

Lawrence C. Hersh
Attorney at Law
17 Sylvan Street
Suite 102B
Rutherford, New Jersey 07070
Tel: (201) 507-6300
Fax: (201) 507-6311
lh@hershlegal.com

Of Counsel
Theodore F. Shiells
Texas State Bar No. 00796087
Shiells Law Firm P.C.
1201 Main Street – Suite 2470
Dallas, Texas 75202
Tel: (214) 979-7312
Fax: (214) 979-7301
tfshiells@shiellslaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Simon Nicholas Richmond

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|------------------|
| _____ |) | |
| SIMON NICHOLAS RICHMOND, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | Civil Action No. |
| |) | |
| HSN, INC. |) | _____ |
| |) | MLC-DEA |
| |) | |
| Defendant. |) | |
| _____ |) | |

SEVERED FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

SEVERED FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff Simon Nicholas Richmond (“Richmond” or “Plaintiff”), for his claims against Defendant HSN, Inc., (“HSN, Inc.” or “Defendant”) makes and files this Complaint and alleges as follows:

1. STATEMENT OF RELATED CASES AND PRIOR PROCEEDINGS

This case is related to *Simon Nicholas Richmond v. Daintily, LLC, et al.*, 13-cv-1950 (MLC-DEA), and alleges infringement of the same United States Patents that are at issue in the aforementioned case, i.e., United States Patent Nos. 7,196,477; 7,429,827; and, 8,362,700. This case is further related to case docket nos. 13-cv-1944 (MLC-DEA), 13-cv-1949 (MLC-DEA), 13-cv-1950 (MLC-DEA), 13-cv-1951 (MLC-DEA), 13-cv-1952 (MLC-DEA), 13-cv-1953 (MLC-DEA), 13-cv-1954 (MLC-DEA), 13-cv-1957 (MLC-DEA), 13-cv-1959 (MLC-DEA), 13-cv-1960 (MLC-DEA), 13-cv-2916 (MLC-DEA), all of which have been consolidated with *Simon Nicholas Richmond v. Lumisol, et al.*, 13-cv-1944 (MLC-DEA).

The allegations contained in this Complaint against Defendant were originally filed in *Simon Nicholas Richmond v. Daintily, LLC, et al.*, 13-cv-1950 (MLC-DEA). In an Order dated July 3, 2014, the claims against Defendant HSN, Inc. were severed, and Plaintiff was ordered to file a severed complaint against

each individual defendant in Case No. 13-cv-1950 (MLC-DEA) by August 1, 2014. (Case No. 13-cv-1944, Dkt. 122, p.10).

2. THE PARTIES

A. Plaintiff Richmond.

1. Plaintiff Richmond is an individual and a resident of New Jersey.

B. Defendant.

2. HSN, Inc. (HSN, Inc.) is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, having a principal place of business at 1 HSN Drive, St. Petersburg, Florida 33729. HSN, Inc. may be served through its agent for service of process at National Registered Agents, Inc., 160 Greentree Drive, Suite 101, Dover, Delaware 19904.

3. Service of the prior Original and First Amended Complaints in 13-cv-1950 (MLC-DEA) was previously properly effectuated on Defendant.

3. SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION

4. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35, United States Code, including 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 and 281-285. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

4. PERSONAL JURISDICTION AND VENUE

A. General.

5. Personal jurisdiction over Defendant is proper pursuant to New Jersey Long-Arm Statute, N.J. CT. R. 4:4-4 and principles of due process.

6. HSN, Inc. has sufficient minimum contacts with New Jersey and this district and the maintenance of this suit does not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

B. Specific Jurisdiction.

7. Personal jurisdiction over Defendant is proper under principles of specific jurisdiction.

8. Upon information and belief, Defendant has transacted and solicited business in New Jersey and in this district related to the subject matter of the claims alleged herein and, upon information and belief, has committed direct infringement in this state and district by importing, offering to sell and/or selling goods infringing one or more of the Patents-in-Suit, to customer(s) in this state.

9. Upon information and belief, Defendant has knowingly induced infringement in New Jersey by its customer(s) by offering to sell and/or selling goods that infringe one or more of the Patents-in-Suit (as detailed in the Counts

below) to customer(s) in New Jersey, with specific knowledge of Plaintiff's applicable patent(s), and with a specific intent and/or willful blindness to the fact that their infringing products will be imported into and offered for sale, sold and/or used in New Jersey by Defendant's customers.

10. The infringement by Defendant that is the subject of the claims alleged has caused Plaintiff to suffer damages and other losses in New Jersey and this district, a result that was reasonably foreseeable to Defendant at the time Defendant committed its misconduct.

C. General Jurisdiction.

11. Personal jurisdiction over Defendant is also proper under principles of general jurisdiction in that Defendant either resides in this state and district and/or has regularly and purposefully conducted business in New Jersey and this district.

