

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

**VERIFIRE NETWORK SOLUTIONS,
LLC,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**WATCHGUARD TECHNOLOGIES,
INC.,**

Defendant.

Case No. 2:15-cv-944

PATENT CASE

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff VeriFire Network Solutions, LLC, files this Complaint against WatchGuard Technologies, Inc. for infringement of United States Patent No. 8,463,727 (the “727 Patent”).

PARTIES AND JURISDICTION

1. This is an action for patent infringement under Title 35 of the United States Code. Plaintiff is seeking injunctive relief as well as damages.

2. Jurisdiction is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 (Federal Question) and 1338(a) (Patents) because this is a civil action for patent infringement arising under the United States patent statutes.

3. Plaintiff VeriFire Network Solutions, LLC (“Plaintiff” or “VeriFire”), is a Texas limited liability company with its principal office located in the Eastern District of Texas, at 211 E. Tyler Street, Suite 600-A, Longview, Texas 75601.

4. Upon information and belief, Defendant WatchGuard Technologies, Inc. (“Defendant”) is a Washington corporation with a principal office located at 505 Fifth Avenue, South, Suite 500, Seattle, WA 98104. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because

Defendant has committed, and continues to commit, acts of infringement in the state of Texas, has conducted business in the state of Texas, and/or has engaged in continuous and systematic activities in the state of Texas.

5. On information and belief, Defendant's instrumentalities that are alleged herein to infringe were and/or continue to be sold, offered for sale, and/or used in the Eastern District of Texas.

VENUE

6. Venue is proper in the Eastern District of Texas pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(c) and 1400(b) because Defendant is deemed to reside in this district. In addition, and in the alternative, Defendant has committed acts of infringement in this district.

COUNT I
(INFRINGEMENT OF UNITED STATES PATENT NO. 8,463,727)

7. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 6 herein by reference.

8. This cause of action arises under the patent laws of the United States, and in particular, 35 U.S.C. §§ 271, *et seq.*

9. Plaintiff is the owner by assignment of the '727 Patent with sole rights to enforce the '727 Patent and sue infringers.

10. A copy of the '727 Patent, titled "Communication Management System and Communication Management Method," is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

11. The '727 Patent is valid and enforceable, and it was duly issued in full compliance with Title 35 of the United States Code.

(Direct Infringement)

12. Upon information and belief, Defendant has infringed and continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the '727 Patent, including at least claim 1, by making, having made,

selling, offering for sale, and/or importing network security appliances (including firewalls) and networking equipment with integrated security appliances that serve as a communication management system, including without limitation Defendant's XTM and Firebox firewall product families (the "Accused Instrumentalities").

13. Defendant's actions complained of herein are causing irreparable harm and monetary damage to Plaintiff and will continue to do so unless and until Defendant is enjoined and restrained by this Court.

14. Plaintiff is in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 287.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, under Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, requests a trial by jury of all issues so triable by right.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court to:

- a) Enter judgment for Plaintiff on this Complaint on all causes of action asserted herein;
- b) Enjoin Defendant, its agents, officers, servants, employees, attorneys and all persons in active concert or participation with Defendant who receive notice of the order from further infringement of United States Patent No. 8,463,727 (or, in the alternative, awarding Plaintiff a running royalty from the time of judgment going forward);
- c) Award Plaintiff damages resulting from Defendant's infringement in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 284;
- d) Declare this an "exceptional case" pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285 and award Plaintiff its attorney's fees and any other appropriate relief;
- e) Award Plaintiff pre-judgment and post-judgment interest and costs; and

- f) Award Plaintiff such further relief to which the Court finds Plaintiff entitled under law or equity.

Dated: June 3, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Craig Tadlock
Craig Tadlock
State Bar No. 00791766
John J. Harvey, Jr.
State Bar No. 09179770
Keith Smiley
State Bar No. 24067869
TADLOCK LAW FIRM PLLC
2701 Dallas Parkway, Suite 360
Plano, Texas 75093
903-730-6789
craig@tadlocklawfirm.com
john@tadlocklawfirm.com
keith@tadlocklawfirm.com

***Attorneys for Plaintiff VeriFire Network
Solutions, LLC***