| 1 | Matt Olavi, Esq. (Bar No. 265945) | |
|----------|--|--|
| 2 | molavi@olavidunne.com | |
| | Brian J. Dunne, Esq. (Bar No. 275689) | |
| 3 | bdunne@olavidunne.com OLAVI DUNNE LLP | |
| 4 | 800 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 320 | |
| 5 | Los Angeles, California 90017 | |
| 6 | Telephone: (213) 516-7900 Facsimile: (213) 516-7910 | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | Attorneys for Plaintiff Eclipse IP LLC | |
| 9 | UNITED STATE | S DISTRICT COURT |
| 10 | CENTRAL DISTR | ICT OF CALIFORNIA |
| 11 | ECLIPSE IP LLC, a Florida Limited |) Case No. 2:13-cv-06650-SJO-FFM |
| 12 | Liability Company, |) > EIDST AMENDED COMDI AINT |
| 13 | Plaintiff, |) FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT) FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT |
| 14 | , Y |)) TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED |
| 15 | V. |) INIAL DI JONI DEMANDED |
| 16 | AIR CANADA, a Canadian |) |
| 17 | Corporation, |) |
| 18 | Defendant. |) |
| 19 | | _) |
| 20 | | |
| 20 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |
| | | |
| | FIRST AMENDED COMPLAIN | T FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT |
| | | |

| 1 | Plaintiff Eclipse IP LLC ("Eclipse"), by and through counsel, complains | | |
|----------|---|--|--|
| 2 | against Air Canada as follows: | | |
| 3 4 | NATURE OF LAWSUIT | | |
| 5 | 1. This is a suit for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of | | |
| 6 | the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code § 1 et seq. This Court has | | |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | exclusive jurisdiction over the subject matter of the Complaint under 28 U.S.C. | | |
| 9 | §§ 1331 and 1338(a). | | |
| 10 | PARTIES AND PATENTS | | |
| 11 12 | 2. Eclipse is a company organized under the laws of Florida and having a | | |
| 13 | principal place of business at 115 NW 17 th St, Delray Beach, Florida 33444. | | |
| 14 | 3. Eclipse owns all right, title, and interest in and has standing to sue for | | |
| 15 16 | infringement of United States Patent No. 7,119,716 ("the '716 patent"), entitled | | |
| 16 17 | "Response systems and methods for notification systems for modifying future | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | notifications" (Exhibit A) and United States Patent No. 7,504,966 ("the '966 | | |
| 20 | patent"), entitled "Response systems and methods for notification systems for | | |
| 21 | modifying future notifications" (Exhibit B) (collectively, "the Eclipse Patents"). | | |
| 22 | 4. On information and belief, Air Canada is a corporation existing under | | |
| 23 24 | the laws of Canada. | | |
| 25 | 5. On information and belief, Air Canada does regular business in this | | |
| 26 | Judicial District and conduct leading to Air Canada's acts of infringement has | | |
| 27 | | | |
| 28 | occurred in this Judicial District. | | |
| | FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT | | |
| | | | |

| | 1 |
|---|---|
| | 2 |
| | 3 |
| | 4 |
| | 5 |
| | 6 |
| | 7 |
| | 8 |
| | 9 |
| 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 |
| 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 5 |
| 1 | 6 |
| 1 | 7 |
| 1 | 8 |
| | |

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2 This Court has personal jurisdiction over Air Canada because it has 6. 3 engaged in continuous and systematic business in California; upon information and 4 belief, derives substantial revenues from commercial activities in California; and, 5 6 upon information and belief, is operating and/or supporting products or services that 7 fall within one or more claims of Eclipse's patents in this District. 8 9 7. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and (c) and 0 28 U.S.C. § 1400(a) at least because the claim arises in this Judicial District, Air 1 Canada may be found and transacts business in this Judicial District, and injuries 2 3 suffered by Plaintiff took place in this Judicial District. Air Canada is subject to the 4 general and specific personal jurisdiction of this Court at least because of its 5 contacts with the State of California. 6 7 FACTUAL BACKGROUND 8 8. On information and belief, Air Canada is an airline that offers domestic 19 and international flights from cities across the United States, including many from 20 21 Los Angeles. 22 On information and belief, Air Canada creates and maintains a 9. 23 timetable for every scheduled Air Canada flight, which includes a scheduled 24 25 departure time and a scheduled arrival time for every Air Canada flight. 26 On information and belief, Air Canada, either on its own or through its 10. 27 agents, monitors the location of its various airplanes, and based at least in part on 28 FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

the location of a given airplane, determines whether a particular flight will depart 1 2 from its scheduled departure city and/or whether a particular flight will arrive at its 3 scheduled arrival city earlier than the scheduled time, at the scheduled time, or later 4 5 than the scheduled time. 6 On information and belief, Air Canada also uses the location of its 11. 7 various planes to determine whether or not to cancel flights. 8 9 12. On information and belief, Air Canada uses, makes, deploys, 10 advertises, and/or operates at lease one system and/or service (the "Air Canada 11 System") that can automatically notify one or more individuals about the status of a 12 13 flight. 14 13. On information and belief, as one non-limiting example, the Air 15 Canada System can automatically notify one or more individuals whether a flight is 16 17 delayed, or cancelled a set number of hours before the flight is scheduled to depart. 18 On information and belief, as another non-limiting example, the Air 14. 19 Canada System can automatically notify one or more individuals that the departure 20 21 of a scheduled flight will be delayed. 22 On information and belief, these notifications can occur through at least 15. 23 one communications method, including but not limited to through email and SMS 24 25 messages, and that the one or more individuals can select or modify which of the at 26 least one communications method should be used. 27 28 FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

