

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

|                         |   |                               |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| _____                   | ) |                               |
| CHANBOND, LLC,          | ) |                               |
|                         | ) |                               |
| Plaintiff,              | ) |                               |
|                         | ) |                               |
| v.                      | ) | C.A. No. _____                |
|                         | ) |                               |
| COMCAST CORPORATION and | ) | <b>TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED</b> |
| COMCAST CABLE           | ) |                               |
| COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,    | ) |                               |
|                         | ) |                               |
| Defendants.             | ) |                               |
| _____                   | ) |                               |

**COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

Plaintiff ChanBond, LLC (“ChanBond”), as for its complaint of patent infringement in this matter, hereby alleges through its attorneys as follows:

**Nature of the Action**

This is an action for patent infringement of United States Patent Nos. 7,941,822 (the “822 Patent”), 8,341,679 (the “679 Patent”) and 8,984,565 (the “565 Patent”) (collectively, the Patents) under the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1, *et seq.*, seeking damages and injunctive and other relief under 35 U.S.C. § 281, *et seq.*

**The Parties**

- 1. Plaintiff ChanBond is a Delaware limited liability company with its principal place of business at 2633 McKinney Ave., Dallas, Texas 75204.
- 2. Defendant Comcast Corporation (“Comcast Corp.”) is a Pennsylvania corporation with its principal place of business at 1701 John F Kennedy Boulevard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103. Comcast Corp. may be served with process pursuant to the Delaware long arm statute, 10 *Del. C.* § 3104.

3. Defendant Comcast Cable Communications, LLC (“Comcast Cable”) is a Delaware limited liability company with its principal place of business at 1701 John F Kennedy Boulevard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103. On information and belief, Comcast Cable is a wholly owned, direct or indirect subsidiary of Comcast Corp. Comcast Cable may be served with process via its registered agent, Comcast Capital Corporation, 1201 North Market Street, Suite 1000, Wilmington, Delaware 19801.

4. Comcast Corp. and Comcast Cable are referred to herein, collectively, as “Comcast” or “defendants.”

### **Jurisdiction and Venue**

5. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the Patent Laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code.

6. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a) because the action concerns the infringement of United States patents.

7. This court has personal jurisdiction over defendants. Upon information and belief, each defendant transacts substantial business in the State of Delaware, directly or through intermediaries, including: (i) at least a portion of the infringements alleged herein, and (ii) regularly does or solicits business in Delaware, engages in other persistent courses of conduct, maintains continuous and systematic contacts in Delaware, purposefully avails itself of the privileges of doing business in Delaware, and/or derives substantial revenue from goods and services provided to individuals in Delaware. In addition, Comcast Cable is a limited liability corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware.

8. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400(b) because, among other reasons, defendants have transacted business in the State of Delaware and defendants have committed and continue to commit acts of patent infringement in Delaware.

### **The Patents-In-Suit**

9. On May 10, 2011, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued the '822 Patent, entitled "Intelligent Device System and Method for Distribution of Digital Signals on a Wideband Signal Distribution System," to its inventors, Earl Hennenhofer, Richard Snyder and Robert Stine. The inventors assigned all rights in the '822 Patent to CBV, Inc. ("CBV"), which was founded by the inventors, and CBV assigned the '822 Patent to ChanBond, including all rights to enforce the '822 Patent and to recover for infringement. ChanBond has all right, title and interest to the '822 Patent. The '822 Patent is valid and in force. A true and correct copy of the '822 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

10. On December 25, 2012, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued the '679 Patent, entitled "Intelligent Device System and Method for Distribution of Digital Signals on a Wideband Signal Distribution System," to its inventors, Earl Hennenhofer, Richard Snyder and Robert Stine. The inventors assigned all rights in the '679 Patent to CBV, which was founded by the inventors, and CBV assigned the '679 Patent to ChanBond, including all rights to enforce the '679 Patent and to recover for infringement. ChanBond has all right, title and interest to the '679 Patent. The '679 Patent is valid and in force. A true and correct copy of the '679 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

11. On March 17, 2015, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued the '565 Patent, entitled "Intelligent Device System and Method for Distribution of Digital Signals on a Wideband Signal Distribution System," to its inventors, Earl Hennenhofer,

Richard Snyder and Robert Stine. The inventors assigned all rights in the '565 Patent to CBV, which was founded by the inventors, and CBV assigned the '565 Patent to ChanBond, including all rights to enforce the '565 Patent and to recover for infringement. ChanBond has all right, title and interest to the '565 Patent. The '565 Patent is valid and in force. A true and correct copy of the '565 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

12. Generally, the patents-in-suit are directed in improving the data transmission of wideband distribution systems. Historically, data service flows (e.g. data, web traffic, voice and video transmitted via the Internet Protocol) have been transmitted over a single channel at a fixed bandwidth. But with the demand for transmission of more and more content at ever increasing speeds, the capabilities of a single channel transmission methodology became exhausted.

