Randall J. Sunshine (SBN 137363)
rsunshine@linerlaw.com
Ryan E. Hatch (SBN 235577)
rhatch@linerlaw.com
Jason L. Haas (SBN 217290)
jhaas@linerlaw.com
LINER LLP
1100 Glendon Avenue, 14th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90024.3503
Telephone: (310) 500-3500
Facsimile: (310) 500-3501

Attorneys for Plaintiff
SIGNAL IP, INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SIGNAL IP, INC., a California corporation, Plaintiff, vs. AMERICAN HONDA MOTOR CO., INC, a California corporation; HONDA OF AMERICA MFG., INC., an Ohio corporation, Defendants.	Case No. 2:14-cv-2454 **FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT** **JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

Plaintiff Signal IP, Inc. ("Signal IP" or "Plaintiff") brings this First Amended Complaint against Defendants American Honda Motor Co., Inc. and Honda of America Mfg., Inc. (collectively, "Honda" or "Defendants"), as permitted by Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2) and pursuant to written consent provided by Defendants on May 30, 2014 (Dkt. 21), alleging as follows:

PARTIES

1. Plaintiff Signal IP is a California corporation with its principal place of business at 11100 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 380, Los Angeles, CA 90025.

2. On information and belief, Defendant American Honda Motor Co., Inc. is a California corporation with its principal place of business at 1919 Torrance

Blvd., Torrance, CA 90501.

3. On information and belief, Defendant Honda of America Mfg., Inc. is an Ohio corporation with its principal place of business at 24000 Honda Parkway, Marysville, Ohio 43040.

JURISDICTION, VENUE AND JOINDER

4. 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).

5. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants. Defendants have conducted extensive commercial activities and continue to conduct extensive commercial activities within the State of California. Defendant American Honda Motor Co., Inc. maintains its principal place of business within this judicial district. Additionally, on information and belief, Defendants, directly and/or through intermediaries (including Defendants' entities, subsidiaries, distributors, sales agents, partners and others), distribute, offer for sale, sell, and/or advertise their products (including but not limited to the products and services that are accused of infringement in this lawsuit) in the United States, in the State of California, and in this judicial district, under the "Honda" and "Acura" brand names. Defendants have purposefully and voluntarily placed one or more of their infringing products and services into the stream of commerce with the expectation that the products and services will be purchased or used by customers in California and within this judicial district. Accordingly, Defendants have infringed Signal IP's patents within the State of California and in this judicial district as alleged in more detail below.

6. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400(b).

BACKGROUND

7. Signal IP, Inc. is a California corporation with a principal place of business at 11100 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 380, Los Angeles, CA 90025. It is the owner of the entire right, title and interest in and to U.S. Patent Nos. 5,714,927;

5,732,375; 6,434,486; 6,775,601; and 6,012,007 (the "Patents-in-Suit"), including the right to recover for past, present and future infringement.

8. On information and belief, Defendants are direct or indirect subsidiaries of global car manufacturer and distributor Honda Motor Company, Ltd. ("Honda Limited"), which is headquartered in Japan. Honda Limited manufactures and distributes cars under both the "Honda" and "Acura" brand names.

9. Defendants have had knowledge of each of the Patents-in-Suit, and have had the specific knowledge that their products and services described below infringe the Patents-in-Suit, since at least the filing of the complaint in this action on April 1, 2014, which was served on defendant American Honda Motor Co., Inc. on April 4, and on defendant Honda of America Mfg., Inc. on April 10, 2014. Signal IP gives and has given Honda notice of its infringement of the Patents-in-Suit.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Infringement of the '927 Patent)

10. Plaintiff incorporates all previous paragraphs of this complaint as if set forth in full herein.

11. Signal IP is the owner of the entire right, title, and interest in and to U.S. Patent No. 5,714,927 (the '927 Patent), entitled "Method of Improving Zone of Coverage Response of Automotive Radar." The '927 Patent was duly and legally issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on February 3, 1998. A true and correct copy of the '927 Patent is attached as Exhibit A.

12. On information and belief, Defendants have been and are directly infringing, inducing others to infringe, and/or contributorily infringing, literally, under the doctrine of equivalents, and/or jointly, one or more claims of the '927 Patent, including but not limited to claim 1 ("the '927 Patent Asserted Claims"), in the State of California, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, importing, making, using, offering for sale, and/or selling in the United States certain methods or systems disclosed and claimed in the '927 Patent,

including but not limited to the Honda Blind Spot Information System, used in products including but not limited to the Honda Accord, Civic, Crosstour, Odyssey, Civic Hybrid, and Accord Hybrid, and in the Acura MDX, RLX/RL and TL (collectively, the accused products and features are referred to herein as "the '927 Patent Accused Instrumentalities").

13. The '927 Patent Accused Instrumentalities are described or have been described at least in part online at: http://automobiles.honda.com/odyssey/interior.aspx, http://www.acura.com/features.aspx?model=mdx&context=exterior#blind_spot_information_system, and http://owners.honda.com/utility/download?path=/static/pdfs/2013/Odyssey/13_Odyssey_trg_touring_BSI.pdf&ei=MqEZU9uLBcSHrgfgn4HYCg&usg=AFQjCNHMC6VgyMzOZM75V-F5U940nC6Szg&bvm=bv.62578216,d.bmk&cad=rja.

14. As described below, Honda includes a radar system where a host vehicle uses radar to detect a target vehicle in a blind spot of the host vehicle driver which improves the perceived zone of coverage response of automotive radar. Honda determines the relative speed of the host and target vehicles and selects a variable sustain time as a function of relative vehicle speed. Honda detects target vehicle presence and produces an alert command. Honda activates an alert signal in response to the alert command. At the end of the alert command, Honda determines whether the alert signal was active for a threshold time and if the alert signal was active for the threshold time, Honda sustains the alert signal for the variable sustain time, where the zone of coverage appears to increase according to the variable sustain time.

15. According to Defendants' websites or documentation, Honda's Blind Spot Information System (BSI) uses "a pair of sensors, one on each rear corner of the vehicle" that "can detect a vehicle that may be positioned in the driver's blind spot." Additionally, "a graphic indicator located on the interior garnish near the

appropriate side-view mirror alerts the driver."

