

Texas pursuant to the Texas Long Arm Statute, Texas Civil Practice & Remedies Code § 17.044 and asking the Secretary of State to serve Pantech Wireless, Inc. at its principal place of business at 5607 Glenridge Drive, Atlanta, Georgia 30342 – Return Receipt Requested.

3. On information and belief, Pantech Co. is a South Korea corporation with its principal place of business in Seoul, South Korea. On information and belief, this Defendant may be served with process at its principal place of business at DMC I-2 Block, Sangam-dong, Seoul, 121270, South Korea.

4. On information and belief, AT&T Inc. is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 208 Akard Street, Dallas, Texas 75202 and regularly does business throughout this judicial district. AT&T Inc.'s registered agent for service of process in Texas is CT Corporation System, 350 N. St. Paul St., Dallas, Texas 75201.

5. On information and belief, AT&T Mobility LLC is a Delaware limited liability corporation with its principal place of business at 1025 Lenox Park Blvd., NE, Atlanta, Georgia and does business in the judicial district at 5976 West Parker Road, Plano, Texas 75093. AT&T's registered agent for service of process in Texas is CT Corporation System, 350 N. St. Paul St., Dallas, Texas 75201.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. This action arises under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

7. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b, c) and 1400(b). On information and belief, each defendant has purposely transacted business in this judicial district, has committed acts of direct and/or indirect infringement in this judicial district, and each defendant has availed itself of this forum by commencing patent litigation herein.

8. On information and belief, each defendant is subject to this Court's specific and general personal jurisdiction pursuant to due process and/or the Texas Long Arm Statute, due at least to its substantial business in this forum, including: (A) at least part of its infringing activities alleged herein, and (B) regularly doing or soliciting business, engaging in others persistent causes of conduct, and/or deriving substantial revenue from goods and services provided to persons and other entities in Texas and this judicial district.

COUNT I
(INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,454,212)

9. ADAPTIX incorporates paragraphs 1 through 8 herein by reference.

10. This cause of action arises under the patent laws of the United States, and in particular, 35 U.S.C. §§271 *et seq.*

11. ADAPTIX is the owner by assignment of United States patent number 7,454,212, entitled "OFDMA WITH ADAPTIVE SUBCARRIER-CLUSTER CONFIGURATION AND SELECTIVE LOADING" ("the '212 patent") with ownership of all substantial rights in the '212 patent, including the right to exclude others and to sue and recover damages for the past and future infringement thereof. A true and correct copy of the '212 patent is attached as Exhibit A.

12. The '212 patent is valid, enforceable, and was duly issued in full compliance with Title 35 of the United States Code.

13. ADAPTIX has been damaged as a result of PANTECH and AT&T's infringing conduct described in this Count. PANTECH and AT&T are, thus, liable to ADAPTIX in an amount that adequately compensates it for their infringement, which by law, cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

(Direct Infringement)

14. On information and belief, PANTECH has and continues to directly infringe at least one claim of the '212 patent in this judicial district and elsewhere in Texas and the United States, including at least claim 1 and 18 by, among other things, making, using, offering for sale, selling and/or importing computerized communications devices including, without limitation, the smartphones sold to AT&T and others; the PANTECH Burst smartphone sold to AT&T and others; the PANTECH Flex smartphone sold to AT&T and others; the PANTECH Discover smartphone sold to AT&T and others; and the PANTECH Element tablet sold to AT&T and others, which, at a minimum, directly infringe the '212 patent; PANTECH is thereby liable for infringement of the '212 patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. PANTECH's infringement has caused damage to ADAPTIX, which infringement and damage to ADAPTIX will continue unless and until PANTECH is enjoined.

15. On information and belief, AT&T has and continues to directly infringe at least one claim of the '212 patent in this judicial district and elsewhere in Texas and the United States, including at least claim 1 and 18 by, among other things, making, using, offering for sale, selling and/or importing computerized communications devices including, without limitation, the PANTECH Burst smartphone; the PANTECH Flex smartphone; the PANTECH Discover smartphone; and the PANTECH Element tablet, which, at a minimum, directly infringe the '212 patent. AT&T is thereby liable for infringement of the '212 patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. AT&T's infringement has caused damage to ADAPTIX, which infringement and damage will continue unless and until AT&T is enjoined.

