

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

**EMSAT ADVANCED GEO-LOCATION
TECHNOLOGY, LLC**

and

LOCATION BASED SERVICES LLC,

Plaintiffs,

v.

**UNITED STATES CELLULAR
CORPORATION,**

Defendant.

Case No. 4:09-cv-2313

PATENT CASE

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

Plaintiffs EMSAT Advanced Geo-Location Technology, LLC (“EMSAT”) and Location Based Services LLC (“LBS”) file this First Amended Complaint against United States Cellular Corporation (“US Cellular” or “Defendant”) for infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,847,822 (the “’822 patent”).

THE PARTIES

1. Plaintiff EMSAT is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the State of Nevada with its principal place of business located at 101 Southbend Court, Loveland, Ohio.

2. Plaintiff LBS is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware with its principal place of business located at 500 Newport Center Drive, Newport Beach, California.

3. US Cellular is a corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its principal executive offices at 8410 West Bryn Mawr, Suite 700, Chicago, Illinois, 60631.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This is an action for infringement of United States patents arising under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271, 281, and 284-285, among others. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction of the action under Title 28 U.S.C. §1331 and §1338(a).

5. The Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant, and venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400(b). Defendant has substantial contacts with the forum as a result of pervasive business activities conducted within the State of Ohio and within this District, including but not limited to: (i) the marketing, sale and distribution of cellular telephones and (ii) the marketing and sale of services for cellular telephone communications.

6. Defendant has committed acts of patent infringement, directly and/or through agents and intermediaries, by using, shipping, distributing, importing, offering for sale, and/or selling certain infringing products, services, and systems in Ohio and, particularly, the Northern District of Ohio. Specifically, Defendant has purposefully and voluntarily placed one or more of its infringing products, services, and/or systems into the stream of commerce with the expectation that they will be purchased and used by consumers in this District, which products, services, and/or systems have been purchased and used by consumers in this District. Defendant also provided support for its infringing products, services, and systems to their respective customers in the District.

BACKGROUND

7. On January 25, 2005, United States Patent No. 6,847,822 (“the ’822 patent”) was issued for a “Cellular Telephone System That Uses Position of a Mobile Unit to Make Call Management Decisions.” A true and correct copy of the ’822 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit “A” and made a part hereof.

8. Plaintiff EMSAT is the assignee of the ’822 patent. Plaintiff LBS is the exclusive licensee of the ’822 patent and possesses all rights of recovery under it, including the right to prosecute this action and to collect damages for all relevant times.

9. The ’822 patent relates to systems and methods for combining certain features of cellular, or “wireless,” telephone systems with location-finding technology to create location-aware networks that can determine the exact geographic locations of telephones and, in turn, use that information to improve network operations. In particular, the ’822 patent allows for increased accuracy in determining the location of a mobile phone for the purpose of transmitting location information to nearby emergency call centers, known as “Public Safety Answering Points” (“PSAPs”).

10. In 1996, the Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) established the Enhanced 911 (“E911”) program. Under “Phase 2” of the E911 program, all cellular telephone service providers in the United States must be capable of providing the location of cellular telephones to PSAPs with a specified accuracy for a specified percentage of wireless calls.

11. The methods and systems involved in deploying a mobile E911 system, as described above, are substantially similar to those required to deploy so-called “commercial” location-based services to cell phone subscribers. In fact, commentators have asserted that the FCC-required development of mobile E911 systems allowed the wireless carriers, such as

Defendants, to develop and deploy commercial location-based services. These location-based services permit the cell phone user, often for a fee, to use his or her cell phone as a navigation device, to locate nearby products and services, and to find friends, among other things.

12. Upon information and belief, and at all pertinent times, Defendant made, had made, deployed, used, operated, sold, and offered for sale the above-described E911 systems for cellular telephones. These systems infringe the '822 patent. Exhibit B, attached hereto, is a printout from Defendant's website as of February 18, 2014 regarding its E911 program.

13. Representative claim 21 of the '822 patent (which depends from claim 10) is comprised of the following elements:

A cellular communications network comprising:

a cellular communication network comprising a plurality of cell sites and a plurality of mobile units, for radio frequency communication between said cell sites and mobile units, at least one of said cell sites receiving an identification of a specific mobile unit, said cellular communication network communicating with said specific mobile unit via a cell site chosen based upon signal strength,

a positioning system obtaining a position for said specific mobile unit identifying an exact geographic location of the specific mobile unit,

a data storage system for recording said exact geographic location and specific mobile unit identification for use in subsequent services.

The cellular communication system of claim 10 wherein said data storage system makes said exact geographic location information accessible for emergency services provisioning.

14. The United States Patent and Trademark Office has confirmed the validity of claims of the '822 patent at least four times.

15. There are no non-infringing alternatives to the inventions described in claims 21 and 31 of the '822 patent that also meet the FCC E911 requirements.

COUNT I
(INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,847,822)

16. Plaintiffs incorporate each of the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 15 as if fully set forth herein.

17. The asserted claims of the '822 patent are valid, enforceable, and were duly issued in full compliance with Title 35 of the United States Code.

18. During the relevant time period, Defendant infringed one or more claims of the '822 patent (namely, claims 21 and 31) without Plaintiffs' consent or authorization. Such acts of infringement include Defendant's making, having made, offering for sale, selling, and/or using of mobile E911 systems.

19. Plaintiffs have been damaged as a result of Defendant's infringing conduct. Defendant is, thus, liable to Plaintiffs in an amount that adequately compensates them for Defendant's infringements, which by law, cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiffs hereby request a trial by jury pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiffs request that the Court find in their favor and against Defendant, and that the Court grant Plaintiffs the following relief:

- a. Judgment that one or more claims of United States Patent No. 6,847,822 has been infringed, either literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, by Defendant;
- b. Judgment that Defendant account for and pay to Plaintiffs all damages to and costs incurred by them because of Defendant's infringing activities and other conduct complained of herein;
- c. That Plaintiffs be granted pre-judgment and post-judgment interest on the damages caused by Defendant's infringing activities and other conduct complained of herein; and
- d. That Plaintiffs be granted such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper under the circumstances.

Dated: April 7, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

THE SIMON LAW FIRM, P.C.

By: /s/ Timothy D. Krieger
Anthony G. Simon (*pro hac vice*)
Benjamin R. Askew (*pro hac vice*)
Timothy D. Krieger (*pro hac vice*)
Stephanie H. To (*pro hac vice*)
Michael P. Kella (*pro hac vice*)
800 Market Street, Suite 1700
St. Louis, MO 63101
P. 314-241-2929
F. 314-241-2029
asimon@simonlawpc.com
baskew@simonlawpc.com
tkrieger@simonlawpc.com
sto@simonlawpc.com
mkella@simonlawpc.com

Edward R. Nelson, III (*pro hac vice*)
enelson@nbclaw.net
Texas State Bar No. 00797142
Christie B. Lindsey (*pro hac vice*)
clindsey@nbclaw.net
Texas State Bar No. 24041918
NELSON BUMGARDNER CASTO, P.C.
3131 West 7th Street, Suite 300
Fort Worth, Texas 76107
Phone: (817) 377-9111
Fax: (917) 377-3485

John F. Hill
Ohio State Bar No. 0039675
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLP
3800 Embassy Parkway, Suite 300
Akron, OH 44333-8332
T. 330-258-6404
F. 330-252-5414
jhill@bdblaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was served upon all counsel of record via the Court's CM/ECF service on April 7, 2014.

/s/ Timothy D. Krieger
Timothy D. Krieger