16. Further according to Defendants' websites, Honda's BSI system "also includes a maximum speed difference threshold, so the alert will not activate as you drive past parked cars." Additionally, "If the system detects a vehicle in an adjacent lane in the … 'alert zone' … an indicator will appear on that side's windshield pillar. The pillar light will flash if the driver activates the turn signal in the direction where a vehicle has been detected."

17. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, in Honda's BSI system, "When a vehicle is detected in your blind spot, the blind spot indicator turns on and stays lit until the area is clear. When your turn signal is on and a vehicle is detected, the blind spot indicator blinks until the area is clear or the turn signal is off."

18. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, in Honda's BSI system, "A radar sensor on each corner of the rear bumper alerts you when it detects a vehicle in your left or right blind spots."

19. In addition to their own direct infringement, Defendants have also been and are inducing and/or contributing to the direct infringement of the '927 Patent by at least, but not limited to, customers of Defendants, partners of Defendants, and/or end-users of Defendants' products, including but not limited to the '927 Patent Accused Instrumentalities ("the '927 Patent Third Party Infringers"), who directly implement, use or otherwise participate in the use of the '927 Patent Accused Instrumentalities, which have no substantial non-infringing uses, by at least the following affirmative acts: (1) advertising in public and marketing the features, benefits and availability of the '927 Patent Accused Instrumentalities; (2) promoting the adoption and use of the '927 Accused Instrumentalities; and (3) providing instructions on how to use the '927 Patent Accused Instrumentalities.

20. Defendants indirectly infringe by actively, knowingly, and/or intentionally inducing or contributing to infringement of one or more of the claims

of the '927 Patent, including but not limited to the '927 Patent Asserted Claims, by a third party, including but not limited to the '927 Patent Third Party Infringers, who directly implement, use or otherwise participate in the use of the '927 Patent Accused Instrumentalities. On information and belief, Defendants actively, knowingly, and/or intentionally induce the use of the '927 Patent Accused Instrumentalities by the '927 Patent Third Party Infringers, and provide or otherwise implement material components of one or more claims of the '927 Patent, including but not limited to the '927 Patent Asserted Claims, which were especially made or adapted for use in the infringement of the '927 Patent claims, including but not limited to the '927 Patent Asserted Claims, and are not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing uses. Defendants know and have known that the combination for which their infringing components, including but not limited to the '927 Patent Accused Instrumentalities, were especially made or adapted are both patented and infringing.

21. Defendants' infringement of the '927 Patent has been and continues to be willful, rendering this case exceptional within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 285. With knowledge of the Patents-in-Suit, as described above, Defendants have continued their infringing actions, as described above, despite an objectively high likelihood (and affirmative allegations) that these actions constitute infringement of the Patents-in-Suit. This objectively defined risk was known to Defendants, and so obvious that it should have been known to Defendants.

22. Unless enjoined by this Court, Defendants will continue to infringe the '927 Patent.

23. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has suffered, and will continue to suffer, irreparable injury for which it has no adequate remedy at law. Plaintiff also has been damaged and, until an injunction issues, will continue to be damaged in an amount yet to be determined.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Infringement of the '375 Patent)

24. Plaintiff incorporates all previous paragraphs of this complaint as if set forth in full herein.

25. Signal IP is the owner of the entire right, title, and interest in and to U.S. Patent No. 5,732,375 (the '375 Patent), entitled "Method of Inhibiting or Allowing Airbag Deployment." The '375 Patent was duly and legally issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on March 24, 1998. A true and correct copy of the '375 Patent is attached as Exhibit B.

26. On information and belief, Defendants have been and are directly infringing, inducing others to infringe, and/or contributorily infringing, literally, under the doctrine of equivalents, and/or jointly, one or more claims of the '375 Patent, including but not limited to claim 1 ("the '375 Patent Asserted Claims"), in the State of California, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, importing, making, using, offering for sale, and/or selling in the United States certain methods or systems disclosed and claimed in the '375 Patent, including but not limited to the Occupant Positioning Detection System (OPDS) used in products including but not limited to the Honda Accord, CR-V, CR-Z, Civic, Crosstour, Fit, Insight, Odyssey, Pilot, Ridgeline, Element, FCX, Fit EV, Civic Hybrid, Insight Hybrid, Accord Hybrid, CR-Z Hybrid, and the Acura ILX, MDX, RDX, RXL/RL, TL, TSX, TSX Sedan, TSX Sport Wagon, and ILX Hybrid (collectively, the accused products and features are referred to herein as "the '375 Patent Accused Instrumentalities").

27. The '375 Patent Accused Instrumentalities are described or have been described at least in part online at: http://corporate.honda.com/safety/details.aspx?id=technology, http://techinfo.honda.com/rjanisis/pubs/OM/9B0606/9B0606O00025A.pdf, http://automobiles.honda.com/images/information/owner-

resources/SafetyEquipment.pdf, http://parts.sonshonda.com/showAssembly.aspx?ukey_assembly=270304&ukey_product=1746685, and http://www.oemacuraparts.com/auto-parts/2014/acura/ilx/interior-bumper/front-seat-components-r/?trim=base&engine=5-speed-automatic.

28. As described below, Honda provides airbag control in a vehicle having an array of force sensors on the passenger seat coupled to a controller for determining whether to allow airbag deployment based on sensed force. Honda measures the force detected by each sensor and calculates the total force of the sensor array. Honda allows deployment if the total force is above a total threshold force. Honda defines a plurality of seat areas, and has at least one sensor located in each seat area. Honda determines the existence of a local pressure area when the calculated total force is concentrated in one of said seat areas. Honda calculates a local force as the sum of forces sensed by each sensor located in the seat area in which the total force is concentrated. Honda allows deployment if the local force is greater than a predefined seat area threshold force.

29. According to Defendants' websites or documentation, the Front Side Airbags with Passenger-Side Occupant Position Detection System (OPDS) system operates such that "In the event of a moderate-to-severe side impact, the side airbag inflates to help protect the driver's or front passenger's upper body. The Occupant Position Detection System (OPDS) utilizes sensors in the front passenger's seatback to detect the height and seating position of the occupant. If a child or small-statured adult is leaning into the deployment path of the side airbag, sensors deactivate it."

30. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, "The driver's advanced front airbag system includes a seat position sensor under the seat. If the seat is too far forward, the airbag will inflate with less force, regardless of the severity of the impact." Additionally, "The passenger's advanced front airbag system has weight sensors under the seat. Although Honda does not encourage

carrying an infant or small child in the front, if the sensors detect the weight of an infant or small child, the system will automatically turn the passenger's front airbag off."

31. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, "To prevent airbag-caused injuries to infants and small children improperly placed in front, if sensors detect the weight on the seat is about the weight of an infant or small child in a child safety seat, the passenger's front airbag will automatically shut off." Further, "If sensors detect up to about 67 lbs (the weight of an infant or small child) on the front passenger's seat, the airbag will automatically turn off."

32. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, "… if sensors detect up to about 67 pounds – the approximate weight of an infant or child and their safety seat – the control unit automatically shuts the airbag off, and the Passenger Airbag Off indicator comes on." Further, "In addition, if weight on the seat is close to the upper or lower threshold, the indicator may flicker on and off."

33. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, Honda products contain "sensor assembly, weight" inner and outer components, and "sensor seat weight" components near or adjacent to the seat.

34. In addition to their own direct infringement, Defendants have also been and are inducing and/or contributing to the direct infringement of the '375 Patent by at least, but not limited to, customers of Defendants, partners of Defendants, and/or end-users of Defendants' products, including but not limited to the '375 Patent Accused Instrumentalities ("the '375 Patent Third Party Infringers"), who directly implement, use or otherwise participate in the use of the '375 Patent Accused Instrumentalities, which have no substantial non-infringing uses, by at least the following affirmative acts: (1) advertising in public and marketing the features, benefits and availability of the '375 Patent Accused Instrumentalities; (2) promoting the adoption and use of the '375 Accused Instrumentalities; and (3) providing instructions on how to use the '375 Patent Accused Instrumentalities.

35. Defendants indirectly infringe by actively, knowingly, and/or intentionally inducing or contributing to infringement of one or more of the claims of the '375 Patent, including but not limited to the '375 Patent Asserted Claims, by a third party, including but not limited to the '375 Patent Third Party Infringers, who directly implement, use or otherwise participate in the use of the '375 Patent Accused Instrumentalities. On information and belief, Defendants actively, knowingly, and/or intentionally induce the use of the '375 Patent Accused Instrumentalities by the '375 Patent Third Party Infringers, and provide or otherwise implement material components of one or more claims of the '375 Patent, including but not limited to the '375 Patent Asserted Claims, which were especially made or adapted for use in the infringement of the '375 Patent claims, including but not limited to the '375 Patent Asserted Claims, and are not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing uses. Defendants know and have known that the combination for which their infringing components, including but not limited to the '375 Patent Accused Instrumentalities, were especially made or adapted are both patented and infringing.

36. Defendants' infringement of the '375 Patent has been and continues to be willful, rendering this case exceptional within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 285. With knowledge of the Patents-in-Suit, as described above, Defendants have continued their infringing actions, as described above, despite an objectively high likelihood (and affirmative allegations) that these actions constitute infringement of the Patents-in-Suit. This objectively defined risk was known to Defendants, and so obvious that it should have been known to Defendants.

37. Unless enjoined by this Court, Defendants will continue to infringe the '375 Patent.

38. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has suffered, and will continue to suffer, irreparable injury for which it has no adequate remedy at law. Plaintiff also has been damaged and, until an injunction

issues, will continue to be damaged in an amount yet to be determined.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Infringement of the '486 Patent)

39. Plaintiff incorporates all previous paragraphs of this complaint as if set forth in full herein.

40. Signal IP is the owner of the entire right, title, and interest in and to U.S. Patent No. 6,434,486 (the '486 Patent), entitled "Technique for Limiting the Range of an Object Sensing System in a Vehicle." The '486 Patent duly and legally issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on August 13, 2002. A true and correct copy of the '486 Patent is attached as Exhibit C.

41. On information and belief, Defendants have been and are directly infringing, inducing others to infringe, and/or contributorily infringing, literally, under the doctrine of equivalents, and/or jointly, one or more claims of the '486 Patent, including but not limited to claim 21 ("the '486 Patent Asserted Claims"), in the State of California, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, importing, making, using, offering for sale, and/or selling in the United States certain methods or systems disclosed and claimed in the '486 Patent, including but not limited to: (1) the Honda Forward Collision Warning System, used in products including but not limited to the Honda Accord, Civic, Crosstour, Fit, Odyssey, Civic Hybrid, and Accord Hybrid; (2) the Collision Mitigation Braking System (CMBS), used in products including but not limited to the Honda Accord, Civic, Crosstour, Fit, Odyssey, Civic Hybrid, and Accord Hybrid Acura MDX and RLX/RL; and (3) the Parking Sensor System used in products including but not limited to the Honda CR-V, Civic, Crosstour, Odyssey, Pilot, Civic Hybrid, and Acura ILX, MDX, RLX/RL, and ILX Hybrid (collectively, the accused products and features are referred to herein as "the '486 Patent Accused Instrumentalities").

42. The '486 Patent Accused Instrumentalities are described or have been described at least in part online at:

http://www.haccord.org/forward_collision_warning_fcw_-185.html, http://www.honda.ca/Content/honda.ca/en/2014/accord_coupe/ex_10238/GenericLink/TechnologyReferenceGuide_EN.pdf, https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=13&cad=rja&ved=0CDIQFjACOAo&url=http%3A%2F%2Fowners.honda.com%2Futility%2Fdownload%3Fpath%3D%2Fstatic%2Fpdfs%2F2014%2FAccord%2520Hybrid%2F2014_Accord_Hybrid_Tour_ForwardCollision.pdf&ei=a1viUt-9PIKNrgeizIHICw&usg=AFQjCNEqwPWXFuNC9M3eR9M_to4lGbV6og&bvm=bv.59930103,d.bmk, http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/pdf/esv/esv19/05-0148-O.pdf, http://techinfo.honda.com/rjanisis/pubs/OM/HJ0606/HJ0606O00277A.pdf, http://www.acurinfo.com/tech-858.html, http://owners.honda.com/vehicles/information/2014/Odyssey/features/Parking-Sensor-System/2, http://owners.honda.com/vehicles/information/2014/Accord-Coupe/features/Forward-Collision-Warning/3, and http://techinfo.honda.com/rjanisis/pubs/QS/3W14TOQS.pdf.

