or directly infringed under the doctrine of equivalents one or more claims of United States Patent No. 5,891,459 by making, using, selling, and offering for sale the accused products, or any one of those products.
- 57. In addition to the fact that Defendant makes, uses, sells, and offers for sale the accused products, and did so in the past, further examples of Defendant's direct infringements include, without limitation, the fact that Defendant encouraged and/or is aware of the fact that its employees, agents, representatives and other persons sponsored by or who endorse Defendant and Defendant's products in

advertising and marketing activities orally administer the accused products and practice the methods disclosed in one or more claims of United States Patent No. 5,891,459, and these employees, agents, representatives and other persons sponsored by or who endorse Defendant and Defendant's products in advertising and marketing activities acted under Defendant's direction and control when practicing those methods.

- 58. Defendant encouraged and was aware of these persons' oral administration of the accused products for these purposes, these persons are acting under Defendant's direction and control, and therefore Defendant directly practiced the methods disclosed in United States Patent No. 5,891,459.
- 59. End-users of Defendant's accused products were also direct infringers of one or more claims of United States Patent No. 5,891,459.
- 60. End-users of Defendant's accused products have taken, used, and orally administered the accused products.
- 61. The accused products were formulated, made, manufactured, shipped, distributed, advertised, offered for sale, and sold by Defendant to include certain ingredients that, by virtue of their inclusion in the products, infringed one or more claims of United States Patent No. 5,891,459.
- 62. The accused products were formulated, made, manufactured, shipped, distributed, advertised, offered for sale, and sold by Defendant to include specific ingredients for purposes that, by their inclusion in the products for such purposes, infringed one or more claims of United States Patent No. 5,891,459, and as a result, when end-users of Defendant's accused products or ally administered the accused products, they were practicing the methods disclosed in one or more claims of that patent.
- 63. Defendant's labels and advertising for the accused products explained the elements and essential elements of the methods disclosed in United States Patent No. 5,891,459, and those labels and advertising statements encouraged,

urged, and induced the accused products' end-users to purchase and orally ingest the products to practice those methods, and end-users did practice those methods.

- 64. Defendant therefore specifically intended to cause these end-users to directly infringe the claimed methods of United States Patent No. 5,891,459, and had in fact urged them to do so.
- 65. The accused products were not suitable for non-infringing uses, and none of Defendant's labels or advertisements for the accused products disclosed any uses for the products, nor for the compounds disclosed in the claimed methods, that did not infringe upon such methods.
- 66. The inclusion of these specific infringing compounds in the products was material to practicing such methods.
- 67. Defendant had knowledge that the accused products were especially adapted by end-users of the products for the practicing of such methods, and, indeed, Defendant encouraged, urged, and induced the accused products' end-users to purchase and orally administer the accused products to practice such methods.
- 68. Defendant intentionally and knowingly induced, encouraged, and urged end-users of the accused products to purchase and orally administer the accused products for the purposes disclosed in one or more claims of United States Patent No. 5,891,459, by having them orally ingest the compounds disclosed in such claims.
- 69. Defendant had knowledge of the fact that the accused products, particularly as administered, infringed on one or more claims of United States Patent No. 5,891,459.
- 70. Defendant also had direct, firsthand knowledge of United States Patent No. 5,891,459 itself.
- 71. Defendant's activities were without express or implied license by Plaintiff.

- 72. As a result of Defendant's acts of infringement, Plaintiff suffered and will continue to suffer damages in an amount to be proved at trial.
- 73. Defendant's past infringements and/or continuing infringements have been deliberate and willful, and this case is therefore an exceptional case, which warrants an award of treble damages and attorneys' fees in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 285.

