

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

JOAO CONTROL & MONITORING
SYSTEMS, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

VERIZON COMMUNICATIONS INC.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. _____

**ORIGINAL COMPLAINT FOR
PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiff Joao Control & Monitoring Systems, LLC (“Plaintiff” or “JCMS”), by and through its undersigned counsel, files this Original Complaint for Patent Infringement against Defendant Verizon Communications Inc. (hereinafter, “Defendant” or “Verizon”) as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This is a patent infringement action to stop Defendant's infringement of Plaintiff's United States Patent No. 6,542,076 entitled “*Control, Monitoring and/or Security Apparatus*” (the “’076 Patent”; a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A), United States Patent No. 6,542,077 entitled “*Monitoring Apparatus for a Vehicle and/or a Premises*” (the “’077 Patent”; a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B), United States Patent No. 6,549,130 entitled “*Control Apparatus and Method for Vehicles and/or for Premises*” (the “’130 Patent”; a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit C), United States Patent No. 6,587,046 entitled “*Monitoring Apparatus and Method*” (the “’046 Patent”; a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit D), United States Patent No. 7,277,010 entitled “*Monitoring Apparatus and Method*” (the “’010 Patent”; a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit E), and United States Patent No. 7,397,363 entitled “*Control and/or Monitoring Apparatus and Method*” (the “’363 Patent”; a copy of which

is attached hereto as Exhibit F) (collectively, "the Patents-in-Suit"). Plaintiff is the owner of the Patents-In-Suit. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief and monetary damages.

PARTIES

2. JCMS is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the state of Delaware. Plaintiff maintains its principal place of business at 122 Bellevue Place, Yonkers (Westchester County), New York, 10703. Plaintiff is the owner of the Patents-in-Suit, and possesses all rights thereto, including the exclusive right to exclude the Defendant from making, using, selling, offering to sell or importing in this district and elsewhere into the United States the patented invention(s) of the Patents-in-Suit, the right to sublicense the Patents-in-Suit, and to sue the Defendant for infringement and recover past damages.

3. Upon information and belief, Verizon is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware since October 7, 1983 and has its principal place of business located at 140 West Street, New York, New York, 10007. Upon information and belief, Verizon may be served through its registered agent The Corporation Trust Company, Corporation Trust Center, 1209 Orange Street, Wilmington, Delaware, 19801.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This action arises under the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1 *et seq.*, including 35 U.S.C. §§ 271, 281, 283, 284, and 285. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this case for patent infringement under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

5. The Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because: Defendant has minimum contacts within the State of Delaware and in the District of Delaware; Defendant has purposefully availed itself of the privileges of conducting business in the State of Delaware and in the District of Delaware; Defendant has sought protection and benefit from the laws of the

State of Delaware; Defendant regularly conducts business within the State of Delaware and within the District of Delaware, and Plaintiff's causes of action arise directly from Defendant's business contacts and other activities in the State of Delaware and in the District of Delaware.

6. More specifically, Defendant, directly and/or through its intermediaries, ships, distributes, offers for sale, sells, and/or advertises (including the provision of an interactive web page) its products and services in the United States, the State of Delaware, and the District of Delaware. Upon information and belief, Defendant has committed patent infringement in the State of Delaware and in the District of Delaware. Defendant solicits customers in the State of Delaware and in the District of Delaware. Defendant has many paying customers who are residents of the State of Delaware and the District of Delaware and who use Defendant's products and services in the State of Delaware and in the District of Delaware.

7. Venue is proper in the District of Delaware pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400(b).

BACKGROUND

8. The Patents-in-Suit were duly and legally issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office to Mr. Raymond A. Joao after full and fair examination. Mr. Joao assigned all rights, title and interest in and to the Patents-in-Suit to JCMS, giving JCMS the right to exclude Defendant from making, using, selling, offering to sell or importing in this district and elsewhere in the United States the patented invention(s) of the Patents-in-Suit, and the right to sublicense the Patents-in-Suit, collect damages and initiate lawsuits against the Defendant.

