

The Markow Law Group
Gregory S. Markow (Cal. Bar No. 216748)
E-mail: gsm@markowlaw.com
600 West Broadway, Suite 700
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: 619.500.3644
Facsimile: 619.272.7090

Attorneys for Plaintiff
Rothschild GPS Sharing Innovations, LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROTHSCHILD GPS SHARING
INNOVATIONS, LLC,

Plaintiff,

vs.

NISSAN NORTH AMERICA, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. **'14CV0819 GPC NLS**

**COMPLAINT FOR PATENT
INFRINGEMENT**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Judge:

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Rothschild GPS Sharing Innovations, LLC for its Complaint for patent infringement against Defendant Nissan North America, Inc. alleges as follows:

NATURE OF THE LAWSUIT

1. This is a claim for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code.

PARTIES

2. Plaintiff Rothschild GPS Sharing Innovations, LLC (“Rothschild GPS Sharing Innovations”) is a Florida corporation with its principal place of business at 1108 Kane Concourse, Suite #310, Bay Harbor Islands, FL 33154.

1 3. Rothschild GPS Sharing Innovations is the owner of record and assignee of US
2 Patent No. 7,917,285 (“the ‘285 Patent”). Rothschild GPS Sharing Innovations has and has
3 had the exclusive right to enforce and collect damages for infringement of the ‘285 Patent
4 during all relevant time periods. One of the principal investors in Rothschild GPS Sharing
5 Innovations is Leigh Rothschild, who was the sole inventor of the ‘285 Patent.
6

7 4. On information and belief, Defendant Nissan North America, Inc. (“Nissan”) is
8 organized and existing under the laws of the State of California, having its principal place of
9 business at One Nissan Way, Franklin, TN 37067 and having a place of business in
10 numerous locations in this District, including one at 9800 Campus Point Drive, San Diego,
11 CA 92121. Nissan’s registered agent in California is: Corporation Service Company d/b/a
12 CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Service at 2710 Gateway Oaks Dr., Suite 150N, Sacramento,
13 CA, 95833.
14
15

16 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

17 5. This is a civil action for patent infringement arising under the Patent Laws of
18 the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1, *et seq.*, and more particularly 35 U.S.C. § 271.
19

20 6. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action under 28
21 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

22 7. Personal jurisdiction over the defendant is proper under C.C.P. § 410.10 and
23 the United States Constitution because this action arises from the Defendant’s commission of
24 at least (a) transacting business and (b) committing the complained of tortious acts within
25 this jurisdiction and because Defendant is incorporated in California.
26

27 8. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 (b), (c) and 1400(b).
28

1 **THE PATENT-IN-SUIT**

2 9. On March 29, 2011, the ‘285 Patent, entitled “Device, System and Method for
3 Remotely Entering, Storing and Sharing Addresses for a Positional Information Device” was
4 duly and legally issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. A true and
5 correct copy of the ‘285 Patent is attached as Exhibit A.

6
7 10. The ‘285 Patent was previously assigned to Qaxaz LLC and has been asserted
8 in two previous patent infringement lawsuits, resulting in nine licensees of the ‘285 patent.
9 These previous actions include: *Qaxaz LLC v. BMW of North America LLC. et al*, Case No.
10 11 CV 00491, (D. Del.) and *Qaxaz LLC v. Alpine Electronics of America, Inc. et al*, Case
11 No. 11 CV 00491, (D. Del.). The defendants in those actions included major automobile
12 manufacturers such as BMW, Ford, GM, Mercedes-Benz, and Toyota.
13
14

15 **Nissan’s Knowledge Of The ‘285 Patent, How It Is Infringed,
16 And Continued Infringement Despite That Knowledge**

17 11. Nissan has been aware of the ‘285 Patent no later than approximately October
18 11, 2013, when a letter dated October 8, 2013 was delivered by Federal Express to Nissan.
19 The letter identified the ‘285 Patent and also included a claim chart setting forth Rothschild
20 GPS Sharing Innovations’ contention of infringement of claim 1 of the ‘285 Patent, thereby
21 making Nissan aware of the activities that constitute infringement.
22

23 12. In addition to the October 11, 2013 letter and claim chart, this Complaint
24 serves as additional notice to Nissan of the ‘285 Patent and the manner in which it is
25 infringed.
26

27 13. Rothschild GPS Sharing Innovations, through counsel, has corresponded with
28 Nissan several times since the October 11, 2013 letter (including phone calls and or emails in

1 October, November, December, January, and February), but Nissan has not agreed to license
2 the '285 Patent and has not explained why a license is not necessary.

3
4 14. With knowledge of the '285 Patent and knowledge of the manner in which the
5 '285 Patent is infringed, Nissan has continued to produce and distribute systems, including at
6 least the NissanConnect™ and Infiniti Connection™ systems discussed below that infringe
7 the '285 Patent.

8
9 15. Nissan manufactures, sells, and imports automobiles under both the Nissan and
10 Infiniti brands. On information and belief, Infiniti is a brand owned by and a division of
11 Nissan's parent company Nissan Motor Company, Ltd.

12
13 16. In some of the automobiles it manufactures and sells, Nissan offers an option
14 called "NissanConnect™" or "Infiniti Connection™" that enables users to remotely connect
15 with their automobiles, including a feature that enables users to find locations/destinations
16 using a desktop computer and/or a mobile application and send the locations/destinations to
17 the navigation systems in their automobiles.