43. As described below, Honda limits the range of an object sensing system such that certain objects detected by the sensing system that are not in a vehicle path do not cause the sensing system to provide an alarm. Honda determines a desired warning distance based upon the current steering angle. Honda determines a current distance to a sensed object. Honda provides an alarm only if the sensed object is within the desired warning distance.

44. According to Defendants' websites or documentation, the Forward Collision Warning system (FCWS) "Alerts you when it detects the possibility of your vehicle colliding with the vehicle in front of yours. If the system determines a collision is possible, it gives both visual and audible alerts, including a heads-up warning that flashes on the windshield."

45. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, the FCWS has Long, Normal, or Short warning settings for when warning starts, and

"may give warnings of potential collisions when your vehicle speed is above 10mph (15 km/h)." Further, "FCW cannot detect all objects ahead and may not detect a given object; accuracy of the system will vary based on weather, speed and other factors. FCW does not include a braking function. It is always your responsibility to safely operate the vehicle and avoid collisions."

46. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, "If the radar sensor in the front grille detects a vehicle in front of you when your vehicle speed is 16 km/h or higher – and it determines there is a likelihood of a frontal collision – the system provides you with the following visual and audible warnings: With the FCW Distance set to Short: the heads-up light near the windshield flashes continuously; the FCW indicator flashes continuously; a beep sounds continuously until you take preventative action; With the FCW Distance set to Normal or Long: the head-up light near the windshield and FCW indicator flash twice; if you do not take action to prevent a collision and the distance to the other vehicle becomes sufficiently close, BRAKE flashes on the MID, the FCW indicator and heads-up light flash, and a beep sounds continuously until you take preventative action."

47. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, Honda's Collision Mitigation Brake System (CMBS) is used to determine the distance between two vehicles by taking inputs from the radar sensor mounted in front of the vehicle along with the data from a yaw rate sensor as well.

48. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, Honda's Parking Sensor System "lets you know the approximate distance between your vehicle and most obstacles while you are parking. When the system is on and your vehicle is nearing an obstacle, you will hear beeping and see parking messages in the multi-information display." Further, "Each corner sensor is capable of sensing an obstacle only when your vehicle is 20 in (50 cm) or closer. The rear center sensor senses an obstacle that is behind your vehicle 70 in (1.8 m) or closer."

49. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, "The rear

center and corner sensors start to detect an obstacle when the shift lever is in "R" and the vehicle speed is less than 5 mph (8 km/h). The front corner sensors start to detect an obstacle when the shift lever is in any position other than "P" and the vehicle speed is less than 5 mph (8 km/h)."

50. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, "The corner and center sensor monitor obstacles behind your vehicle, and the beeper and audio/information screen let you know the approximate distance between your vehicle and the obstacle."

51. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, the Parking Sensor System "gauges the approximate distance between your vehicle and most objects. When the system is on and your vehicle is approaching an object while parking, you will hear an audible alert as well as see parking sensor indicators on the navigation screen."

52. In addition to their own direct infringement, Defendants have also been and are inducing and/or contributing to the direct infringement of the '486 Patent by at least, but not limited to, customers of Defendants, partners of Defendants, and/or end-users of Defendants' products, including but not limited to the '486 Patent Accused Instrumentalities ("the '486 Patent Third Party Infringers"), who directly implement, use or otherwise participate in the use of the '486 Patent Accused Instrumentalities, which have no substantial non-infringing uses, by at least the following affirmative acts: (1) advertising in public and marketing the features, benefits and availability of the '486 Patent Accused Instrumentalities; (2) promoting the adoption and use of the '486 Accused Instrumentalities; and (3) providing instructions on how to use the '486 Patent Accused Instrumentalities.

53. Defendants indirectly infringe by actively, knowingly, and/or intentionally inducing or contributing to infringement of one or more of the claims of the '486 Patent, including but not limited to the '486 Patent Asserted Claims, by a third party, including but not limited to the '486 Patent Third Party Infringers, who

directly implement, use or otherwise participate in the use of the '486 Patent Accused Instrumentalities. On information and belief, Defendants actively, knowingly, and/or intentionally induce the use of the '486 Patent Accused Instrumentalities by the '486 Patent Third Party Infringers, and provide or otherwise implement material components of one or more claims of the '486 Patent, including but not limited to the '486 Patent Asserted Claims, which were especially made or adapted for use in the infringement of the '486 Patent claims, including but not limited to the '486 Patent Asserted Claims, and are not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing uses. Defendants know and have known that the combination for which their infringing components, including but not limited to the '486 Patent Accused Instrumentalities, were especially made or adapted are both patented and infringing.

54. Defendants' infringement of the '486 Patent has been and continues to be willful, rendering this case exceptional within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 285. With knowledge of the Patents-in-Suit, as described above, Defendants have continued their infringing actions, as described above, despite an objectively high likelihood (and affirmative allegations) that these actions constitute infringement of the Patents-in-Suit. This objectively defined risk was known to Defendants, and so obvious that it should have been known to Defendants.

55. Unless enjoined by this Court, Defendants will continue to infringe the '486 Patent.

56. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has suffered, and will continue to suffer, irreparable injury for which it has no adequate remedy at law. Plaintiff also has been damaged and, until an injunction issues, will continue to be damaged in an amount yet to be determined.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Infringement of the '601 Patent)

57. Plaintiff incorporates all previous paragraphs of this complaint as if set

forth in full herein.

58. Signal IP is the owner of the entire right, title, and interest in and to U.S. Patent No. 6,775,601 (the '601 Patent), entitled "Method and Control System for Controlling Propulsion in a Hybrid Vehicle." The '601 Patent was duly and legally issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on August 10, 2004. A true and correct copy of the '601 Patent is attached as Exhibit D.