9. Upon information and belief, Defendant had actual knowledge of the specification and issued claims of the Patents-in-Suit, at the very latest, since June 5, 2013 when it received a letter from Mr. Raymond A. Joao addressed to Lowell C. McAdam, Chief Executive Officer of

Verizon, describing JCMS's Licensing Program for the patents in JCMS's portfolio, including the Patents-in-Suit. A copy of said letter is attached as Exhibit G.

10. On information and belief, Defendant operates, advertises, implements, and controls its website, www.terremark.com (either directly or through a third-party) as well as functionality modules and/or programming modules to support its products and services. In addition to providing information about Defendant's products and services and how to obtain them, this website provides support to Defendant's customers by providing access to various instructional guides to assist customers to install and use Defendant's products and services.

11. On information and belief, Defendant offers its customers products and services that infringe the Patents-in-Suit, including but not limited to: Verizon's "Managed Security Services on Premises," which is distributed, sold, and provided by Verizon's subsidiary, Verizon Terremark.

COUNT I: INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,542,076

12. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each of Paragraphs 1 - 11 above.

13. The '076 Patent was duly and legally issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office on April 1, 2003, after full and fair examination for systems and methods for controlling vehicles and/or premises using at least three devices. A Certificate of Correction was issued on July 1, 2003 and a second Certificate of Correction was issued on October 25, 2005. Plaintiff is the owner of the '076 Patent, and possesses all substantive rights and rights of recovery under the '076 Patent with respect to the Defendant, including the right to sue for infringement and recover past damages.

14. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant has infringed and continues to infringe the '076 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents. Upon information

and belief, Defendant has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims of the '076 Patent by making, using, providing, and/or importing, directly or through intermediaries, in this district and elsewhere in the United States, systems which are comprised of three devices that constitute a control apparatus, including but not limited to Verizon's "Managed Security Services on Premises (the "Accused Products and Services"). The control apparatus used by Defendant consists of security devices, located at a premises, a WiFi station or cellular tower, located remote from the premises, and an Internet-enabled computer or phone at a location remote from both the premises and the WiFi station or cellular tower. The security device(s) located at a premises is used to detect an event (such as a security breach, a fire or an environmental condition). When an event occurs, the security device sends a signal to the WiFi station or cellular tower, located remote from the premises, which in turn sends a signal to a an Internet-enabled computer or phone at a location remote from both the Server and from the premises, displaying to the user information regarding the event. Infringing conduct regarding this apparatus and its attendant functions take place in this district and elsewhere in the United States, enabled by and accessed through Defendant's website.

15. Upon information and belief, Defendant has intentionally induced and continues to induce infringement of one or more claims of the '076 Patent in this district and elsewhere in the United States, by its intentional acts which have successfully, among other things, encouraged, instructed, enabled, and otherwise caused Defendant's customers to use Accused Products and Services in an infringing manner. Despite knowledge of the '076 Patent as early as June 5, 2013, Defendant, upon information and belief, continues to encourage, instruct, enable, and otherwise cause its customers to use its systems, in a manner which infringes the '076 Patent. Upon information and belief, Defendant has specifically intended its customers to use its

systems in such a way that infringes the '076 Patent by, at a minimum, providing and supporting the Accused Products and Services and instructing its customers on how to use them in an infringing manner, at least through information available on Defendant's website. Defendant knew that its actions, including, but not limited to any of the aforementioned system, would induce, have induced, and will continue to induce infringement by its customers.

16. Defendant's aforesaid activities have been without authority and/or license from Plaintiff.

17. Despite its knowledge of the '076 Patent, known of at least since June 5, 2013, and without a reasonable basis for continuing the infringing activities described in the preceding paragraphs, on information and belief, Defendant has willfully infringed the '076 Patent.

18. Plaintiff is entitled to recover from Defendant the damages sustained by Plaintiff as a result of Defendant's wrongful acts in an amount subject to proof at trial, 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.

COUNT II: INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,542,077

19. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each of Paragraphs 1 - 11 above.