13. The patents-in-suit address and overcome, among other things, the throughput problems regarding this single channel methodology. The inventors of the patents-in-suit invented intelligent devices that allow a single data service flow (e.g. large data transmissions) to be split and modulated onto multiple channels for transmission. This transmission is then demodulated and recombined back into a single service flow for distribution to addressable devices. Using the inventions, service providers are now capable of efficiently transmitting more content at higher speeds and better quality of service.

**COUNT I  
(INFRINGEMENT OF THE '822 PATENT)**

14. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 13 herein by reference as if set forth here in full.

15. Upon information and belief, Comcast has been and is currently directly infringing, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, one or more claims of the '822 Patent by making, using, testing, offering to sell, and/or selling within the United States, and/or importing

into the United States, without authority, cable systems and cable services that are covered by at least one claim of the '822 Patent. The accused cable systems include cable system components such as cable modem termination systems, RF transmission hardware, network monitoring equipment and customer premises equipment (*e.g.*, cable modems, embedded multimedia terminal adapters, and set-top boxes), including but not limited to components that are compliant with the Data Over Cable System Interface Specification (“DOCSIS”) standard, version 3.0 or higher.<sup>1</sup> More particularly, Comcast, without authority from Plaintiff, provides, operates, implements, sells, markets, imports and/or offers for sale cable systems and/or cable services that perform, are capable of performing or are provided having channel bonding functionality, including but not limited to cable systems and components that have the capability to distribute a service flow over multiple, bonded channels and/or the capability to receive a service flow over multiple, bonded channels (the “Accused Functionality”). Comcast’s cable systems and components that perform or are capable of performing the Accused Functionality, and/or the use of such cable systems and components, infringe one or more claims of the '822 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271.

16. As a result of Comcast’s unlawful infringement of the '822 Patent, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer damages in an amount to be proven at trial. Plaintiff is entitled to recover from Comcast the damages adequate to compensate for such infringement, which have yet to be determined.

17. Comcast will continue to infringe the '822 Patent unless and until it is enjoined by this Court.

---

<sup>1</sup> See, *e.g.*, <http://customer.xfinity.com/help-and-support/internet/docsis3/?ts=2> (“With DOCSIS 3.0, you’ll experience significantly faster speeds, so you can make the most of your online experience. DOCSIS 3.0 also opens the door to new Internet technologies.”)

**COUNT II  
(INFRINGEMENT OF THE '679 PATENT)**

18. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 17 herein by reference as if set forth here in full.

19. Upon information and belief, Comcast has been and is currently directly infringing, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, one or more claims of the '679 Patent by making, using, testing, offering to sell, and/or selling within the United States, and/or importing into the United States, without authority, cable systems and cable services that are covered by at least one claim of the '679 Patent. The accused cable systems include cable system components such as cable modem termination systems, RF transmission hardware, network monitoring equipment and customer premises equipment (*e.g.*, cable modems, embedded multimedia terminal adapters, and set-top boxes), including but not limited to components that are compliant with the DOCSIS standard, version 3.0 or higher. More particularly, Comcast, without authority from Plaintiff, provides, operates, implements, sells, markets, imports and/or offers for sale cable systems and/or cable services that perform, are capable of performing or are provided having channel bonding functionality, including but not limited to cable systems and components that have the capability to distribute a service flow over multiple, bonded channels and/or the capability to receive a service flow over multiple, bonded channels (the "Accused Functionality"). Comcast's cable systems and components that perform or are capable of performing the Accused Functionality, and/or the use of such cable systems and components, infringe one or more claims of the '679 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271.

20. As a result of Comcast's unlawful infringement of the '679 Patent, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer damages in an amount to be proven at trial. Plaintiff is

entitled to recover from Comcast the damages adequate to compensate for such infringement, which have yet to be determined.

21. Comcast will continue to infringe the '679 Patent unless and until it is enjoined by this Court.

**COUNT III  
(INFRINGEMENT OF THE '565 PATENT)**

22. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 21 herein by reference as if set forth here in full.

23. Upon information and belief, Comcast has been and is currently directly infringing, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, one or more claims of the '565 Patent by making, using, testing, offering to sell, and/or selling within the United States, and/or importing into the United States, without authority, cable systems and cable services that are covered by at least one claim of the '565 Patent. The accused cable systems include cable system components such as cable modem termination systems, RF transmission hardware, network monitoring equipment and customer premises equipment (*e.g.*, cable modems, embedded multimedia terminal adapters, and set-top boxes), including but not limited to components that are compliant with the DOCSIS standard, version 3.0 or higher. More particularly, Comcast, without authority from Plaintiff, provides, operates, implements, sells, markets, imports and/or offers for sale cable systems and/or cable services that perform, are capable of performing or are provided having channel bonding functionality, including but not limited to cable systems and components that have the capability to distribute a service flow over multiple, bonded channels and/or the capability to receive a service flow over multiple, bonded channels (the "Accused Functionality"). Comcast's cable systems and components that perform or are capable of

performing the Accused Functionality, and/or the use of such cable systems and components, infringe one or more claims of the '565 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271.

