

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
BALTIMORE DIVISION**

IN RE:	§	
	§	MDL 1:14-MD-02581-MJG
CTP INNOVATIONS, LLC,	§	(LEAD ACTION)
PATENT LITIGATION	§	

CTP INNOVATIONS, LLC,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	Case No.: 1:15-cv-01471-MJG
	§	
SANDY ALEXANDER, INC.,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff CTP Innovations, LLC, for its First Amended Complaint against Defendant Sandy Alexander, Inc., states as follows:

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

This lawsuit is one of over forty lawsuits that Plaintiff CTP Innovations, LLC (“CTP”) has filed in district courts throughout the United States since 2013. In each of those cases, CTP asserted infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,611,349 (the “349 Patent”) and/or 6,738,155 (the “155 Patent”). The Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation consolidated the remaining cases before the District of Maryland in *In re: CTP Innovations, LLC Patent Litigation*, Case No. MDL 14-MD-2581. This Complaint, therefore, is a “tag-a-long action” that has been consolidated under MDL 14-MD-2581 for pretrial purposes.

A group of third-party manufacturers filed two petitions for *inter partes* review of the ‘349 Patent with the Patent Trial and Appeal Board of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“PTAB”). Based on the petitions, PTAB instituted *inter partes* reviews of claims 1-3 and 10-13 of the ‘349 Patent. PTAB declined to institute *inter partes* review of claims 4-9 of the ‘349 Patent. PTAB later denied a motion for rehearing and again declined to institute *inter partes* review of claims 4-9 of the ‘349 Patent. Upon review, PTAB found that claims 10-20 of the ‘155 Patent and claims 1-3 and 10-14 of the ‘349 Patent have not been shown to be unpatentable.

Defendants Command Web Offset Company, Inc.; Worzalla Publishing Company; Sandy Alexander, Inc.; Publication Printers Corp.; Specialty Promotions, Inc.; and Trend Offset Printing Services, Inc. filed a Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of claims 4-9 of the ‘349 Patent (Case No. IPR2016-00008). Plaintiff filed its preliminary response to the Petition on January 13, 2016. PTAB previously has twice declined to institute *inter partes* review proceedings in response to petitions for *inter partes* review seeking invalidity of claims 4-9 of the ‘349 Patent, as well as denied a motion for rehearing and again declined to institute *inter partes* review of claims 4-9 of the ‘349 Patent.

II. THE PARTIES

1. Plaintiff CTP Innovations, LLC (“CTP”) is a Delaware limited liability company.
2. Upon information and belief, Defendant Sandy Alexander, Inc., (“Defendant”) is a Delaware corporation, with its principal place of business located at, 200 Entin Road, Clifton, New Jersey 07014. Defendant does business in New Jersey, including in the District of New

Jersey. Defendant may be served with process through its registered agent, The Corporation Trust Company, located at, 1209 Orange Street, Wilmington, Delaware 19801.

III. NATURE OF ACTION

3. This is a patent infringement action to stop Defendant's infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,611,349 (the "349 Patent") and 6,738,155 (the "155 Patent").

IV. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. The United States District Court for the District of New Jersey and this Court have subject matter jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a) because it arises under the Patent Laws of the United States, United States Code, Title 35.

5. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(c) and 1400(b). On information and belief, Defendant has a regular and established place of business in that district, has transacted business in that district, and/or has committed acts of patent infringement in that district.

6. Venue is also proper in this Court because this action has been transferred to this district by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation for consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407.

7. On information and belief, Defendant is subject to the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey's specific and general personal jurisdiction pursuant to due process and/or the New Jersey Long Arm Statute, due at least to its substantial business in that forum including but not limited to: (i) at least a portion of the infringements alleged herein; and (ii) regularly doing or soliciting business, engaging in other persistent courses of conduct, and/or

deriving substantial revenue from goods and services provided to individuals in New Jersey and in that district.

