

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

IXI Mobile (R&D) Ltd. and IXI IP, LLC,	§	
	§	
Plaintiffs	§	Civil No.:
	§	
v.	§	COMPLAINT AND
	§	JURY DEMAND
	§	
HTC Corporation and HTC America, Inc.,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiffs IXI Mobile (R&D) Ltd. and IXI IP, LLC (collectively, “Plaintiffs”), for their Complaint against Defendants HTC Corporation and HTC America, Inc. (“Defendants” or “HTC”), allege as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This is an action arising under the patent laws of the U.S. (35 U.S.C. § 100 *et seq.*) based upon HTC’s infringement of U.S. Patent No. 7,552,124.

THE PARTIES

2. IXI Mobile (R&D) Ltd. (“IXI”; formerly known as IXI Mobile (Israel) Ltd.) is a company incorporated and registered under the laws of Israel with a registered address of 11 Moshe Levi Street Rishon Lezion 75658, Israel. IXI develops, makes, and sells wireless mobile devices (e.g., cellular telephones and messaging devices) and related services. IXI previously owned the patent at issue in this litigation (the “Patent-in-Suit”) and now has an exclusive license to the Patent-in-Suit.

3. IXI IP, LLC (“IXI IP”) is a New York limited liability company with its principle place of business located at 825 Third Avenue, 2nd Floor, New York, New York and with a registered address of 1218 Central Avenue, Suite 100, Albany, NY 12205. IXI IP owns the Patent-in-Suit. IXI IP has exclusively licensed the Patent-in-Suit to IXI.

4. HTC Corporation (“HTC Corp.”) is a Taiwanese corporation with its principal offices at No. 23 Xinghua Road, Taoyuan City, Taoyuan County 330, Taiwan. HTC Corp. sells wireless mobile devices and related services.

5. HTC America, Inc. (“HTC America”) is Texas corporation with its principal place of business at 13920 SE Eastgate Way #400, Bellevue, WA 98005. HTC America sells wireless mobile devices and related services.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1 *et seq.*, including, but not limited to, 35 U.S.C. § 271.

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

8. The Court has personal jurisdiction over HTC because, among other things, HTC has committed and continues to commit acts of patent infringement within the U.S. and this Judicial District, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271.

9. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b), 1391(c), and 1400(b) because HTC has committed and continues to commit acts of patent infringement in this Judicial District, has induced and are continuing to induce others to infringe the Patent-in-Suit in this District, provides a substantial volume of goods to this District, and does a substantial amount of business within this District, and thus has purposefully availed themselves of the privilege of conducting business within the State of Texas and this Judicial District.

BACKGROUND

10. This dispute involves technology relating to wireless networking and mobile devices, including natural language parsing technology (e.g., parsing natural language code for operative language, determining operations associated with the operative language, and producing executable code to perform the operation).

11. IXI was formed in 2000 and develops phone operating systems and messaging devices.

12. IXI filed patent applications describing its technological developments in the field of mobile communications. The Patent-in-Suit is among the patents issued to IXI by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO).

THE PATENT-IN-SUIT

13. IXI IP is the owner, by assignment, of United States Patent No. 7,552,124 (the “’124 Patent”), titled “Natural Language for Programming a Specialized Computing System,” which duly and legally issued on June 23, 2009. The ’124 Patent covers methods and systems for parsing natural language code for operative language, determining operations associated with the operative language, and producing executable code to perform the operation. IXI Mobile is the exclusive licensee of the ’124 Patent. A copy of the ’124 Patent is attached as Exhibit A.

HTC’S INFRINGEMENT

14. As described below, HTC infringes each of the claims of the Patent-in-Suit directly (alone or jointly) and/or indirectly by contributing to and/or inducing direct infringement by others by making, using, offering for sale, importing into the United States, and/or encouraging the manufacture, use, and sale of devices and/or services. For example, HTC smartphones (e.g., One series, Desire series, EVO 4G LTE, Incredible 4G LTE, Droid DNA,

8XT, and Thunderbolt) (collectively, the “Accused Products”) embody (in whole or in part) the apparatuses or practice the methods claimed by the Patent-in-Suit. The Accused Products meet the limitations of the Patent-in-Suit literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents.

15. On information and belief, HTC has been aware of the Patent-in-Suit prior to the filing of this lawsuit. The fields of wireless local networking, cellular telephony, and Internet connectivity are covered by many United States patents and patent applications claiming various aspects of these technologies, and it is a routine practice in these fields for major manufacturers and service providers to canvass United States patents and pending patent applications in order to identify those which may be relevant to a product or service to be made, used, sold, or offered for sale in, or imported into the United States prior to commencing such making, use, selling, offering, or importing. In researching the patentability of their patents, HTC should have become aware of the Patent-in-Suit.