20. The '077 Patent was duly and legally issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office on April 1, 2003, after full and fair examination for systems for monitoring vehicles and/or premises using at least three devices. Plaintiff is the owner of the '077 Patent, and possesses all substantive rights and rights of recovery under the '077 Patent with respect to the Defendant, including the right to sue for infringement and recover past damages.

21. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant has infringed and continues to infringe the '077 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents. Upon information

and belief, Defendant has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims of the '077 Patent by making, using, providing, and/or importing, directly or through intermediaries, in this district and elsewhere in the United States, systems which are comprised of three devices that constitute a control apparatus, including but not limited to Verizon's "Managed Security Services on Premises (the "Accused Products and Services"). The control apparatus used by Defendant consists of security devices, located at a premises, a WiFi station or cellular tower, located remote from the premises, and an Internet-enabled computer or phone at a location remote from both the premises and the Server. The security device(s) located at a premises is used to monitor and detect an event (such as a security breach, a fire or an environmental condition). When an event occurs, the security device sends a signal to the WiFi station or cellular tower, located remote from the premises, which in turn sends a signal to a an Internet-enabled computer or phone at a location remote from both the WiFi station or cellular tower and from the premises, displaying to the user information regarding the event. Infringing conduct regarding this apparatus and its attendant functions take place in this district and elsewhere in the United States, enabled by and accessed through Defendant's website.

22. Upon information and belief, Defendant has intentionally induced and continues to induce infringement of one or more claims of the '077 Patent in this district and elsewhere in the United States, by its intentional acts which have successfully, among other things, encouraged, instructed, enabled, and otherwise caused Defendant's customers to use Accused Products and Services in an infringing manner. Despite knowledge of the '077 Patent as early as June 5, 2013, Defendant, upon information and belief, continues to encourage, instruct, enable, and otherwise cause its customers to use its systems, in a manner which infringes the '077 Patent. Upon information and belief, Defendant has specifically intended its customers to use its

systems in such a way that infringes the '077 Patent by, at a minimum, providing and supporting the Accused Products and Services and instructing its customers on how to use them in an infringing manner, at least through information available on Defendant's website. Defendant knew that its actions, including, but not limited to any of the aforementioned system, would induce, have induced, and will continue to induce infringement by its customers.

23. Defendant's aforesaid activities have been without authority and/or license from Plaintiff.

24. Despite its knowledge of the '077 Patent, known of at least since June 5, 2013, and without a reasonable basis for continuing the infringing activities described in the preceding paragraphs, on information and belief, Defendant has willfully infringed and continues to willfully infringe the '077 Patent.

25. Plaintiff is entitled to recover from Defendant the damages sustained by Plaintiff as a result of Defendant's wrongful acts in an amount subject to proof at trial, 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.

26. Defendant's infringement of Plaintiff's rights under the '077 Patent will continue to damage Plaintiff, causing irreparable harm for which there is no adequate remedy at law, unless enjoined by this Court.

COUNT III: INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,549,130

27. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each of Paragraphs 1 - 11 above.

28. The '130 Patent was duly and legally issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office on April 15, 2003, after full and fair examination for systems and methods for controlling vehicle or premises systems using at least three devices. A Certificate of Correction

was issued on July 1, 2003. Plaintiff is the owner of the '130 Patent and possesses all substantive rights and rights of recovery under the '130 Patent, including the right to sue for infringement and recover past damages.

29. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant has infringed and continues to infringe the '130 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents. Upon information and belief, Defendant has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims of the '130 Patent by making, using, providing, and/or importing, directly or through intermediaries, in this district and elsewhere in the United States, systems which are comprised of three devices that constitute a control apparatus, including but not limited to Verizon's "Managed Security Services on Premises (the "Accused Products and Services"). The control apparatus used by Defendant consists of a security device(s), located at a premises, a WiFi station or cellular tower, located remote from the premises, and an Internet-enabled computer or phone, at a location remote from both the premises and the WiFi station or cellular tower. The Internet-enabled computer or phone signals the WiFi station or cellular tower from a location remote from both the premises and the WiFi station or cellular tower, causing the WiFi station or cellular tower to issue a signal to the security device, located at the premises, to activate the device at a premises. Infringing conduct regarding this apparatus and its attendant functions take place in this district and elsewhere in the United States, enabled by and accessed through Defendant's Verizon Security management Center or "Dashboard".