8. On information and belief, Defendant is subject to this Court's jurisdiction because this action has been transferred to this district by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation for consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407.

V. GENERAL SUMMARY OF THE TECHNOLOGY AT ISSUE

9. The inventions in the '349 and '155 Patents relate generally to the field of publishing and printing.

10. More specifically, the inventions relate to systems and methods of providing publishing and printing services via a communication network involving computer to plate technology.

11. Simplistically, computer to plate technology involves transferring an image to printing plate without the middle step of creating a film of the image that is imprinted on the plate. The plate is then used in a printing press to transfer the image to different types of media, for example, but not by way of limitation, newspaper, card stock, or standard paper. By directly transferring the image to the plate, the printing company eliminates the need for film and related developer chemicals, improves image quality, and may produce plates more quickly. The claimed methods and systems provide a solution for communicating and managing printing and publishing services without the need to physically transfer copies of design files and proofs through workflows that result in the generation of a plate ready file.

VI. BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTIONS IN THE '349 AND '155 PATENTS

12. Key steps for producing printed materials using a plate process include (1) preparing copy elements for reproduction, (2) prepress production, (3) platemaking, (4) printing, and (5) binding, finishing and distribution.

13. In the printing production process, an “end user” prepares copy elements for reproduction. In this “design” stage of the printing process, the end user provides images and data using slides or computer files to create one or more “pages.” Pages can be designed using computer programs such as QuarkXpress, Adobe InDesign, Adobe Illustrator, Photoshop, or other printing or publishing software packages. Prior to the inventions claimed in the ‘155 and ‘349 Patents, slides or computer disks containing pages to be printed were sent (via mail or express carrier) to be prepared for creation of a plate.

14. In the prepress production stage, the end user input (or “copy”) is transformed into a medium that is reproducible for printing. Typically, prepress involves typesetting, illustration, page building and design, image capture, image color correction, file conversion, RIPing, trapping, proofing, imposition, filmsetting, and platesetting. “Proofing” involves producing a proof, or sample, of what the printed product will look like. Prior to the inventions claimed in the ‘155 and ‘349 Patents, the proof was sent by mail or express carrier to the end user for review and approval. After alterations are made, new proofs are sent to the end user. Once approval of the proof is given by the end user, a medium, such as a computer to plate (CTP) file is produced and sent to the printer. “Imposition” involves the set of pages on a particular plate as well as their positioning and orientation. Imposition is particularly important

in the creation of booklets or catalogs, where pages are positioned using register marks to assist in the stripping, collating, and folding of the printed product.

15. In the platemaking stage, a “printer” manufactures a printing plate using the medium created during prepress. Where a CTP file is used, the printer converts the CTP file into a printing plate or goes directly to a digital press. In the printing stage, the printer uses the printing plate to create the printed product. In the binding, finishing and distribution stage, the printed product is prepared in its final form.

16. Each step in the printing production process described briefly above can be accomplished using a variety of different known systems and techniques. Nevertheless, such conventional systems have many delays, particularly in the transporting of pages and proofs to and from the end user and prepress provider. Due to delays and the fragmented nature of conventional printing production systems, errors often occur. Further, typical printing production systems are limited in their ability to re-purpose data, manage content of pages, and piece together individual processes or tasks to establish an efficient production system or “workflow”. Indeed, no conventional system prior to the invention claimed in the ‘349 and ‘155 Patents combines prepress, content management, infrastructure (server, storage & distribution) and workflow services.

17. Prior to the inventions claimed in the ‘349 and ‘155 Patents, conventional printing and publishing systems generally include Macintosh computers or workstations which communicate with each other using the AppleTalk protocol. AppleTalk protocol could not, however, be communicated over switched networks such as the Internet and private networks where nodes in the network have IP (Internet Protocol) addresses. As such, conventional

systems could not merely be coupled to a communication network for remotely controlling design, prepress and print processes.