16. In addition, HTC received actual notice of its infringement of the Patent-in-Suit at least as early as the date of service of this complaint. Therefore, HTC was aware of the Patent-in-Suit or willfully blinded themselves as to the existence of the Patent-in-Suit and made, used, sold, offered to sell, imported and/or encouraged the making, using, selling, offering to sell, or importing of the Accused Products despite knowing of an objectively high likelihood that its actions constituted infringement of the Patent-in-Suit at all times relevant to this suit.

(INFRINGEMENT OF THE '124 PATENT)

17. The allegations of every preceding item in this Complaint are incorporated herein by reference.

18. HTC has and continues to directly infringe alone or jointly, literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, because it has and continues to make, use, offer for sale, sell, and/or

import the Accused Products in the United States without the authority of the owner of the '124 Patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

19. Despite its knowledge or willful blindness of the '124 Patent described above, HTC has intentionally and actively induced others, such as its customers, end users, mobile network operators, distributors, and/or retailers, to make, use, offer for sale, sell, and/or import the Accused Products without the authority of the owner of the '124 Patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b), for example through joint business planning, the provision of advertisements, technical specifications, instructional and/or promotional materials provided in connection with the Accused Products, including for example the associated user manuals and other materials that instruct and encourage the purchaser to use the products in a manner that HTC knows to infringe.

20. Despite its knowledge or willful blindness of the '124 Patent described above, HTC has and continues to sell, offer for sale, and/or import into United States the Accused Products without the authority of the owner of the '124 Patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(c).

21. On information and belief, HTC knew at all times relevant to this Complaint that the Accused Products are especially made or especially adapted for use in the inventions claimed by the '124 Patent and are not staple articles of commerce suitable for non-infringing use.

22. IXI and IXI IP have sustained, are sustaining, and will continue to sustain damages owing to HTC's infringement of the '124 Patent.

23. HTC's infringement of the '124 Patent is continuing and is expected to continue unless enjoined by this Court. IXI and IXI IP do not have an adequate remedy at law, will be irreparably harmed if HTC's infringement of the '124 Patent is permitted to continue, and are therefore entitled to an injunction against further infringement by HTC pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 283.

24. On information and belief, HTC's infringement of the '124 Patent is exceptional and IXI and IXI IP are therefore entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees incurred in prosecuting this action in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 285.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiffs respectfully request this Court to enter judgment in their favor against HTC and to grant the following relief:

A. an adjudication that HTC has infringed one or more claims of the Patent-in-Suit pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 271(a), 271(b), and/or 271(c);

B. a judgment declaring that continuing manufacture, use, offer for sale, sale, and/or importation of Accused Products, or inducement of or contribution to such conduct, by HTC would constitute infringement of one or more claims of the Patent-in-Suit pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 271(a), 271(b), and/or 271(c);

C. a permanent injunction enjoining HTC and its corresponding officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, affiliates, divisions, subsidiaries, and all persons in active concert or participation with any of them, from infringing the Patent-in-Suit, and/or contributing to or inducing anyone to do the same, including manufacture, use, offer to sell, sale, and/or importation of Accused Products before the expiration of the Patent-in-Suit;

D. an award of damages sustained by Plaintiffs as a result of HTC's infringement of the Patent-in-Suit, in an amount to be ascertained at trial, including at least a reasonable royalty on sales of Accused Products and/or Plaintiffs' lost profits;

E. an assessment of pre-judgment and post-judgment interest and costs against HTC, together with an award of such interest and costs, in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §284;

F. a determination that this is an exceptional case and a corresponding award of reasonable attorneys' fees, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285; and

H. such other or further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

JURY DEMAND

Pursuant to Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury on all issues properly so triable.

Dated: November 25, 2015

Deron Dacus, Esquire
Bar No.: 00790553
ddacus@dacusfirm.com
THE DACUS FIRM
821 ESE Loop 323, Suite 430
Tyler, TX 75701
T: (903) 705-1117

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Mark W. Halderman

Thomas S. Biemer, Esquire
tbiemer@dilworthlaw.com
Mark W. Halderman
Bar No.: 24077403
mhalderman@dilworthlaw.com
DILWORTH PAXSON LLP
1500 Market Street, Suite 3500E
Philadelphia, PA 19102
T: (215) 575-7025
F: (215) 575-7200

Attorneys for the Plaintiffs