18
19 17. On information and belief, Nissan owns or controls the NissanConnect™ and
20 Infiniti Connection™ servers. These servers receive a request for an address of a location
21 not already stored in a positional information device, determine the address and transmit the
22 determined address to the positional information device (*i.e.*, a Nissan or Infiniti car with a
23 navigation system).

24
25 18. In light of its knowledge of the '285 Patent, knowledge of the manner in which
26 it is infringed, and refusal to license the '285 Patent, Nissan was objectively reckless in
27 continuing to engage in actions that directly and indirectly infringe the '285 Patent. Nissan
28

1 knew or should have known that there was an objectively high likelihood that its actions
2 constituted infringement of a valid patent.

3
4 **COUNT I: DIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF THE '285 PATENT**

5 19. Rothschild GPS Sharing Innovations incorporates by reference the allegations
6 set forth in paragraphs 1 through 18 of this Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

7 20. By making, using, selling, or offering for sale in this District and elsewhere in
8 the United States, without authorization or license from Rothschild GPS Sharing
9 Innovations, products or systems covered by one or more claims of the '285 Patent,
10 Defendant Nissan has been and is currently infringing the '285 Patent directly in violation of
11 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).
12

13 21. Nissan has and controls a server computer and makes, uses, sells, and offers for
14 sale a positional information device (*e.g.*, the in car navigation unit), that together meet each
15 and every element of one or more of the claims in the '285 patent, resulting in direct
16 infringement of the '285 patent.
17

18 22. Nissan's conduct is willful and deliberate.
19

20 23. As a direct and proximate result of Nissan's acts, Rothschild GPS Sharing
21 Innovations has been and continues to be injured, has sustained, and will continue to sustain,
22 substantial damages in an amount not yet determined.
23

24 **COUNT II: INDUCING INFRINGEMENT OF THE '285 PATENT**

25 24. Rothschild GPS Sharing Innovations incorporates by reference the allegations
26 set forth in paragraphs 1 through 18 and 19 through 23 of this Complaint as though set forth
27 fully herein.
28

1 25. Nissan, through previous correspondence from Rothschild GPS Sharing
2 Innovations, and based upon this Complaint, is actually aware of the '285 patent and the acts
3 that constitute infringing conduct.
4

5 26. With knowledge of the '285 patent and knowledge of the acts that constitute
6 infringement of the '285 patent, Nissan acted with the specific intent to induce the direct
7 infringement of the '285 patent.
8

9 27. Specific acts undertaken by Nissan to induce infringement of the claims of the
10 '285 patent include: (1) producing and selling positional information devices (*e.g.*, in-vehicle
11 navigation units) that can receive addresses remotely; (2) producing and distributing a
12 mobile application that enables individuals to send addresses to their vehicles; (3)
13 maintaining and controlling a website that enables individuals to send addresses to their
14 vehicles; and (4) expressly encouraging or instructing individuals to search for an address
15 and send it to their vehicles.
16

17 28. Nissan's customers directly infringe the '285 Patent when they use the claimed
18 system by putting the system into service (*e.g.*, by remotely requesting an address and
19 sending it to their vehicles) thereby controlling the system as a whole and obtaining a benefit
20 from it (*e.g.*, the address is sent to the customers' vehicles).
21

22 29. Nissan is liable to Rothschild GPS Sharing Innovations for inducing
23 infringement of the '285 Patent, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b).
24

25 30. Nissan's conduct is willful and deliberate.
26
27
28

1 31. As a direct and proximate result of Nissan’s acts, Rothschild GPS Sharing
2 Innovations has been and continues to be injured, has sustained, and will continue to sustain,
3 substantial damages in an amount not yet determined.
4

5 **REQUEST FOR RELIEF**

6 WHEREFORE, Rothschild GPS Sharing Innovations requests that this Court enter
7 judgment:
8

- 9 A. Adjudging, finding and declaring that Nissan has directly infringed and indirectly
10 infringed (via induced infringement) the asserted claims of the Patent-In-Suit under
11 35 U.S.C. § 271;
12 B. Adjudging, finding and declaring that infringement by Nissan is willful and
13 deliberate;
14 C. Ordering Nissan to pay Rothschild GPS Sharing Innovations an amount that, as
15 adequately as possible, compensates Rothschild GPS Sharing Innovations for
16 infringement by Nissan, in no event less than a reasonable royalty fee;
17 D. Ordering Nissan to pay court costs, pre-judgment interest, post-judgment interest, and
18 attorneys’ fees under 35 U.S.C. §§ 284 and 285;
19 E. Finding that this is an “exceptional” case pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285, and awarding
20 enhanced damages up to and including treble the amount of damages and the payment
21 of attorneys’ fees; and
22 F. Granting Rothschild GPS Sharing Innovations such other and further relief as is just
23 and proper, or as the Court deems appropriate.
24
25
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

JURY DEMAND

Rothschild GPS Sharing Innovations demands a trial by jury on all issues that may be so tried.

Dated: April 7, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Gregory Markow

Gregory S. Markow (Cal. Bar No. 216748)

E-mail: gsm@markowlaw.com

600 West Broadway, Suite 700

San Diego, CA 92101

Telephone: 619.500.3644

Facsimile: 619.272.7090

David Berten (IL Bar No. 6200898)

(pro hac vice to be filed)

E-mail: dberten@giplg.com

Alexander Debski (IL Bar No. 6305715)

(pro hac vice to be filed)

E-mail: adebski@giplg.com

Global IP Law Group, LLC

233 South Wacker Drive, 92nd Floor

Chicago, IL 60606

T: (312) 241-1500

F: (312) 241-1522

Attorneys for Plaintiff Rothschild GPS

Sharing Innovations, LLC.