- 3. Upon information and belief, Defendant Yahoo! Inc. ("Yahoo!") is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware with a principal place of business at 701 First Avenue, Sunnyvale, California 94089.
- 4. Upon information and belief, Defendant AOL LLC ("AOL") is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware with a principal place of business at 22000 AOL Way, Dulles, Virginia 20166-9323.
- 5. Upon information and belief, Defendant Lycos, Inc. ("Lycos") is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia with a principal place of business at 100 5th Avenue, Waltham, Massachusetts 02451.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 6. This action arises under the United States Patent Act, codified at 35 U.S.C. § 1 *et seq.* This Court has exclusive subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).
- 7. This Court as well as the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas has personal jurisdiction over Google, Yahoo!, AOL and Lycos (collectively, "Defendants"). Defendants reside in both Districts, have transacted business in both Districts, have committed acts of infringement in both Districts and continue to commit acts of infringement in both Districts.
- 8. Venue is proper in the Eastern District of Texas pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b), (c) and 1400(b), because Defendants reside in that District, have committed acts of direct and indirect infringement in that District, have transacted business in that District, and have established minimum contacts with this District. At Defendants' request, this case was transferred from that District to the Northern District of California.

III. THE '352 PATENT

9. On August 6, 1996, United States Patent No. 5,544,352 (the "352 Patent"), entitled "Method and Apparatus for Indexing, Searching and Displaying Data" was duly and lawfully issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office, naming Daniel Egger as sole inventor and Libertech, Inc. as assignee. A true and correct copy of the '352 Patent is attached

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27 28 as Exhibit A. SRA is the assignee of all right, title and interest in and to the '352 Patent, and holds the right to sue and recover for past, present, and future infringement thereof.

- 10. Defendants have directly infringed and continue to infringe directly the '352 Patent by their use, offer for sale, and sale of search engines, systems and services covered by the claims of the '352 Patent. Defendants have also infringed and continue to infringe the '352 Patent by jointly infringing with others and/or contributing to and/or inducing infringement by others. Defendants are therefore liable to Plaintiff for infringement of the '352 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271.
- 11. Acts of infringement by Defendants have damaged SRA. Defendants' infringement of SRA's rights under the '352 Patent will continue to damage SRA. SRA is entitled to recover from Defendants the damages sustained by SRA as a result of Defendants' wrongful acts in an amount subject to proof at trial, but not less than a reasonable royalty.
- 12. Upon information and belief, Defendants' infringement of the '352 Patent is willful and deliberate, entitling SRA to enhanced damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284. Upon information and belief, Defendants have demonstrated at least objective recklessness in connection with their willful infringement.
- 13. This case is exceptional, entitling SRA to recover attorneys' fees and costs incurred in prosecuting this action under 35 U.S.C. § 285.

IV. THE '494 PATENT

- 14. On November 3, 1998, United States Patent No. 5,832,494 (the "494 Patent"). entitled "Method and Apparatus for Indexing, Searching and Displaying Data" was duly and lawfully issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office naming Daniel Egger, Shawn Cannon, and Ronald D. Sauers as inventors, and Libertech, Inc. as assignee. A true and correct copy of the '494 Patent is attached as Exhibit B. SRA is the assignee of the '494 Patent and holds the right to sue and recover for past, present, and future infringement thereof.
- 15. Defendants have directly infringed and continue to infringe directly the '494 Patent by their use, offer for sale, and sale of search engines, systems and services covered by the claims of the '494 Patent. Defendants have also infringed and continue to infringe the '494

Patent by jointly infringing with others and/or contributing to and/or inducing others to infringe. Defendants are therefore liable to Plaintiff for infringement of the '494 Patent under 35 U.S.C. §