AIR CANADA'S ACTS OF PATENT INFRINGEMENT 1 2 16. Eclipse reiterates and reincorporates the allegations set forth in 3 paragraphs 1 through 15 above as if fully set forth herein. 4 5 17. Air Canada owns, uses, deploys, and/or operates at least one 6 computerized service and/or system, the Air Canada System, for notifying one or 7 more individuals regarding flight departure and/or arrival times. 8 9 18. Based at least in part on the location of an Air Canada airplane, the Air 10 Canada System provides electronic notifications to one or more individuals 11 regarding flight departure and/or arrival times. 12 13 **CLAIMS FOR RELIEF** 14 COUNT 1 15 (Patent Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 7,119,716 Under 35 U.S.C. § 271 *et seq.*) 16 17 Eclipse reiterates and reincorporates the allegations set forth in 19. 18 paragraphs 1 through 18 above as if fully set forth herein. 19 20. On October 10, 2006, the United States Patent and Trademark Office 20 21 duly and legally issued United States Patent No. 7,119,716, entitled "Response 22 systems and methods for notification systems for modifying future notifications." 23 Eclipse is the owner of the entire right, title and interest in and to the '716 patent. A 24 25 true and correct copy of the '716 patent is attached as Exhibit A to this Complaint. 26 The '716 patent is valid and enforceable. 21. 27 28 FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Eclipse is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that: (1) Air 22. 1 2 Canada has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims of the '716 3 patent, literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents and additionally and/or in 4 the alternative, (2) Air Canada has actively induced and continues to actively induce 5 6 and/or has contributed to and continues to contribute to the infringement of one or 7 more claims of the '716 patent in this District and elsewhere in the United States. 8 9 23. On information and belief, Air Canada has directly infringed and 10 continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the '716 patent, in violation of 11 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), by, among other things, making, using, offering for sale, and/or 12 13 selling a method for communications in connection with a computer-based 14 notification system to, for example: store contact data in computer memory; provide 15 electronic notification communications to a personal communications device based 16 17 on the contact data; receive changes to the contact data; and modify if and/or how 18 future notification communications will be sent. 19 24. Additionally and/or in the alternative, on information and belief, Air 20 21 Canada has actively induced and continues to actively induce and/or has contributed 22 to and continues to contribute to the infringement of one or more claims of the '716 23 patent, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) and/or (c), by, among other things, 24 25 actively, knowingly, and intentionally encouraging, aiding, and/or abetting others to 26 make, use, offer for sale, and/or sell portions of a computer-based notification 27 system that infringes one or more claims of the '716 patent, with the specific intent 28 FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

- to encourage infringement and with the knowledge that the making, using, offering
 to sell, and/or selling of such a system would constitute infringement.
- 3 25. On information and belief, Air Canada has had knowledge of the '716 4 patent at least as early as September 17, 2013, the day that it was served with a copy 5 6 of the Complaint, which set forth factual allegations of Air Canada's infringement. 7 See Dkt. No. 9. Additionally, at least as early as September 17, 2013, Air Canada 8 9 knew or should have known that its continued offering, use, deployment, and/or 10 operation of the at least one flight notification service and/or system and its 11 continued support of others, if those parties perform any limitations of one or more 12 13 of the claims of the '716 patent, would induce direct infringement of the '716 patent, 14 as it had actual knowledge of the patent and factual allegations of its infringement 15 thereof. 16 17 On information and belief, Air Canada has not changed or modified its 26. 18

infringing behavior since September 17, 2013.

20 27. Air Canada's aforesaid infringing activity has directly and proximately
21 caused damage to Plaintiff Eclipse, including loss of profits from sales and/or
22 licensing revenues it would have made but for the infringements. Unless enjoined,
23 the aforesaid infringing activity will continue and cause irreparable injury to Eclipse
25 for which there is no adequate remedy at law.
26 ///