16. Based upon information set forth in the preceding two paragraphs, on information and belief both PANTECH and AT&T have and continue to directly and jointly infringe one or more claims of the '212 patent in this judicial district and/or elsewhere in Texas and the United States, by,

among other things, making, using, offering for sale, selling and/or importing computerized communications devices including, without limitation, the PANTECH Burst smartphone; the PANTECH Flex smartphone; the PANTECH Discover smartphone; and the PANTECH Element tablet, which, at a minimum, directly infringe the '212 patent. Thereby, PANTECH and AT&T are jointly liable for infringement of the '212 patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a). PANTECH'S and AT&T's joint infringement has caused damage to ADAPTIX, which infringement and damage will continue unless and until PANTECH and AT&T are enjoined.

(Indirect Infringement- Inducement)

17. Based on the information presently available to ADAPTIX, absent discovery, and in the alternative to direct infringement, ADAPTIX contends that PANTECH has and continues to indirectly infringe one or more claims of the '212 patent, including at least claim 16 by, among other things, making, selling, testing, and/or importing the PANTECH Burst smartphone; the PANTECH Flex smartphone; the PANTECH Discover smartphone; and the PANTECH Element tablet, and/or advertising the LTE capability of the above mentioned devices. AT&T's and/or PANTECH's end users who purchase systems and components thereof and operate such systems and components in accordance with PANTECH's instructions directly infringe one or more claims of the '212 patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b). PANTECH's infringement has caused damage to ADAPTIX, which infringement and damage to ADAPTIX will continue unless and until PANTECH is enjoined. PANTECH is thereby liable for infringement of the '212 patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(b).

18. Based on the information presently available to ADAPTIX, absent discovery, and in the alternative to direct infringement, ADAPTIX contends that AT&T has and continues to indirectly infringe one or more claims of the '212 patent, including at least claim 16 by, among other things, taking active steps to encourage and facilitate its customers to purchase and use the PANTECH Burst

smartphone; the PANTECH Flex smartphone; the PANTECH Discover smartphone; and the PANTECH Element tablet. AT&T's customers who purchase systems and components thereof and operate such systems and components in accordance with AT&T's instructions directly infringe one or more claims of the '212 patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b). AT&T's infringement has caused damage to ADAPTIX, which infringement and damage to ADAPTIX will continue unless and until AT&T is enjoined. AT&T is thereby liable for infringement of the '212 patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(b).

19. On information and belief, Defendants have been on notice of the '212 patent since at least service of this action. Additionally, both defendants have been on notice of the '212 patent as they are parties to a similar action concerning the same patent.¹ In accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b)(3), ADAPTIX will likely have additional evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery on this issue.

20. On information and belief, since Defendants have been on notice of the '212 patent since at least service of this action, Defendants have been knowingly inducing infringement of the '212 patent, including at least claim 16 of the '212 patent, and possessing specific intent to encourage others' infringement.

21. On information and belief, since Defendants have been on notice of the '212 patent since at least service of this action, Defendants knew or should have known that their actions would induce actual infringement of the '212 patent, including at least claim 16 of the '212 patent.

22. Defendants have not produced any evidence as to any investigation, design around, or that any remedial action was taken with respect to the '212 patent. In accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P.

¹ Pantech is a party to 6:12-cv-0020 filed on or about January 12, 2012, while AT&T is a party to 6:12-cv-0017, filed on or about January 13, 2012. Both cases are pending in the Eastern District of Texas - Tyler Division with Judge Schneider presiding, and with a referral to Judge Craven.

11(b)(3), ADAPTIX will likely have additional evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for discovery on this issue.

(Indirect Infringement- Contributory)

23. Based on the information presently available to ADAPTIX, absent discovery, and in the alternative to direct infringement, ADAPTIX contends that PANTECH has and continues to indirectly infringe one or more claims of the '212 patent, including at least claim 16 by, among other things, contributing to the direct infringement of others, including entities such as AT&T and end users of PANTECH's computerized communications devices including, without limitation, the PANTECH Burst smartphone; the PANTECH Flex smartphone; the PANTECH Discover smartphone; and the PANTECH Element tablet, through supplying infringing systems and components, that infringe one or more claims of the '212 patent, including at least claim 16, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(c).