59. On information and belief, Defendants have been and are directly infringing, inducing others to infringe, and/or contributorily infringing, literally, under the doctrine of equivalents, and/or jointly, one or more claims of the '601 Patent, including but not limited to claim 15 ("the '601 Patent Asserted Claims"), in the State of California, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, importing, making, using, offering for sale, and/or selling in the United States certain methods or systems for hybrid vehicles disclosed and claimed in the '601 Patent, including but not limited to: (1) the hybrid versions of the Honda Insight, Civic, CR-Z, and Fit; (2) the Sport Hybrid Intelligent Multi-Mode Drive (i-MMD) System, used in products including but not limited to the 2014 Honda Accord Hybrid and Plug-In Hybrid Accord; and (3) the Super Handling All-Wheel Drive, used in products including but not limited to the Acura RLX Sport Hybrid (collectively, the accused products and features are referred to herein as "the '601 Patent Accused Instrumentalities").

60. The '601 Patent Accused Instrumentalities are described or have been described at least in part online at: http://automobiles.honda.com/civic-hybrid/performance.aspx, http://corporate.honda.com/environment/hybridization.aspx?id=hybridization_systems, http://www.honda.co.nz/technology/emissions/ima/, http://www.acura.com/modellanding.aspx?model=rlx&rlxsh=true&, http://www.hondanews.com/channels/acura-automobiles-rlx/releases/2014-acura-rlx-sport-hybrid-sh-awd-powertrain,

http://www.acura.com/modellanding.aspx?model=rlx&rlxsh=true&, http://world.honda.com/automobile-technology/i-MMD/topic3/, http://world.honda.com/automobile-technology/i-MMD/topic1/, http://world.honda.com/news/2013/4130620Accord-Hybrid-Accord-Plug-in-Hybrid/index.html, http://automobiles.honda.com/civic-hybrid/performance.aspx, http://corporate.honda.com/environment/hybridization.aspx?id=hybridization_systems, http://automobiles.honda.com/insight-hybrid/performance.aspx, http://www.hondanews.com/channels/Noticias-en-Espanol/releases/2012-honda-civic-powertrains?l=en-US&mode=print, http://www.ae.pwr.wroc.pl/filez/20110606092416_HEV_Honda.pdf, http://world.honda.com/automobile-technology/IMA/ima03/, http://world.honda.com/news/2013/4130620Accord-Hybrid-Accord-Plug-in-Hybrid/index.html, https://www.google.co.in/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=9&ved=0CE0QFjAI&url=http%3A%2F%2Fprius-pt.com%2Fcafe%2Fcfs-filesystemfile.ashx%2F__key%2FCommunityServer.Components.UserFiles%2F00.00.00.23.01.Honda%2FDevelopment-of-SPORT-HYBRID-i_2D00_MMD-Control-System-for-2014-Model-Year-Accord.pdf&ei=hJSWU9uDItHIuATGnIKoAg&usg=AFQjCNFolScwF3LHcL3NiqbAccAhMCTdZA&bvm=bv.68445247,d.c2E&cad=rja, and http://world.honda.com/automobile-technology/i-MMD/topic3/.

61. As described below, Honda controls a propulsion system in a hybrid vehicle including a traction motor and a propulsion unit. Honda maps respective regions of relatively high and low efficiency in an efficiency map for the propulsion unit. Honda senses a signal indicative of the regions of relatively high and low efficiency. During conditions when the sensed signal indicates a region of low-efficiency for the propulsion unit, Honda generates a signal configured to activate the electric traction motor to drivingly propel the vehicle while de-engaging the

propulsion unit from propelling the vehicle. During conditions when the sensed signal indicates a region of high-efficiency for the propulsion unit, Honda generates a signal configured to deactivate the electric traction motor from drivingly propelling the vehicle while re-engaging the propulsion unit to propel the vehicle.

62. According to Defendants' websites or documentation, the Integrated Motor Assist (IMA) System "couples a compact 110-hp, 8-valve, SOHC, i-VTEC 4-cylinder engine with an ultra-thin electric motor for outstanding efficiency. Energy that used to be wasted when applying brakes is captured and stored as electric power. When the car accelerates, this stored energy is released, enhancing vehicle performance while cutting down on fuel consumption."

63. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, "Although the engine alone provides sufficient driving performance, when additional power is required, a permanent-magnet electric motor mounted between the engine and transmission provides power assist. Under certain conditions, the electric motor can propel the car on its own. Together, the motor and engine produce 110 hp @ 5500 rpm."

64. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, during "low-speed cruising," "the valves of all 4 cylinders of the engine are closed and combustion halted. The motor alone powers the vehicle. Gasoline consumption is reduced to zero, contributing to improved overall fuel efficiency." Additionally, during "gentle acceleration / high-speed cruising," "engine efficiency is high. The vehicle runs on engine power alone. The motor is deactivated, saving electric power."

65. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, Honda vehicles use "three electric motors: a single 35-kilowatt (47 hp) motor that is integrated with the 7-speed Dual Clutch Transmission supplements the V-6 engine in driving the front wheels, and a rear-mounted Twin Motor Unit (TMU) containing two 27-kilowatt (36 hp) motors that dynamically distribute electric-motor torque to

the rear wheels. Both the front and rear motors capture kinetic energy during vehicle deceleration and braking and convert it to electricity to supply the Intelligent Power Unit's 72-cell, 1.3 kwh lithium-ion battery pack, located behind the rear seatback. Together, the 310-horsepower V-6 engine and three electric motors produce a total system output of 377 horsepower and 341 lb.-ft. of torque…."

66. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, "Two independent electric motors [] drive the rear wheels. Through a curve, they produce positive and negative torque – also known as torque vectoring – to deliver unprecedented cornering capabilities. Working in unison, the motors provide power for standing starts, low-speed cruising, and when called upon, vigorous rolling acceleration."

67. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, "working with the gasoline engine, the powerful front electric motor supplies prodigious torque during hard acceleration and extra fuel efficiency at low cruising speeds. The power unit also houses the new Motor-integrated 7-Speed DCT (Dual Clutch Transmission)."

68. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, during "launch acceleration," "from a standing start, acceleration … is swift and electric – making use of the dual rear motors to drive the rear wheels. Unlike gasoline engines, electric motors produce 100% of their torque the moment they are engaged. It's something you'll appreciate as you watch the speedometer needle rapidly climb north."

69. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, during "high-speed cruising," "At highway speeds the 310-hp V-6 gets the assignment—with support from the front electric motor when essential. Variable Cylinder Management (VCM) increases your fuel efficiency by allowing the engine to run on only three cylinders. When you need to quickly pass an 18-wheeler, the VCM system instantly fires all six cylinders, and the electric motors, if necessary. Pass

completed, the engine returns to three-cylinder power. The transition is imperceptible, until you look at your average mpg."

70. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, during "SH-AWD in Slippery Conditions," "SH-AWD monitors speed, road conditions, driver input and other factors to distribute power to the wheels with the most traction."

71. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, Honda's i-MMD "combines high efficiency systems to dramatically increase the driving distance by motor alone, even without starting the engine. No gasoline used = high fuel efficiency."

72. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, Honda supports different modes for different speeds. EV mode is used during low speed scenarios and the vehicle is run using the motor alone. During high speed scenarios the user can manually disengage the motor and run the vehicle using the engine alone. In case of low speed scenarios, the Honda vehicle is run using the electric motor alone. The engine is separated from the drive-train.

73. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, the Hybrid i-MMD features "a simple structure, this hybrid system comprises a newly developed exclusive gasoline engine; an electric CVT enclosing two motors (drive and generation) and a clutch directly linked to the gasoline engine; and a lithium-ion battery that efficiently stores regenerated electricity. The system automatically selects among three drive modes to maximize efficiency at all times. The result is best-in-class acceleration responsiveness and ultra-high fuel economy. The three drive modes are as follows: EV Drive: For off-the-line starts and normal cruising, the battery provides power to the drive motor, which propels the vehicle. During deceleration, this motor serves as a generator to regenerate electricity from kinetic energy. Hybrid Drive: For acceleration, the gasoline engine operates in its high-efficiency rpm range to turn the generation motor. This electricity flows to and turns

the drive motor. When more powerful acceleration is needed, electricity from the battery combines with electricity from the generation motor to provide maximum torque instantaneously. The result is smooth, powerful acceleration. Engine Drive: For high-speed cruising on the highway, the clutch in the transmission directly links the output axis of the gasoline engine with the drive axis of the vehicle. This mechanism makes possible high-speed cruising at the optimal gear ratio and highly efficient operation of the Atkinson cycle engine."

74. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, the "Integrated Motor Assist (IMA®) System … couples a compact 110-hp, 8-valve, SOHC, i-VTEC® 4-cylinder engine with an ultra-thin electric motor for outstanding efficiency. Energy that used to be wasted when applying brakes is captured and stored as electric power. When the car accelerates, this stored energy is released, enhancing vehicle performance while cutting down on fuel consumption." Additionally, "Although the engine alone provides sufficient driving performance, when additional power is required, a permanent-magnet electric motor mounted between the engine and transmission provides power assist. Under certain conditions, the electric motor can propel the car on its own. Together, the motor and engine produce 110 hp @ 5500 rpm (SAE net)."

75. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, "the CVT constantly adjusts to provide the most efficient drive ratio possible depending on torque load. Honda's CVT provides better fuel economy and acceleration when compared to a conventional transmission." Additionally, "Smart electronics measure accelerator pedal position, then adjust the throttle-body butterfly valve for the intake manifold, the gear ratio in the CVT, and the operation of the IMA to best suit the driving conditions. To determine the current driving conditions, the system monitors pedal position, throttle position, vehicle speed, engine speed, calculated road slope and engine vacuum. With this information, the Drive-by-Wire throttle system controls motor and engine power to maximize the output of the new

Lithium-Ion battery."

76. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, "The Motor Control Module (MCM) is the central part in the Intelligent Power Unit. It controls the Motor Power Inverter module (MPI) and does the battery management for the battery pack. Furthermore, the MCM has a self diagnostic function and takes care of the communication with external diagnostic tools." Further, it receives a number of input signals including "Torque requests." "Based on the information the MCM receives, and thus from the condition of the vehicle, it regulates the degree of assistance from the electric motor as well as the amount of regenerative energy from the engine. The regulation of the electric motor is based on the torque requests, via the inverter. In addition, the MCM also calculates the load condition of the battery pack and regulates the ventilator for the cooling."

77. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, "The electric motor delivers maximum torque from zero rpm to assist with the engine, for strong acceleration and reduced fuel consumption." Additionally, during "Low-speed cruising," "the valves of all 4 cylinders of the engine are closed and combustion halted. The motor alone powers the vehicle. Gasoline consumption is reduced to zero, contributing to improved overall fuel efficiency." Additionally, during "Standing start," "the electric motor delivers maximum torque from zero rpm to assist the engine, for strong acceleration and reduced fuel consumption." Additionally, during "gentle acceleration / high-speed cruising," "the engine efficiency is high. The vehicle runs on engine power alone. The motor is deactivated, saving electric power."

78. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, the "Sport Hybrid i-MMD uses three different engine modes..... For off-the-line starts and low- to mid-speed cruising, EV Drive uses the battery to provide power and the drive motor to propel the vehicle. For acceleration, Hybrid Drive uses the gasoline engine to generate electricity and the drive motor to propel the vehicle. Finally, for

high-speed cruising, Engine Drive uses the gasoline engine to provide power directly. By switching automatically among these three modes, Sport Hybrid i-MMD is able to deliver fuel economy of 30.0 km/L." Additionally, "the drive motor is able to produce maximum torque in off-the-line starts and Sport Hybrid i-MMD offers powerful acceleration performance and a completely new driving feel along with a smooth, comfortable ride and exceptional quietness."

79. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, the "major goals of power management control are to: (1) enhance fuel economy in each drive mode; (2) Enhance fuel economy by switching the drive modes…." Additionally, regarding these goals, "fuel economy performance can be enhanced by taking into account the acceleration and deceleration intent of the driver and the constraints and efficiency characteristics of each component."

80. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, "the power management control obtains the acceleration and deceleration intent of the driver (accelerator and brake pedal operations) and the power and torque limit information from each component, and performs the appropriate cooperative power control within the limit range." Additionally, "Power management control first calculates the target vehicle driving force from the acceleration and deceleration intent of the driver and the motor torque limit requirement. Next, it calculates the target engine power that matches the sum of the target motor power calculated from the target vehicle driving force and the target battery power calculated from the energy management control. The target engine power is corrected as necessary by the battery power regulator. After that, the target engine speed and target engine torque are calculated from the corrected target engine power. Here, the target engine speed and torque values select the point at which the engine efficiency is maximum."

81. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, in "EV Drive - For off-the-line starts and normal cruising, the battery provides power to the

drive motor, which propels the vehicle. During deceleration, this motor serves as a generator to regenerate electricity from kinetic energy." Additionally, in "Engine Drive - For high-speed cruising on the highway, the clutch in the transmission directly links the output axis of the gasoline engine with the drive axis of the vehicle. This mechanism makes possible high-speed cruising at the optimal gear ratio and highly efficient operation of the Atkinson cycle engine."

82. In addition to their own direct infringement, Defendants have also been and are inducing and/or contributing to the direct infringement of the '601 Patent by at least, but not limited to, customers of Defendants, partners of Defendants, and/or end-users of Defendants' products, including but not limited to the '601 Patent Accused Instrumentalities ("the '601 Patent Third Party Infringers"), who directly implement, use or otherwise participate in the use of the '601 Patent Accused Instrumentalities, which have no substantial non-infringing uses, by at least the following affirmative acts: (1) advertising in public and marketing the features, benefits and availability of the '601 Patent Accused Instrumentalities; (2) promoting the adoption and use of the '601 Accused Instrumentalities; and (3) providing instructions on how to use the '601 Patent Accused Instrumentalities.

83. Defendants indirectly infringe by actively, knowingly, and/or intentionally inducing or contributing to infringement of one or more of the claims of the '601 Patent, including but not limited to the '601 Patent Asserted Claims, by a third party, including but not limited to the '601 Patent Third Party Infringers, who directly implement, use or otherwise participate in the use of the '601 Patent Accused Instrumentalities. On information and belief, Defendants actively, knowingly, and/or intentionally induce the use of the '601 Patent Accused Instrumentalities by the '601 Patent Third Party Infringers, and provide or otherwise implement material components of one or more claims of the '601 Patent, including but not limited to the '601 Patent Asserted Claims, which were especially made or adapted for use in the infringement of the '601 Patent claims, including but not

limited to the '601 Patent Asserted Claims, and are not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing uses. Defendants know and have known that the combination for which their infringing components, including but not limited to the '601 Patent Accused Instrumentalities, were especially made or adapted are both patented and infringing.

84. Defendants' infringement of the '601 Patent has been and continues to be willful, rendering this case exceptional within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 285. With knowledge of the Patents-in-Suit, as described above, Defendants have continued their infringing actions, as described above, despite an objectively high likelihood (and affirmative allegations) that these actions constitute infringement of the Patents-in-Suit. This objectively defined risk was known to Defendants, and so obvious that it should have been known to Defendants.

85. Unless enjoined by this Court, Defendants will continue to infringe on the '601 Patent.

86. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has suffered, and will continue to suffer, irreparable injury for which it has no adequate remedy at law. Plaintiff also has been damaged and, until an injunction issues, will continue to be damaged in an amount yet to be determined.

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Infringement of the '007 Patent)

87. Plaintiff incorporates all previous paragraphs of this complaint as if set forth in full herein.

88. Signal IP is the owner of the entire right, title, and interest in and to U.S. Patent No. 6,012,007 (the '007 Patent), entitled "Occupant Detection Method and Apparatus for Air Bag System." The '007 Patent was duly and legally issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on January 4, 2000. A true and correct copy of the '007 Patent is attached as Exhibit E.

89. On information and belief, Defendants have been and are directly

infringing, inducing others to infringe, and/or contributorily infringing, literally, under the doctrine of equivalents, and/or jointly, one or more claims of the '007 Patent, including but not limited to claim 1 ("the '007 Patent Asserted Claims"), in the State of California, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, importing, making, using, offering for sale, and/or selling in the United States certain methods or systems for hybrid vehicles disclosed and claimed in the '007 Patent, including but not limited to the Supplemental Restraint System (SRS) Airbags with weight sensors, used in products including but not limited to the Honda Accord, CR-V, CR-Z, Civic, Crosstour, Fit, Insight, Odyssey, Pilot, Ridgeline, Element, FCX, Fit EV, Civic Hybrid, Insight Hybrid, Accord Hybrid, and CR-Z Hybrid, and Acura ILX, MDX, RDX, RLX/RL, TL, TSX, TSX Sedan, TSX Sport Wagon, and ILX Hybrid (collectively, the accused products and features are referred to herein as "the '007 Patent Accused Instrumentalities").

90. The '007 Patent Accused Instrumentalities are described or have been described at least in part online at: http://techinfo.honda.com/rjanisis/pubs/OM/9B0606/9B0606O00025A.pdf, http://automobiles.honda.com/images/information/owner-resources/safetyequipment.pdf, and http://techinfo.honda.com/rjanisis/pubs/OM/A51010/A51010OM.pdf.

91. As described below, Honda includes a vehicle restraint system having a controller for deploying air bags and means for selectively allowing deployment according to the outputs of seat sensors responding to the weight of an occupant. Honda determines measures represented by individual sensor outputs and calculates from the sensor outputs a relative weight parameter. Honda establishes a first threshold of the relative weight parameter and allows deployment when the relative weight parameter is above the first threshold. Honda establishes a lock threshold above the first threshold and sets a lock flag when the relative weight parameter is above the lock threshold and deployment has been allowed for a given time. Honda

establishes an unlock threshold at a level indicative of an empty seat and clears the flag when the relative weight parameter is below the unlock threshold for a time. Honda allows deployment while the lock flag is set.

92. Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 208 defines mandatory testing to ensure occupant crash protection, including tests designed to ensure that airbags are not deployed in a manner that would cause injury to infants, children, or small-statured adults. NHTSA has not promulgated specific tests for rough road conditions, such as tests designed to ensure that airbags do not turn off in the presence of a small-statured adult who is bouncing as a result of riding on a rough road. However, rough road performance is an area that all major vehicle manufacturers must nonetheless consider and address in light of the full range of real world conditions their vehicles will experience. Honda requires a mechanism to ensure due care in addressing the effect of rough road and similar events on occupant presence.

93. According to Defendants' websites or documentation, "Advanced Airbags: Both front airbags now have 'advanced' features. To help prevent airbag-caused injuries to shorter drivers, the driver's bag will inflate with the least force necessary— even in a severe collision—if the driver is seated closer to the airbag than recommended. To prevent airbag-caused injuries to infants and small children improperly placed in front, if sensors detect the weight on the seat is about the weight of an infant or small child in a child safety seat, the passenger's front airbag will automatically shut off."

94. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, "The driver's advanced front airbag system includes a seat position sensor under the seat. If the seat is too far forward, the airbag will inflate with less force, regardless of the severity of the impact. If there is a problem with the sensor, the SRS indicator will come on, and the airbag will inflate in the normal manner regardless of the driver's seating position. The passenger's advanced front airbag system has weight sensors

under the seat. Although Honda does not encourage carrying an infant or small child in front, if the sensors detect the weight of an infant or small child (up to about 65 lbs or 29 kg), the system will automatically turn the passenger's front airbag off."

95. Further according to Defendants' websites or documentation, "The passenger's advanced front airbag system has weight sensors under the seat. Although Honda does not encourage carrying an infant or small child in the front, if the sensors detect the weight of an infant or small child, the system will automatically turn the passenger's front airbag off." Additionally, "If the weight sensors detect there is no passenger in the front seat, the airbag will be off. However, the passenger airbag off indicator will not come on." Additionally, the side airbag indicator "alerts you that the passenger's side airbag has been shut off because weight sensors detect the weight of an infant or small child on the front passenger's seat. It doesn't mean there is a problem with your side airbags. When you turn the ignition switch to the ON (II) position, the indicator should come on briefly and go off... If it doesn't come on, stays on, or comes on while driving without a passenger in the front seat, have the system checked."

96. In addition to their own direct infringement, Defendants have also been and are inducing and/or contributing to the direct infringement of the '007 Patent by at least, but not limited to, customers of Defendants, partners of Defendants, and/or end-users of Defendants' products, including but not limited to the '007 Patent Accused Instrumentalities ("the '007 Patent Third Party Infringers"), who directly implement, use or otherwise participate in the use of the '007 Patent Accused Instrumentalities, which have no substantial non-infringing uses, by at least the following affirmative acts: (1) advertising in public and marketing the features, benefits and availability of the '007 Patent Accused Instrumentalities; (2) promoting the adoption and use of the '007 Accused Instrumentalities; and (3) providing instructions on how to use the '007 Patent Accused Instrumentalities.

97. Defendants indirectly infringe by actively, knowingly, and/or

intentionally inducing or contributing to infringement of one or more of the claims of the '007 Patent, including but not limited to the '007 Patent Asserted Claims, by a third party, including but not limited to the '007 Patent Third Party Infringers, who directly implement, use or otherwise participate in the use of the '007 Patent Accused Instrumentalities. On information and belief, Defendants actively, knowingly, and/or intentionally induce the use of the '007 Patent Accused Instrumentalities by the '007 Patent Third Party Infringers, and provide or otherwise implement material components of one or more claims of the '007 Patent, including but not limited to the '007 Patent Asserted Claims, which were especially made or adapted for use in the infringement of the '007 Patent claims, including but not limited to the '007 Patent Asserted Claims, and are not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing uses. Defendants know and have known that the combination for which their infringing components, including but not limited to the '007 Patent Accused Instrumentalities, were especially made or adapted are both patented and infringing.

98. Defendants' infringement of the '007 Patent has been and continues to be willful, rendering this case exceptional within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 285. With knowledge of the Patents-in-Suit, as described above, Defendants have continued their infringing actions, as described above, despite an objectively high likelihood (and affirmative allegations) that these actions constitute infringement of the Patents-in-Suit. This objectively defined risk was known to Defendants, and so obvious that it should have been known to Defendants.

99. Unless enjoined by this Court, Defendants will continue to infringe on the '007 Patent.

100. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has suffered, and will continue to suffer, irreparable injury for which it has no adequate remedy at law. Plaintiff also has been damaged and, until an injunction issues, will continue to be damaged in an amount yet to be determined.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Signal IP respectfully requests that the Court enter judgment against Defendants as follows:

1. That Defendants have directly infringed the Patents-in-Suit;

2. That Defendants have contributorily infringed the Patents-in-Suit;

3. That Defendants have induced the infringement of the Patents-in-Suit;

4. That Defendants' infringement be adjudged willful and deliberate;

5. That Defendants and their affiliates, subsidiaries, officers, directors, employees, agents, representatives, successors, assigns, and all those acting in concert, participation, or privity with them or on their behalf, including customers, be enjoined from infringing, inducing others to infringe or contributing to the infringement of the Patents-in-Suit;

6. For damages, according to proof, for Defendants' infringement, together with pre-judgment and post-judgment interest, as allowed by law and that such damages be trebled as provided by 35 U.S.C. § 284;

7. That this Court determine that this is an exceptional case under 35 U.S.C. § 285 and an award of attorneys' fees and costs to Signal IP is warranted; and

8. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: June 13, 2014

LINER LLP

By: */s/ Ryan E. Hatch*

Randall J. Sunshine
Ryan E. Hatch
Jason L. Haas
Attorneys for Plaintiff SIGNAL IP, INC.

JURY DEMAND

Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 38(b), Plaintiff Signal IP, Inc. respectfully demands a jury trial on any and all issues triable as of right by a jury in this action.

Dated: June 13, 2014

LINER LLP

By: */s/ Ryan E. Hatch*

Randall J. Sunshine
Ryan E. Hatch
Jason L. Haas
Attorneys for Plaintiff SIGNAL IP, INC