D. Venue.

12. Venue also properly lies in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b) because Defendant has committed acts of infringement in this district.

13. Venue also properly lies in this district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) and/or (3) because, upon information and belief, either a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims recited below occurred in this district,

or a substantial part of the property that is the subject of the action is in this district, or because there is no district in which the action may otherwise be brought as provided in 28 U.S.C. § 1391, and this court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant.

5. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. Plaintiff's Patents-in-Suit

14. For many years, Richmond has engaged in the development, manufacture, and sale of solar-powered garden lighting. Richmond has taken steps to protect his innovative inventions and designs. In particular, Richmond owns United States utility and design patents relating to his solar-powered garden lights.

15. Richmond is the inventor and owner of all right, title, and interest to the United States patent number 7,196,477 A1, entitled "Solar Powered Light Assembly to Produce Light of Varying Colors," ("477 Color-Changing Patent"), which duly and legally issued to Richmond on 3/27/2007.

16. Richmond is the inventor and owner of all right, title, and interest to the United States patent number 7,429,827 A1, entitled "Solar Powered Light Assembly to Produce Light of Varying Colors," ("827 Color-Changing Patent"), which duly and legally issued to Richmond on 9/30/2008.

17. Richmond is the inventor and owner of all right, title, and interest to the United States patent number 8,362,700 A1, entitled “Solar Powered Light Assembly to Produce Light of Varying Colors,” (“’700 Color-Changing Patent”), which duly and legally issued to Richmond on 1/29/2013.

18. Plaintiff’s ‘477 Patent is valid and enforceable.

19. Plaintiff’s ‘827 Patent is valid and enforceable.

20. Plaintiff’s ‘700 Patent is valid and enforceable.

21. On November 3, 2011, United States Patent Publication No. US 2011/0266953 A1 (the “’953 Published Application”) was published. A copy of the ‘953 Published Application may be obtained for free from the official United States Patent and Trademark website, uspto.gov. The invention as claimed in the ‘700 Patent is substantially identical to the invention as claimed in the ‘953 Published Application.

22. Richmond continues to engage in the development and sale of solar-powered garden lighting and continues to take steps to protect his innovative inventions and designs and in this regard has applied for additional patent protection for his inventions. For example, on March 29, 2012, United States Patent Publication No. US 2012/0075104 A1 (the “’104 Published Application”)

was published, and on April 5, 2012, United States Patent Publication No. US 2012/0081888 A1 (the “’888 Published Application”) was published. Copies of the ‘104 and ‘888 Published Applications may be obtained for free from the official United States Patent and Trademark website, uspto.gov.

23. At all times relevant to this action, Richmond has complied with any notice provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 287 as they may relate to the Patents-in-Suit.

B. Facts relevant to Defendant

24. Defendant has imported, sold, exposed for sale or offered for sale accused solar lighting products supplied by vendors other than the named defendants in the cases consolidated under Case No. 13-cv-1944 (D.N.J.).

25. Since issuance of one or more of the foregoing Richmond patents, Defendant has or has been importing, exposing for sale, offering for sale, or selling the following products:

- a) 113-005 Coleman Solar-Powered Color-Changing LED Lights
8-pack
- b) 180-658 Daintily Color-Changing Solar-Powered Light 2-pack
- c) Color-Changing Solar Gazing Ball

6. INFRINGEMENT OF PLAINTIFF’S PATENTS

Count 1 – HSN, Inc.’s Direct Infringement of ‘477 Patent

26. The allegations of Paragraphs 1-26 are incorporated by reference as if fully set forth again herein.

27. HSN, Inc. has notice of Plaintiff’s rights in the ‘477 Patent.

28. Upon information and belief, HSN, Inc. directly infringes, and has infringed, Plaintiff’s ‘477 Color-Changing Patent by, at-least, importing, exposing for sale, offering to sell, and selling one or more solar-powered garden light products that infringe ‘477 Patent. Upon information and belief, those solar-powered garden lights include, at least, the following product:

a) Color-Changing Solar Gazing Ball.

29. Upon information and belief, HSN, Inc. has and is importing, exposing for sale, offering to sell, and selling other solar-powered garden light products which infringe Plaintiff’s ‘477 Color-Changing Patent and will continue to do so unless restrained by this Court.

Count 2 – HSN, Inc.’s Direct Infringement of ‘827 Patent

30. The allegations of Paragraphs 1-31 are incorporated by reference as if fully set forth again herein.

31. HSN, Inc. has notice of Plaintiff’s rights in the ‘827 Patent.

32. Upon information and belief, HSN, Inc. directly infringes, and has infringed, Plaintiff's '827 Color-Changing Patent by, at-least, importing, exposing for sale, offering to sell, and selling one or more solar-powered garden light products that infringe the '827 Patent. Upon information and belief, those solar-powered garden lights include, at least, the following products:

- a) Color-Changing Solar Gazing Ball
- b) 180-658 Daintily Color-Changing Solar-Powered Light 2-pack
- c) 113-005 Coleman Solar-Powered Color-Changing LED Lights 8-pack.