30. Upon information and belief, Defendant has intentionally induced and continues to induce infringement of one or more claims of the '130 Patent in this district and elsewhere in the United States, by its intentional acts which have successfully, among other things, encouraged, instructed, enabled, and otherwise caused Defendant's customers to use the Accused

Products and Services in an infringing manner. Despite knowledge of the '130 Patent as early as June 5, 2013, Defendant, upon information and belief, continues to encourage, instruct, enable, and otherwise cause its customers to use its systems, in a manner which infringes the '130 Patent. Upon information and belief, Defendant has specifically intended its customers to use its systems in such a way that infringes the '130 Patent by, at a minimum, providing and supporting the Accused Products and Services and instructing its customers on how to use them in an infringing manner, at least through information available on Defendant's website. Defendant knew that its actions, including, but not limited to any of the three aforementioned systems, would induce, have induced, and will continue to induce infringement by its customers.

31. Defendant's aforesaid activities have been without authority and/or license from Plaintiff.

32. Despite its knowledge of the '130 Patent, known of at least since June 5, 2013, and without a reasonable basis for continuing the infringing activities described in the preceding paragraphs, on information and belief, Defendant has willfully infringed the '130 Patent.

33. Plaintiff is entitled to recover from Defendant the damages sustained by Plaintiff as a result of Defendant's wrongful acts in an amount subject to proof at trial, 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.

COUNT IV: INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,587,046

34. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each of Paragraphs 1 - 11 above.

35. The '046 Patent was duly and legally issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office on July 1, 2003 after full and fair examination. A Certificate of Correction was issued on January 20, 2004. Plaintiff is the owner of the '046 Patent, and possesses all right,

title and interest in the '046 Patent including the right to enforce the '046 Patent, and the right to sue Defendant for infringement and recover past damages.

36. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant has infringed and continues to infringe the '046 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents. Upon information and belief, Defendant has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims of the '046 Patent by making, using, providing, and/or importing, directly or through intermediaries, in this district and elsewhere in the United States, systems which are comprised of three devices that constitute a control apparatus, including but not limited to Verizon's "Managed Security Services on Premises (the "Accused Products and Services"). The monitoring method used by Defendant consists of transmitting video information, gathered by a recording device or camera located at a premises, to a Server (processing device), which then transmits the video information to an Internet-enabled computer or phone upon receipt of a signal from the Internet-enabled computer or phone (using Verizon software accessible via the computer or phone). The Server is remote from the premises and the user's computer or phone is remote from both the premises and the Server. This method, with its attendant products, is performed in this district and elsewhere in the United States, enabled by and accessed through Defendant's website.

37. Upon information and belief, Defendant has intentionally induced and continues to induce infringement of one or more claims of the '046 Patent in this district and elsewhere in the United States, by its intentional acts which have successfully, among other things, encouraged, instructed, enabled, and otherwise caused Defendant's customers to use the Accused Products and Services in an infringing manner. Despite knowledge of the '046 Patent as early as June 5, 2013, Defendant, upon information and belief, continues to encourage, instruct, enable, and otherwise cause its customers to use its systems, in a manner which infringes the '046

Patent. Upon information and belief, Defendant has specifically intended its customers to use its systems in such a way that infringes the '046 Patent by, at a minimum, providing and supporting the Accused Products and Services and instructing its customers on how to use them in an infringing manner, at least through information available on Defendant's website. Defendant knew that its actions, including, but not limited to any of the three aforementioned systems, would induce, have induced, and will continue to induce infringement by its customers.

38. Defendant's aforesaid activities have been without authority and/or license from Plaintiff.

39. Despite its knowledge of the '046 Patent, known of at least since June 5, 2013, and without a reasonable basis for continuing the infringing activities described in the preceding paragraphs, on information and belief, Defendant has willfully infringed and continues to willfully infringe the '046 Patent.

