

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION**

AirWatch LLC,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
Good Technology Corporation and Good Technology Software, Inc.,)	Civil Action No. 1:14-cv-02281-SCJ
)	
Defendants.)	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
)	

AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff AirWatch LLC (“AirWatch”) complains and alleges as follows against Defendants Good Technology Corporation and Good Technology Software, Inc. (collectively “Good Technology”).

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§ 1, *et seq.*
2. AirWatch has filed this lawsuit to stop Good Technology’s unlawful infringement of AirWatch’s patented inventions and to obtain damages and other relief.

THE PARTIES

3. AirWatch is a Delaware corporation having its principal place of business at 1155 Perimeter Center West, Suite 100, Atlanta, GA 30338.
4. Upon information and belief, Good Technology Corporation and Good Technology Software, Inc. are Delaware corporations with their principal

place of business at 430 N. Mary Ave., Suite 200, Sunnyvale, CA 94085. Good Technology is a competitor of AirWatch.

JURISDICTION, VENUE, AND INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

6. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Good Technology because Good Technology has conducted and conducts business in this District, has committed and continues to commit acts of patent infringement in this District, and has harmed and continues to harm AirWatch in this District by making or using infringing products and services in this District and by inducing and contributing to its customers' infringement in this District.

7. Venue is proper within this District under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and (c) because Good Technology transacts business and sells and offers for sale within this District products and services that practice the asserted AirWatch patent. Assignment to the Atlanta Division is proper because AirWatch has its principal place of business in Atlanta, GA.

THE PATENT IN SUIT

8. U.S. Patent No. 8,713,646 (“the ’646 patent”), entitled “Controlling Access to Resources on a Network,” was lawfully issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“PTO”) on April 29, 2014. The ’646 patent issued from U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 13/316,073, filed on December 9, 2011. A copy of the ’646 patent is attached as Exhibit A.

9. The ’646 patent was assigned to AirWatch, and AirWatch holds the entire right, title, and interest in the ’646 patent.

COUNT ONE

(Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 8,713,646)

10. AirWatch incorporates and realleges paragraphs 1 through 9 of this Complaint.

11. Good Technology has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims of the '646 patent, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271.

12. Upon information and belief, Good Technology's acts of infringement include direct infringement of the '646 patent, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a). Good Technology has directly infringed the '646 patent by making or using in the United States products and services having access-control capabilities covered by one or more claims of the patent. Those products and services (collectively, "Accused Products") include, without limitation, Good Dynamics Secure Mobility Platform, Good for Enterprise (GFE) systems, Good Mobile Messaging (GMM), Good Mobile Control (GMC), Good Mobile Manager, and Network Operations Center (NOC).

13. Good Technology's acts of infringement further include inducement of infringement of the '646 patent, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b). Good Technology has induced and continues to induce its customers to install, configure, and use the Accused Products in the United States so as to infringe the '646 patent. Good Technology's acts of inducement include selling or otherwise distributing the Accused Products in the United States (directly or through intermediaries). Good Technology's acts of inducement further include providing to customers in the United States instructions and promotional materials, including but not limited to website pages and administrator and user guides, for the installation, configuration, and use of the Accused Products. As a consequence of Good Technology's aforementioned acts of inducement, its customers have been

induced and continue to be induced to infringe the '646 patent by installing, configuring, and using the Accused Products.

14. Good Technology has had knowledge of the '646 patent at least since the filing of AirWatch's initial complaint on July 18, 2014. Since at least July 18, 2014, Good Technology has known that the Accused Products infringe the '646 patent. Furthermore, since at least July 18, 2014, Good Technology has specifically intended to induce its customers to install, configure, and use the Accused Products so as to infringe the '646 patent. Indeed, Good Technology's above-referenced acts of inducement have no purpose other than to induce its customers to infringe the '646 patent.

15. Good Technology's acts of infringement further include contributory infringement of the '646 patent, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(c). Good Technology has sold or otherwise distributed in the United States (directly or through intermediaries) the Accused Products to its customers. The Accused Products are components of the computer systems on which they are installed. The computer systems on which the Accused Products are installed are both patented machines and apparatus for practicing patented processes. The Accused Products constitute material parts of the patented invention. Good Technology has known that the Accused Products are especially made and adapted for use in the infringement of the '646 patent and that the Accused Products are not staple articles or commodities of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing use at least since July 18, 2014. Indeed, the only use for the Accused Products is to install and use them on a computer system so as to infringe the '646 patent.