33. Upon information and belief, HSN, Inc. has and is importing, exposing for sale, offering to sell, and selling other solar-powered garden light products which infringe Plaintiff's '827 Color-Changing Patent and will continue to do so unless restrained by this Court.

Count 3 – HSN, Inc.'s Direct Infringement of '700 Patent

34. The allegations of Paragraphs 1-36 are incorporated by reference as if fully set forth again herein.

35. HSN, Inc. has notice of Plaintiff's rights in the '700 Patent.

36. Upon information and belief, HSN, Inc. directly infringes, and has

infringed, Plaintiff's '700 Color-Changing Patent by, at-least, importing, exposing for sale, offering to sell, and selling one or more solar-powered garden light products that infringe the '700 Patent. Upon information and belief, those solar-powered garden lights include, at least, the following products:

- a) Color-Changing Solar Gazing Ball
- b) 180-658 Daintily Color-Changing Solar-Powered Light 2-pack.

37. Upon information and belief, HSN, Inc. has and is importing, exposing for sale, offering to sell, and selling other solar-powered garden light products which infringe Plaintiff's '700 Color-Changing Patent and will continue to do so unless restrained by this Court.

Count 4 – Willfulness of HSN, Inc.'s Infringement

38. The allegations of Paragraphs 1-45 are incorporated by reference as if fully set forth again herein.

39. Upon information and belief, HSN, Inc. has had actual knowledge of Plaintiff's '477 and '827 Patents, and knowledge that its solar-powered garden lights as accused of infringement of these patents earlier in this Complaint (“Accused Infringing Products”) would infringe Plaintiff's '477 and '827 Patents if imported into, offered for sale or sold in the United States. HSN, Inc. is believed

to have had such knowledge long prior to the filing of Plaintiff's Original Complaint against HSN, Inc. in Case No. 13-cv-1950 (D.N.J.).

40. As a result of Richmond's activities, Defendant is believed to have knowledge of Plaintiff's '477 and '827 Patents and knowledge that one or more of Defendant's previously identified products infringe Richmond's aforementioned patents. As a result, Defendant's infringement of Plaintiff's Patent is willful.

41. The allegations and factual contentions set forth in this Count are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b)(3).

7. PLAINTIFF'S DAMAGES AND IRREPARABLE HARM

42. Plaintiff has been damaged as a result of Defendant's infringing activities and will continue to be damaged unless such activities are enjoined by this Court. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284, Plaintiff is entitled to damages adequate to compensate for the infringement of Plaintiff's Patents, including, *inter alia*, lost profits and/or a reasonable royalty.

43. Plaintiff will be irreparably harmed if Defendant's patent infringement continues. Plaintiff relies upon his patents for protection of his business' intellectual property and the rampant infringement of his patents by Defendant robs

Plaintiff's business of its intellectual assets and denies Plaintiff the exclusivity in the marketplace for offering and selling his products to which he is entitled under the Patent Laws. This seriously damages Plaintiff in a manner that cannot be adequately compensated by money alone. Plaintiff is entitled to a permanent injunction prohibiting Defendant, its directors, officers, employees, agents, parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, and anyone else in active concert or participation with them, from taking any other actions that would infringe Plaintiff's Patents.

8. JURY DEMAND

44. Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 38(b), for all issues so triable.

9. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that the court enter judgment granting Plaintiff the following relief:

a. Awarding Plaintiff his damages adequate to compensate for Defendant's infringement of Plaintiff's Patents, including, inter alia, lost profits and/or a reasonable royalty;

b. Awarding treble of the damages and/or reasonable royalty on account of the willful nature of the infringement, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284;

- c. Declaring this case to be exceptional under 35 U.S.C. §285 and awarding Plaintiff his attorneys' fees, costs and expenses related to bringing this action;
- d. Enjoining Defendant from infringing Plaintiff's Patents; and
- e. Awarding Plaintiff such further and other relief as the Court deems just and equitable.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Lawrence C. Hersh
Lawrence C. Hersh
Attorney at Law
17 Sylvan Street
Suite 102B
Rutherford, New Jersey 07070
Tel: (201) 507-6300
Fax: (201) 507-6311
lh@hershlegal.com
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Simon Nicholas Richmond

Of Counsel

Theodore F. Shiells
Texas State Bar No. 00796087
Shiells Law Firm P.C.
1201 Main Street – Suite 2470
Dallas, Texas 75202
Tel: (214) 979-7312
Fax: (214) 979-7301
tfshiells@shiellslaw.com