40. Plaintiff is entitled to recover from Defendant the damages sustained by Plaintiff as a result of Defendant's wrongful acts in an amount subject to proof at trial, 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.

41. Defendant's infringement of Plaintiff's rights under the '046 Patent will continue to damage Plaintiff, causing irreparable harm for which there is no adequate remedy at law, unless enjoined by this Court.

COUNT V: INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,277,010

42. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each of Paragraphs 1 - 11 above.

43. The '010 Patent was duly and legally issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office on October 2, 2007 after full and fair examination. Plaintiff is the owner of

the '010 Patent, and possesses all right, title and interest in the '010 Patent including the right to enforce the '010 Patent, and the right to sue Defendant for infringement and recover past damages.

44. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant has infringed and continues to infringe the '010 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents. Upon information and belief, Defendant has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims of the '010 Patent by making, using, providing, and/or importing, directly or through intermediaries, in this district and elsewhere in the United States, systems which are comprised of three devices that constitute a control apparatus, including but not limited to Verizon's "Managed Security Services on Premises (the "Accused Products and Services"). The monitoring method used by Defendant consists of transmitting video information, gathered by a recording device or camera located at a premises, to the Server and associated computer system, which, upon determination of proper authorization, transmits the video information to an Internet-enabled computer or phone upon receipt of a signal from the user's computer or phone and via the Verizon software. The Server is remote from the premises, and the user's computer or phone is remote from both the premises and the Server. This method, with its attendant products, is performed in this district and elsewhere in the United States, enabled by and accessed through Defendant's website.

45. Upon information and belief, Defendant has intentionally induced and continues to induce infringement of one or more claims of the '010 Patent in this district and elsewhere in the United States, by its intentional acts which have successfully, among other things, encouraged, instructed, enabled, and otherwise caused Defendant's customers to use the Accused Products and Services in an infringing manner. Despite knowledge of the '010 Patent as early as June 5, 2013, Defendant, upon information and belief, continues to encourage, instruct, enable,

and otherwise cause its customers to use its systems, in a manner which infringes the '010 Patent. Upon information and belief, Defendant has specifically intended its customers to use its systems in such a way that infringes the '010 Patent by, at a minimum, providing and supporting the Accused Products and Services and instructing its customers on how to use them in an infringing manner, at least through information available on Defendant's website. Defendant knew that its actions, including, but not limited to any of the three aforementioned systems, would induce, have induced, and will continue to induce infringement by its customers.

46. Defendant's aforesaid activities have been without authority and/or license from Plaintiff.

47. Despite its knowledge of the '010 Patent, known of at least since June 5, 2013, and without a reasonable basis for continuing the infringing activities described in the preceding paragraphs, on information and belief, Defendant has willfully infringed and continues to willfully infringe the '010 Patent.

48. Plaintiff is entitled to recover from Defendant the damages sustained by Plaintiff as a result of Defendant's wrongful acts in an amount subject to proof at trial, 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.

49. Defendant's infringement of Plaintiff's rights under the '010 Patent will continue to damage Plaintiff, causing irreparable harm for which there is no adequate remedy at law, unless enjoined by this Court.

COUNT VI: INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,397,363

50. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each of Paragraphs 1 – 11 above.

51. The '363 Patent was duly and legally issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office on July 8, 2008, after full and fair examination. Plaintiff is the owner of the '363 Patent and possesses all substantive rights and rights of recovery under the '363 Patent, including the right to sue for infringement and recover past damages.

52. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant has infringed and continues to infringe the '363 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents. Upon information and belief, Defendant has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims of the '363 Patent by making, using, providing, and/or importing, directly or through intermediaries, in this district and elsewhere in the United States, systems which are comprised of three devices that constitute a control apparatus, including but not limited to Verizon's "Managed Security Services on Premises (the "Accused Products and Services"). The control apparatus used by Defendant consists of a security device, located at a premises, a Server (as part of the Managed Security Services server), located remote from the premises, and an Internet-enabled computer or phone, at a location remote from both the premises and the Server. The Internet-enabled computer or phone, remote from a premises and the Server, sends a signal via Verizon's software over the Internet to the Server, located remotely from the premises. When a signal is deemed authorized, a different signal is then sent to the security device which activates that security device. Infringing conduct regarding this apparatus and its attendant functions take place in this district and elsewhere in the United States, enabled by and accessed through Defendant's website.