24. Based on the information presently available to ADAPTIX, absent discovery, and in the alternative to direct infringement, ADAPTIX contends that AT&T has and continues to indirectly infringe one or more claims of the '212 patent, including at least claim 16 by, among other things, contributing to the direct infringement of others, including entities such as customers of AT&T's computerized communications devices including, without limitation, the PANTECH Burst smartphone; the PANTECH Flex smartphone; the PANTECH Discover smartphone; and the PANTECH Element tablet, through supplying infringing systems and components, that infringe one or more claims of the '212 patent, including at least claim 16, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(c).

25. Defendants have and continue to contribute to the direct infringement of others, such as end users of Defendants' computerized communications devices, by making, offering to sell, selling, re-selling, and/or importing into the United States a component of a patented apparatus that constitutes a material part of the invention, knowing the same to be especially

made or especially adapted for use in infringement of the '212 patent and not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use. An example of such a material component offered for sale, sold, and/or imported by Defendants is Defendants' computerized communications devices and the technology associated therewith.

26. On information and belief, Defendants have been on notice of the '212 patent since at least service of this action, or before, but has continued since that time to cause others to directly infringe the '212 patent as alleged herein. Additionally, both defendants have been on notice of the '212 patent as they are parties to a similar action concerning the same patent.² In accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b)(3), ADAPTIX will likely have additional evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery on this issue.

27. Since Defendants have been on notice of the '212 patent since at least service of this action, Defendants knew or should have known that Defendants' computerized communications devices and the technology associated therewith constituted material components of the inventions claimed in the '212 patent, are especially made or especially adapted for use in infringement of the '212 patent, and are not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.

28. By virtue of at least this Complaint, Defendants have been provided with written notice of ADAPTIX's allegations that Defendants have and continue to contributorily infringe the '212 patent and written identification of exemplar products that infringe one or more claims of the '212 patent (e.g., systems used by end users of Defendants' computerized communications devices) and written notice of an exemplar material part of these devices (e.g., Defendants' computerized communications devices and the technology associated therewith) that are especially made or especially adapted for use in infringing the '212 patent and are not staple articles or commodities of

² See n.1, *supra*.

commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.

COUNT II
(INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,947,748)

29. ADAPTIX incorporates paragraphs 1 through 28 herein by reference.

30. This cause of action arises under the patent laws of the United States, and in particular, 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 *et seq.*

31. ADAPTIX is the owner by assignment of United States Patent No. 6,947,748 entitled “OFDMA WITH ADAPTIVE SUBCARRIER-CLUSTER CONFIGURATION AND SELECTIVE LOADING” (“the ‘748 patent”) with ownership of all substantial rights in the ‘748 patent, including the right to exclude others and to sue and recover damages for the past and future infringement thereof. A true and correct copy of the ‘748 patent is attached as Exhibit B.

32. The ‘748 patent is valid, enforceable, and was duly issued in full compliance with Title 35 of the United States Code.

33. ADAPTIX has been damaged as a result of PANTECH’s and AT&T’s infringing conduct described in this Count. PANTECH and AT&T are, thus, liable to ADAPTIX in an amount that adequately compensates it for their infringement, which by law, cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

(Direct Infringement)

34. On information and belief, PANTECH has and continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the ‘748 patent in this judicial district and/or elsewhere in Texas and the United States, including at least claim 6 and 8 by, among other things, making, using, offering for sale, selling, and/or importing computerized communications devices including, without limitation, the PANTECH Burst smartphone and others; the PANTECH Flex smartphone and others; the PANTECH Discover smartphone and others; and the PANTECH Element tablet and others which,

at a minimum, directly infringe the '748 patent. PANTECH is thereby liable for infringement of the '748 patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a). PANTECH's infringement has caused damage to ADAPTIX, which infringement and damage to ADAPTIX will continue unless and until PANTECH is enjoined. PANTECH is thereby liable for infringement of the '748 patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