- 27
- 28

COUNT 2 1 (Patent Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 7,504,966 2 Under 35 U.S.C. § 271 *et seq.*) 3 28. Eclipse reiterates and reincorporates the allegations set forth in 4 5 paragraphs 1 through 27 above as if fully set forth herein. 6 On March 17, 2009, the United States Patent and Trademark Office 29. 7 duly and legally issued United States Patent No. 7,504,966, entitled "Response 8 9 systems and methods for notification systems for modifying future notifications." 10 Eclipse is the owner of the entire right, title and interest in and to the '966 patent. A 11 true and correct copy of the '966 patent is attached as Exhibit B to this Complaint. 12 13 The '966 patent is valid and enforceable. 30. 14 Eclipse is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that: (1) Air 31. 15 Canada has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims of the '966 16 17 patent, literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents and additionally and/or in 18 the alternative, (2) Air Canada has actively induced and continues to actively induce 19 and/or has contributed to and continues to contribute to the infringement of one or 20 21 more claims of the '966 patent in this District and elsewhere in the United States. 22 On information and belief, Air Canada has directly infringed and 32. 23 continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the '966 patent, in violation of 24 25 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), by, among other things, making, using, offering for sale, and/or 26 selling a method for communications in connection with a computer-based 27 notification system to, for example: monitor the location of a plane; send a 28 FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

notification communication to a personal communications device when appropriate; 1 2 receive a response from the personal communications device; and based upon the 3 response, initiate one or more future notifications to one or more different 4 individuals. 5

6

Additionally and/or in the alternative, on information and belief, Air 33. 7 Canada has actively induced and continues to actively induce and/or has contributed 8 9 to and continues to contribute to the infringement of one or more claims of the '966 10 patent, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) and/or (c), by, among other things, 11 actively, knowingly, and intentionally encouraging, aiding, and/or abetting others to 12 13 make, use, offer for sale, and/or sell portions of a computer-based notification 14 system that infringes one or more claims of the '966 patent, with the specific intent 15 to encourage infringement and with the knowledge that the making, using, offering 16 17 to sell, and/or selling of such a system would constitute infringement.

18 On information and belief, Air Canada has had knowledge of the '966 34. 19 patent at least as early as September 17, 2013, the day that it was served with a copy 20 21 of the Complaint, which set forth factual allegations of Air Canada's infringement. 22 See Dkt. No. 9. Additionally, at least as early as September 17, 2013, Air Canada 23 knew or should have known that its continued offering, use, deployment, and/or 24 25 operation of the at least one flight notification service and/or system and its 26 continued support of others, if those parties perform any limitations of one or more 27 of the claims of the '966 patent, would induce direct infringement of the '966 patent, 28

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

as it had actual knowledge of the patent and factual allegations of its infringement 1 2 thereof. 3 35. On information and belief, Air Canada has not changed or modified its 4 infringing behavior since September 17, 2013. 5 6 Air Canada's aforesaid infringing activity has directly and proximately 36. 7 caused damage to Plaintiff Eclipse, including loss of profits from sales and/or 8 9 licensing revenues it would have made but for the infringements. Unless enjoined, 10 the aforesaid infringing activity will continue and cause irreparable injury to Eclipse 11 for which there is no adequate remedy at law. 12 13 PRAYER FOR RELIEF 14 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Eclipse asks this Court to enter judgment against Air 15 Canada and against each of Air Canada's respective subsidiaries, affiliates, agents, 16 17 servants, employees and all persons in active concert or participation with it, 18 granting the following relief: 19 A judgment that Air Canada has infringed each and every one of the 1. 20 21 **Eclipse Patents;** 22 2. A permanent injunction against Air Canada, its respective officers, 23 agents, servants, employees, attorneys, parent and subsidiary corporations, assigns 24 25 and successors in interest, and those persons in active concert or participation with 26 them, enjoining them from direct and indirect infringement of each and every one of 27 the Eclipse Patents; 28 FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

| 1 | 3. | An award of damages adequate to compensate Eclipse for the | |
|----------|--|---|--|
| 2 | infringement that has occurred, together with prejudgment interest from the date | | |
| 3 4 | infringement of the Eclipse Patents began; | | |
| 5 | 4. | A reasonable royalty for Air Canada's use of Eclipse's patented | |
| 6 | technology, as alleged herein; | | |
| 7 8 | 5. | An award to Eclipse of all remedies available under 35 U.S.C. §§ 284 | |
| o 9 | and 285; and, | | |
| 10 | 6. | Such other and further relief as this Court or a jury may deem proper | |
| 11 | and just. | | |
| 12 13 | and just. | | |
| 13 14 | | | |
| 15 | DATED: (| October 21, 2013 OLAVI DUNNE LLP | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 18 | | By: <u>/s/ Matt Olavi</u> | |
| 10 19 | | Matt Olavi Brian J. Dunne | |
| 20 | | Attorneys for Plaintiff Eclipse IP LLC | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 23 | /// | | |
| 24 | /// | | |
| 25 | /// | | |
| 26 | /// | | |
| 27 28 | /// | | |
| | | 10 | |
| | FIRS' | T AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT | |

| 1 | JURY DEMAND | | |
|----------|--|--|--|
| 2 | Eclipse demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable pursuant to Federal | | |
| 3 | | | |
| 4 | Rule of Civil Procedure 38. | | |
| 5 | | | |
| 6 7 | DATED: October 21, 2013 OLAVI DUNNE LLP | | |
| 8 | | | |
| 9 | By: <u>/s/ Matt Olavi</u> | | |
| 10 | Matt Olavi | | |
| 11 | Brian J. Dunne | | |
| 12 | Attorneys for Plaintiff Eclipse IP LLC | | |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 17 | | | |
| 17 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| 26 | | | |
| 27 | | | |
| 28 | 11 | | |
| | FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT | | |
| | | | |