16. Upon information and belief, Good Technology's acts of infringement further include infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(f)(1). Without authority, in and from the United States, Good Technology has supplied and

caused to be supplied the Accused Products to customers outside the United States. The Accused Products are substantial portions of the patented invention. The supply of the Accused Products to customers outside the United States actively induces the customers to install the Accused Products on their computer systems, and Good Technology intends for them to do so. Good Technology has known at least since July 18, 2014, that the installation of the Accused Products on a computer system would make a system that practices the '646 patent, and thus infringe the patent, if it occurred within the United States.

17. Upon information and belief, Good Technology's acts of infringement further include infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(f)(2). Without authority, in and from the United States, Good Technology has supplied and caused to be supplied the Accused Products to customers outside the United States. The Accused Products are components of the patented invention. The Accused Products are especially made and adapted for use in the patented invention and are not staple articles or commodities of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing use. Good Technology knows that its customers outside the United States will install the Accused Products on their computer systems, and intends for them to do so. Furthermore, Good Technology knows that its customers' installation of the Accused Products on their computer systems would infringe the '646 patent if it occurred within the United States.

18. Upon information and belief, Good Technology has committed and continues to commit all of the above acts of infringement despite its lack of a good-faith belief that the claims of the '646 patent are noninfringed, invalid, or unenforceable.

19. Good Technology has committed and continues to commit all of the above acts of infringement without license or authorization.

20. As a result of Good Technology's infringement of the '646 patent, AirWatch has suffered damages and will continue to suffer damages.

21. Good Technology's infringement of the '646 patent has been and continues to be willful and deliberate.

22. Good Technology's acts of infringement are ongoing. Good Technology will continue to infringe unless this Court enjoins Good Technology and its agents, servants, employees, representatives, and all others acting in active concert with it from infringing the '646 patent.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Pursuant to Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, AirWatch hereby demands trial by jury on all issues raised by the Complaint.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, AirWatch prays for relief, as follows:

A. A judgment that Good Technology has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims of the '646 patent;

B. An injunction barring Good Technology and its officers, directors, agents, servants, employees, affiliates, attorneys, and all others acting in privity or in concert with it, and its parents, subsidiaries, divisions, successors, and assigns, from further acts of infringement of the '646 patent;

C. An award of damages adequate to compensate for Good Technology's infringement of the '646 patent, including all pre-judgment and post-judgment interest at the maximum rate permitted by law; and

D. An award of trebled damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284;

E. A declaration that this case is exceptional under 35 U.S.C. § 285;

F. An award of AirWatch's costs and attorneys' fees under 35 U.S.C. § 285; and

G. Any other remedy to which AirWatch may be entitled.

Dated: August 6, 2014 Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Susan A. Cahoon
SUSAN A. CAHOON

SUSAN A. CAHOON (GA SBN 102000)
SCahoon@kilpatricktownsend.com
JOSHUA H. LEE (GA SBN 489842)
JLee@kilpatricktownsend.com
KILPATRICK TOWNSEND
1100 Peachtree St. NE, Ste. 2800
Atlanta, GA 30309-4528
Telephone: 404.815.6325
Facsimile: 404.541.3145

MICHAEL A. JACOBS
(admitted *pro hac vice*)
MJacobs@mofocom
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-2482
Telephone: 415.268.7000
Facsimile: 415.268.7522

BITA RAHEBI
(admitted *pro hac vice*)
BRahebi@mofocom
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
707 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 6000
Los Angeles, CA 90017-3543
Telephone: 213.892.5200
Facsimile: 213.892.5454

Attorneys for Plaintiff
AIRWATCH LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on August 6, 2014, true and correct copies of the foregoing AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT were caused to be served by U.S. Mail on the following attorneys representing Good Technology Corporation and Good Technology Software, Inc.:

Courtland Reichman
McKool Smith P.C.
1201 West Peachtree, Suite 3210
Atlanta, GA 30361
creichman@mckoolsmith.com

Robert J. Muller
Cypress LLP
11111 Santa Monica Blvd., Ste. 500
Los Angeles, CA 90025
bob@cypressllp.com

/s/ Susan A. Cahoon

SUSAN A. CAHOON
GA SBN 102000

Attorney for Plaintiff
AIRWATCH LLC