35. On information and belief, AT&T has and continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the '748 patent in this judicial district and/or elsewhere in Texas and the United States, including at least claims 6 and 8 by, among other things, making, using, offering for sale, selling and/or importing computerized communications devices including, without limitation, the PANTECH Burst smartphone; the PANTECH Flex smartphone; the PANTECH Discover smartphone; and the PANTECH Element tablet which, at a minimum, directly infringe the '748 patent. AT&T is thereby liable for infringement of the '748 patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a). AT&T's infringement has caused damage to ADAPTIX, which infringement and damage will continue unless and until AT&T is enjoined. AT&T is thereby liable for infringement of the '748 patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

36. Based upon information set forth in the preceding two paragraphs, on information and belief both PANTECH and AT&T have and continue to directly and jointly infringe one or more claims of the '748 patent in this judicial district and/or elsewhere in Texas and the United States, including at least claims 6 and 8 by, among other things, making, using, offering for sale, selling and/or importing computerized communications devices including, without limitation, the PANTECH Burst smartphone; the PANTECH Flex smartphone; the PANTECH Discover smartphone; and the PANTECH Element tablet which, at a minimum, directly infringe the '748 patent. Thereby, PANTECH and AT&T are jointly liable for infringement of the '748 patent

pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a). PANTECH's and AT&T's joint infringement has caused damage to ADAPTIX, which infringement and damage will continue unless and until PANTECH and AT&T are enjoined.

(Indirect Infringement - Inducement)

37. Based on the information presently available to ADAPTIX, absent discovery, and in the alternative to direct infringement, ADAPTIX contends that PANTECH has and continues to indirectly infringe one or more claims of the '748 patent, including at least claims 6 and 8 by, among other things, making, selling, testing, and/or importing the PANTECH Burst smartphone; the PANTECH Flex smartphone; the PANTECH Discover smartphone; and the PANTECH Element tablet, and/or advertising the LTE capability of the PANTECH Burst smartphone; the PANTECH Flex smartphone; the PANTECH Discover smartphone; and the PANTECH Element tablet which, at a minimum, directly infringe the '748 patent. PANTECH's end users who purchase systems and components thereof and operate such systems and components in accordance with PANTECH's instructions directly infringe one or more claims of the '748 patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b). PANTECH's infringement has caused damage to ADAPTIX, which infringement and damage to ADAPTIX will continue unless and until PANTECH is enjoined. PANTECH is thereby liable for infringement of the '748 patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(b).

38. Based on the information presently available to ADAPTIX, absent discovery, and in the alternative to direct infringement, ADAPTIX contends that AT&T has and continues to indirectly infringe one or more claims of the '748 patent, including at least claims 6 and 8 by, among other things, taking active steps to encourage and facilitate its customers to purchase and use the PANTECH Burst smartphone; the PANTECH Flex smartphone; the PANTECH Discover

smartphone; and the PANTECH Element tablet which, at a minimum, directly infringe the '748 patent. AT&T's customers who purchase systems and components thereof and operate such systems and components in accordance with AT&T's instructions directly infringe one or more claims of the '748 patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b). AT&T's infringement has caused damage to ADAPTIX, which infringement and damage to ADAPTIX will continue unless and until AT&T is enjoined. AT&T is thereby liable for infringement of the '748 patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(b).

39. On information and belief, Defendants have been on notice of the '748 patent since at least service of this action. Additionally, both defendants have been on notice of the '748 patent as they are parties to a similar action concerning the same patent.³ In accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b)(3), ADAPTIX will likely have additional evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery on this issue.

40. On information and belief, since Defendants have been on notice of the '748 patent since at least service of this action, Defendants have been knowingly inducing infringement of the '748 patent, including at least claims 6 and 8 of the '748 patent, while also possessing the specific intent to encourage others' infringement.

41. On information and belief, since Defendants have been on notice of the '748 patent since at least service of this action, Defendants knew or should have known that their actions would induce actual infringement of the '748 patent.

42. Defendants have not produced any evidence as to any investigation, design around or that any remedial action was taken with respect to the '748 patent. In accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b)(3), ADAPTIX will likely have additional evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for discovery on this issue.

³ See n.1, *supra*.