VI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for entry of judgment against Defendant as follows:

- 1. A declaration that Defendant has infringed the patents in suit, under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 et seq.;
- 2. That Defendant be required to provide to Plaintiff an accounting of all gains, profits, and advantages derived by Defendant's infringement of the patents in suit, and that Plaintiff be awarded damages adequate to compensate Plaintiff for the wrongful infringing acts by Defendant, in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 284;
- 3. That the damages awarded to Plaintiff with regard to the patents in suit be increased up to three times, in view of Defendant's willful infringement, in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 284;
- 4. That this case be declared to be exceptional in favor of Plaintiff under 35 U.S.C. § 285, and that Plaintiff be awarded its reasonable attorneys' fees and other expenses incurred in connection with this action;
- 5. That Plaintiff be awarded its interest and costs of suit incurred in this action;
 - 6. Compensatory damages;
 - 7. Punitive damages; and
- 8. That Plaintiff be awarded such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

HIDEN, ROTT & OERTLE, LLP

2635 Camino Del Rio South, Suite 306

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b), Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial for all issues in this case that properly are subject to a jury trial.

DATED: September 12, 2013

HIDEN, ROTT & OERTLE, LLP

By:

Eric M. Overholt, Esq.

Attorneys for Plaintiff

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating

the civil docket sheet. (SEE IN	ISTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)					····		
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	DEFENDANTS							
THERMOLIFE INTERNATIONAL LLC			LG SCIENCES					
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Los Angeles County (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.					
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) SEE ATTACHMENT			Attorneys (If Known) '13CV2172 LAB RBB					
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES			
U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	1		TF DEF	Incorporated or Pri		or Derendal PTF 4	DEF
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)				Incorporated and Prof Business In A		□ 5 □ 6	□ 5 □ 6
		Fc	en or Subject of a reign Country	, i i	Foreign Nation			
IV. NATURE OF SUI	(Place an "X" in One Box Only)	FOR	FETTURE/PENALALY	BAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER	STATUT	ES
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment Æ Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise ☐ REAL PROPERTY ☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Forceiosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & PERSONAL INJURY 362 Personal Injury Med. Malpractice 365 Personal Injury Product Liability	e G C	10 Agriculture 20 Other Food & Drug 25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 330 Liquor Laws 440 R R & Truck 550 Airline Regs. 560 Occupational Safety/Health 590 Other LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting & Disclosure Act 740 Railway Labor Act 740 Other Labor Litigation 751 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	422 Appea 423 Without 28 US PROPER 830 Paten 840 Trade 861 HIA (862 Black 863 DIW(864 SSID 865 RSI (FEDERA 870 Taxes or Def 871 IRS	al 28 USC 158 lrawal C 157 ETY RIGHTS rights t mark SECURITY 1395ff) Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI 405(g)) L TAX SUITS (U.S. Plaintiff endant)	□ 480 Consum □ 490 Cable/S □ 810 Selectiv Exchang □ 875 Custom 12 USC □ 890 Other S □ 891 Agricu □ 892 Econor □ 893 Enviroc □ 894 Energy □ 895 Freedo Act □ 900Appeal	st and Bankingerce attion eer Influence Organization eer Influence Organization er Credit Sat TV ve Service ices/Commo gener Challenge 3410 Statutory Adlural Acts onmental May Allocation of Fee Deta Equal Accessed	ced and ons odities/ ge ctions ration Act latters a Act mation ermination ess
☑1 Original ☐ 2 F	Removed from Remanded from Appellate Court	Reo	istated or anoth	ferred from er district ify)	6 Multidistr	ict 🗆 7	Appeal to Judge from Magistrate Judgment	m e
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	ON Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you 28 USC SECTION 1331, 1338, 1 Brief description of cause: Patent Litigation		5:1126	l J				
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23			EMAND \$	☐ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: ☑ Yes ☐ No				
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S) (See instructions): JUDGE Hon. Jan		nmartino	DOCKE	T NUMBER 13	-CV-651		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	SIGNATURE OF A	TTOPMEY	OF REGORD					
RECEIPT#	AMOUNT : APPLYING IFP		JUDGE_		: , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	OGE	<u></u>	
4	The Control of	-	1 4 4	1 1 2 12	:			

ATTACHMENT TO CIVIL COVER SHEET

Attorneys:

Tyler J. Woods Tu-Quyen Pham Newport Trial Group, APC 4100 Newport Place, Ste. 800 CA 92660 (949) 706-6464

Eric M. Overholt Hiden, Rott & Oertle, LLP 2635 Camino del Rio South, Ste. 306 San Diego, CA 92108 (619) 296-5884