24. As a result of Comcast's unlawful infringement of the '565 Patent, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer damages in an amount to be proven at trial. Plaintiff is entitled to recover from Comcast the damages adequate to compensate for such infringement, which have yet to be determined.

25. Comcast will continue to infringe the '565 Patent unless and until it is enjoined by this Court.

**WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT OF THE '822, '679, and '565 PATENTS**

26. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 25 herein by reference as if set forth here in full.

27. In January 2012, Comcast announced that it had completed its rollout of DOCSIS 3.0.

28. In February 2012, a business associate of the inventors communicated with Mr. Joseph DiTrollo, Comcast Vice President and Corporate Comptroller, regarding the patent portfolio. On February 23, 2012, the business associate had a face-to-face meeting with Mr. DiTrollo, wherein he provided a write-up that identified the '822 Patent and the application that would issue as the '679 Patent, and that indicated other continuations were pending. The write-up described the patents and applications and their applicability to DOCSIS 3.0 and the cable industry's channel bonding technology. The business associate and Mr. DiTrollo discussed the patents, patent applications, relevant technology, and the patents' and patent applications' applicability to the cable industry's channel bonding technology. By February 23, 2012, Mr. DiTrollo, and thus Comcast, knew of the at least the '822 Patent and the application that would



issue as the '679 Patent, and knew of their relevance to the DOCSIS 3.0 channel bonding technology used by Comcast.

29. By February 27, 2012, Mr. DiTrollo had communicated the patent portfolio and the write-up to Mr. James Finnegan, Comcast Senior Vice President, Intellectual Property Strategy. On information and belief, by February 27, 2012, Mr. Finnegan knew of the '822 Patent and the applications that would issue as the '679 and '565 Patents, and knew of their relevance to the DOCSIS 3.0 channel bonding technology used by Comcast.

30. On March 28, 2012, Mr. Hennenhoefler (one of the co-inventors) had a teleconference with Mr. Finnegan during which the patents, applications and CBV were discussed. Mr. Finnegan informed Mr. Hennenhoefler that Comcast was obtaining a legal opinion regarding the patents. Shortly thereafter, Mr. Hennenhoefler had a follow-up call with Mr. Finnegan.

31. On February 12, 2013, the '822 and '679 Patents and the application that would issue as the '565 Patent were also brought to the attention of Mr. Tony Werner of Comcast. On February 13, 2013, Mr. Werner communicated the patents and applications, for at least a second time, to Mr. Finnegan. Shortly thereafter, Messrs. Hennenhoefler and Stine (another of the co-inventors) had a teleconference with Mr. Mark Dellinger, Comcast Vice President, Intellectual Property Strategy in which the patents and applications were discussed, along with their applicability to DOCSIS 3.0.

32. Despite Comcast's knowledge of the Patents and the channel bonding technology that they covered, Comcast nevertheless continued making, using and selling products that complied with and used DOCSIS 3.0 (and higher) channel bonding, despite an objectively high likelihood that such actions constituted infringement of the Patents. This infringement was

known to Comcast or was so obvious that Comcast should have known about this infringement. Despite knowing that its actions constituted infringement of the Patents and/or despite knowing that that there was a high likelihood that its actions constituted infringement of the Patents, Comcast nevertheless continued its infringing actions, and continued to make, use and sell infringing DOCSIS 3.0 (and higher) products.

33. Comcast's infringement of the '822, '679 and '565 Patents has thus been deliberate and willful, at least since February 23, 2012.

### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff ChanBond, LLC respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment in its favor as follows:

A. Declaring that defendants have infringed, literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, at least one claim of each of the '822, '679 and '565 Patents, and that this infringement is willful;

B. Awarding to Plaintiff the damages to which it is entitled under 35 U.S.C. § 284 for defendants' past infringement and any continuing or future infringement, including compensatory damages, and the trebling of such damages due to the willful nature of the infringement;

C. Awarding Plaintiff costs (including all disbursements) and expenses incurred in this action;

D. Awarding Plaintiff pre- and post-judgment interest on its damages;

E. Declaring that this case is exceptional pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §285 and awarding Plaintiff its attorneys' fees and costs; and

F. Awarding Plaintiff such other and further relief in law or in equity as this Court deems just and proper.

**JURY DEMAND**

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

Dated: September 21, 2015

BAYARD, P.A.

OF COUNSEL:

Mark Raskin  
Robert Whitman  
John F. Petrusic  
MISHCON DE REYA NEW YORK LLP  
750 Seventh Ave., 26<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10019

*/s/ Stephen B. Brauerman*  
Stephen B. Brauerman (No. 4952)  
Vanessa R. Tiradentes (No. 5398)  
Sara E. Bussiere (No. 5725)  
222 Delaware Avenue, Suite 900  
P.O. Box 25130  
Wilmington, Delaware 19899  
(302) 655-5000  
sbrauerman@bayardlaw.com  
vtiradentes@bayardlaw.com  
sbussiere@bayardlaw.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff ChanBond, LLC*