(Indirect Infringement - Contributory)

43. Based on the information presently available to ADAPTIX, absent discovery, and in the alternative to direct infringement, ADAPTIX contends that PANTECH has and continues to indirectly infringe one or more claims of the '748 patent, including at least claims 19 and 21 by, among other things, contributing to the direct infringement of others, including entities such as AT&T and end users of PANTECH's computerized communications devices, including without limitation the PANTECH Burst smartphone; the PANTECH Flex smartphone; the PANTECH Discover smartphone; and the PANTECH Element tablet, through supplying infringing systems and components, that infringe one or more claims of the '748 patent, including at least claims 19 and 21, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(c).

44. Based on the information presently available to ADAPTIX, absent discovery, and in the alternative to direct infringement, ADAPTIX contends that AT&T has and continues to indirectly infringe one or more claims of the '748 patent, including at least claims 19 and 21 by, among other things, contributing to the direct infringement of others, including entities such as customers of AT&T's computerized communications devices, including without limitation the PANTECH Burst smartphone; the PANTECH Flex smartphone; the PANTECH Discover smartphone; and the PANTECH Element tablet, through supplying infringing systems and components, that infringe one or more claims of the '748 patent, including at least claims 19 and 21, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(c).

45. Defendants have and continue to contribute to the direct infringement of others, such as end users of Defendants' computerized communications devices, by making, offering to sell, selling, re-selling, and/or importing into the United States a component of a patented apparatus that constitutes a material part of the invention, knowing the same to be especially

made or especially adapted for use in infringement of the '748 patent and not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use. An example of such a material component offered for sale, sold, and/or imported by Defendants is Defendants' computerized communications devices and the technology associated therewith.

46. On information and belief, Defendants have been on notice of the '748 patent since at least service of this action, or before, but has continued since that time to cause others to directly infringe the '748 patent as alleged herein. In accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b)(3), ADAPTIX will likely have additional evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery on this issue.

47. Since Defendants have been on notice of the '748 patent since at least service of this action, Defendants knew or should have known that Defendants' computerized communications devices and the technology associated therewith constituted material components of the inventions claimed in the '748 patent, are especially made or especially adapted for use in infringement of the '748 patent, and are not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.

48. By virtue of at least this Complaint, Defendants have been provided with written notice of ADPATIX's allegations that Defendants have and continue to contributorily infringe the '748 patent and written identification of exemplar products that infringe one or more claims of the '748 patent (e.g., systems used by end users of Defendants' computerized communications devices) and written notice of an exemplar material part of these devices (e.g., Defendants' computerized communications devices and the technology associated therewith) that are especially made or especially adapted for use in infringing the '748 patent and are not staple articles or commodities of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

ADAPTIX requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable by right pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 38.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, ADAPTIX respectfully requests that this Court enter:

- A. Judgment in favor of ADAPTIX that each defendant has infringed the '212 and '748 patents, directly and indirectly, as aforesaid;
- B. A permanent injunction enjoining each defendant, its officers, directors, agents, servants, affiliates, employees, divisions, branches, subsidiaries, parents and all others acting in active concert or privity therewith from direct and/or indirect infringement of the '212 and '748 patents pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 283;
- C. An order requiring each defendant to pay ADAPTIX its damages with pre- and post-judgment interest and costs thereon pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284;
- D. A determination that this case is exceptional pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285; and
- E. Any and all further relief to which the Court may deem ADAPTIX is entitled.

Date: October 15, 2013

ADAPTIX, INC.

By: /s/ Craig Tadlock

Craig Tadlock

Texas State Bar No. 00791766

Keith Smiley

Texas State Bar No. 24067869

TADLOCK LAW FIRM PLLC

2701 Dallas Parkway, Suite 360

Plano, Texas 75093

Phone: (903) 730-6789

Email: craig@tadlocklawfirm.com

Email: keith@tadlocklawfirm.com

Paul J. Hayes

Samiyah Diaz

Steven E. Lipman

HAYES, MESSINA, GILMAN & HAYES LLC

200 State Street, 6th Floor

Boston, MA 02109

Tel: (978) 809-3850

Fax: (617) 443-1999

Email: phayes@hayesmessina.com

Email: sdiaz@hayesmessina.com

Email: slipman@hayesmessina.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF

ADAPTIX, INC.