- Defendants' acts of infringement have damaged SRA. Defendants' infringement of SRA's rights under the '494 Patent will continue to damage SRA. SRA is entitled to recover from Defendants the damages sustained by SRA as a result of Defendants' wrongful acts in an amount subject to proof at trial, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty.
- Upon information and belief, Defendants' infringement of the '494 Patent is willful and deliberate, entitling SRA to enhanced damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284. Upon information and belief, Defendants have demonstrated at least objective recklessness in
- This case is exceptional, entitling SRA to recover attorneys' fees and costs
- On May 15, 2001, United States Patent No. 6,233,571 (the "571 Patent"), entitled "Method and Apparatus for Indexing, Searching and Displaying Data" was duly and lawfully issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office naming Daniel Egger, Shawn Cannon, and Ronald D. Sauers as inventors, and Daniel Egger as assignee. A true and correct copy of the '571 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit C. SRA is the assignee of the '571 Patent and holds the right to sue and recover for past, present, and future infringement thereof.
- 20. Defendants have directly infringed and continue to infringe directly the '571 Patent by their use, offer for sale, and sale of search engines, systems and services covered by the claims of the '571 Patent. Defendants have also infringed and continue to infringe the '571 Patent by jointly infringing with others and/or contributing to infringement and/or inducing others to infringe. Defendants are therefore liable to Plaintiff for infringement of the '571 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271.
- 21. Defendants' acts of infringement have damaged SRA. Defendants' infringement of SRA's rights under the '571 Patent will continue to damage SRA. SRA is entitled to recover

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1	from Defendants the damages sustained by SRA as a result of Defendants' wrongful acts in an	
2	amount subject to proof at trial, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty.	
3	22.	Upon information and belief, Defendants' infringement of the '571 Patent is
4	willful and	deliberate, entitling SRA to enhanced damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284. Upon
5	information	and belief, Defendants have demonstrated at least objective recklessness in
6	connection with their willful infringement.	
7	23.	This case is exceptional, entitling SRA to recover attorneys' fees and costs
8	incurred in p	rosecuting this action under 35 U.S.C. § 285.
9	VI. JURY DEMAND	
10	24.	SRA demands a trial by jury.
11		VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF
12	WHEREFORE, SRA prays for relief against Defendants as follows:	
13	a.	Judgment that Defendants have directly infringed, jointly infringed, induced
14		others to infringe, and/or committed acts of contributory infringement with
15		respect to the claims of the '352, '494 and '571 Patents;
16	b.	Judgment that Defendants' patent infringement has been, and continues to be,
17		willful;
18	c.	Awarding SRA damages adequate to compensate for the infringement by
19		Defendants, past, present, and future, but in no event less than a reasonable
20		royalty for the use made of the inventions by Defendants, together with interest
21		and costs under 35 U.S.C. § 284;
22	d.	Enhancing the foregoing damages due to Defendants' willful infringement,
23		pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284;
24	e.	Awarding pre- and post-judgment interest on the damages assessed;
25	f.	Declaring this case exceptional pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285, and awarding SRA
26		its reasonable attorney fees and costs;
27	g.	SRA's costs of court; and
28	h.	Awarding to SRA such other and further relief as the Court deems just.

	Case 5.05 of 50172 family Bookinsin 500 fined 61/05/11 fined 61/05/11	
1	Respectfully submitted/	
2	100 / //_	
3	Lee L. Kaplan (Texas Bar No. 11094400)	
4	Attorney-in-charge Jeffrey A. Potts (Texas Bar No. 00784781)	
5	Raj Duvvuri (Texas Bar No. 24054185) (admitted pro hac vice)	
6	700 Louisiana Street, Suite 2300 Houston, Texas 77002	
7	Telephone: (713) 221-2300	
8	Facsimile: (713) 221-2320 Email: lkaplan@skv.com	
	Victor G. Hardy (Texas Bar No. 00790821)	
9	Jay D. Ellwanger (California Bar No. 217747) Chester J. Shiu (Texas Bar No. 24071126)	
10	(admitted pro hac vice)	
11	DiNovo Price Ellwanger & Hardy LLP 7000 North MoPac Expressway	
12	Suite 350	
13	Austin, Texas 78731 Telephone: (512) 539-2630	
14	Facsimile: (512) 539-2627	
15	Email: jellwanger@dpelaw.com	
16	Thomas F. Smegal, Jr. (Bar No. 34,819) One Sansome Street, 35th Floor	
17	San Francisco, CA 94104	
	Telephone: (415) 217-8383 Facsimile: (415) 399-5093	
18	Email: tomsmegal@smegallaw.com	
19	Attorneys for Software Rights Archive, LLC	
20		
21		
22	<u>CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE</u>	
23	I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing instrument has	
24	been forwarded to all counsel of record pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on this the day of January, 2011.	
25	Lee L/	
26	Lee L. Kaplan	
27		
28		
20	AMENDED COMPLAINT	
	CV 02-3172 DMW	

Case 5:08-cv-03172-RMW Document 309 Filed 01/06/11 Page 6 of 6