53. Upon information and belief, Defendant has intentionally induced and continues to induce infringement of one or more claims of the '363 Patent in this district and elsewhere in the United States, by its intentional acts which have successfully, among other things, encouraged, instructed, enabled, and otherwise caused Defendant's customers to use the Accused

Products and Services in an infringing manner. Despite knowledge of the '363 Patent as early as June 5, 2013, Defendant, upon information and belief, continues to encourage, instruct, enable, and otherwise cause its customers to use its systems, in a manner which infringes the '363 Patent. Upon information and belief, Defendant has specifically intended its customers to use its systems in such a way that infringes the '363 Patent by, at a minimum, providing and supporting the Accused Products and Services and instructing its customers on how to use them in an infringing manner, at least through information available on Defendant's website. Defendant knew that its actions, including, but not limited to any of the three aforementioned systems, would induce, have induced, and will continue to induce infringement by its customers.

54. Defendant's aforesaid activities have been without authority and/or license from Plaintiff.

55. Despite its knowledge of the '363 Patent, known of at least since June 5, 2013, and without a reasonable basis for continuing the infringing activities described in the preceding paragraphs, on information and belief, Defendant has willfully infringed and continues to willfully infringe the '363 Patent.

56. Plaintiff is entitled to recover from Defendant the damages sustained by Plaintiff as a result of Defendant's wrongful acts in an amount subject to proof at trial, 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.

57. Defendant's infringement of Plaintiff's rights under the '363 Patent will continue to damage Plaintiff, causing irreparable harm for which there is no adequate remedy at law, unless enjoined by this Court.

JURY DEMAND

58. Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all issues.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff respectfully requests that Court find in its favor and against Defendant, and that the Court grant Plaintiff the following relief:

- A. An adjudication that one or more claims of the Patents-in-Suit have been infringed, either literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, by the Defendant and/or its customers;
- B. An adjudication that Defendant has induced infringement of one or more claims of the Patents-in-Suit;
- C. An award of damages to be paid by Defendant adequate to compensate Plaintiff for its past infringement and any continuing or future infringement up until the date such judgment is entered, including interest, costs, and disbursements as justified under 35 U.S.C. § 284 and, if necessary to adequately compensate Plaintiff for Defendant's infringement, an accounting of all infringing sales including, but not limited to, those sales not presented at trial;
- D. That, should Defendant's acts of infringement be found to be willful from the time that Defendant became aware of the infringing nature of its actions, that the Court award treble damages for the period of such willful infringement pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284;
- E. A grant of permanent injunction pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 283, enjoining the Defendant from further acts of infringement with respect to the claims of the Patents-in-Suit;

F. That this Court declare this to be an exceptional case and award Plaintiff its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 285; and,

G. Any further relief that this Court deems just and proper.

Dated: April 23, 2014

STAMOULIS & WEINBLATT LLC

/s/ Stamatios Stamoulis
Stamatios Stamoulis (#4606)
stamoulis@swdelaw.com
Richard C. Weinblatt (#5080)
weinblatt@swdelaw.com
Two Fox Point Centre
6 Denny Road, Suite 307
Wilmington, Delaware 19809
Telephone: (302) 999-1540

HENINGER GARRISON DAVIS, LLC
Steven W. Ritcheson, *Pro Hac Vice* anticipated
9800 D Topanga Canyon Blvd. #347
Chatsworth, California 91311
Telephone: (818) 882-1030
Facsimile: (818) 337-0383
Email: switcheson@hgdllawfirm.com

HENINGER GARRISON DAVIS, LLC
Maureen V. Abbey, *Pro Hac Vice* anticipated
220 St. Paul Street
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
Telephone: (908) 379-8475
Facsimile: (205) 326-3332
Email: maureen@hgdllawfirm.com

**Attorneys for Plaintiff Joao Control &
Monitoring Systems, LLC**