18. Prior to the inventions claimed in the '349 and '155 Patents, there was a need for a system which combines design, prepress, content management, infrastructure (server, storage & distribution) and workflow. For end users in particular, there was a need for a system and a method to gain control of the design, prepress, and print processes. To save time and costs, there was a need to eliminate manual shipping of proofs back and forth to a prepress provider. Further, there was a need for a prepress capability at a local facility without the time and costs of shipping proofs back and forth to a prepress provider. Even further, there was a need for a system and method to provide plate-ready files over a communications network for delivery to a CTP device. Moreover, for commercial printers, there was a need for a system and method to remotely drive a plate-setting device located at a printer's facility. Further, there was a need to decrease the amount of time necessary to generate printing plates after processing of the pages (i.e., the cycle time). Even further, there was a need for providing access to the functionality of high-end server, storage, and networking equipment to the printer facility without the associated capital investments.

VII. INTER PARTES REVIEW

19. On July 29, 2013, Printing Industries of America ("PIA") filed a petition to institute an *inter partes* review proceeding with the United States Patent and Trademark Office's Patent Trial and Appeal Board ("PTAB"). That case was captioned *Printing Industries of America v. CTP Innovations, LLC*, Case No. IPR2013-00474.

20. In IPR2013-00474, the petitioner challenged the validity of each and every claim in the '349 patent.

21. On August 2, 2013, PIA filed a petition to institute a second *inter partes* review proceeding with the United States Patent and Trademark Office's Patent Trial and Appeal Board ("PTAB") on July 29, 2013. This case was captioned *Printing Industries of America v. CTP Innovations, LLC*, Case No. IPR2013-00489.

22. In IPR2013-00489, the petitioner challenged the validity of each and every claim in the '155 patent.

23. On December 30, 2013, PTAB found that the petition in IPR2013-00489 did not demonstrate that there was a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to invalidating at least one of the claims in the '155 Patent.

24. A true and correct copy of PTAB's determination in IPR2013-00489 is attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**.

25. On December 31, 2013, PTAB found that the petition in IPR2013-00474 did not demonstrate that there was a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to invalidating at least one of the claims in the '349 Patent.

26. A true and correct copy of PTAB's determination in IPR2013-00474 is attached hereto as **Exhibit 2**.

27. Although it had the opportunity to file a motion for rehearing in both IPR2013-00474 and IPR2013-00489, PIA declined to file any motion for rehearing.

28. Instead, PIA requested the return of refund of its Post-Institution Fees.

29. The determinations by PTAB in IPR2013-00474 and IPR2013-00489 are not appealable.

30. On May 20, 2014, Eastman Kodak Company, Agfa Corporation, Esko Software BVBA and Heidelberg, USA filed *inter partes* review petitions IPR2014-00788 and IPR2014-00789 seeking review of all the claims of the ‘155 Patent.

31. On May 20, 2014, Eastman Kodak Company, Agfa Corporation, Esko Software BVBA and Heidelberg, USA filed *inter partes* review petitions IPR2014-00790 and IPR2014-00791 seeking review of all the claims of the ‘349 Patent.

32. On November 28, 2014, the PTAB took up the petitions and instituted review of claims 1-3 and 10-14 of the ‘349 Patent. Claims 4-9 of the ‘349 Patent are not part of the instituted review.

33. On November 25, 2015, PTAB found claims 10-20 of the ‘155 Patent “have not been shown to be unpatentable.” A true and correct copy of the Final Written Decision in IPR2014-00788 is attached hereto as **Exhibit 3**.

34. On November 25, 2015, PTAB found claims 1-9 of the ‘155 Patent “are held unpatentable.” A true and correct copy of the Final Written Decision in IPR2014-00789 is attached hereto as **Exhibit 4**.

35. On November 25, 2015, PTAB found claims 1-3 of the ‘349 Patent “have not been shown to be unpatentable.” A true and correct copy of the Final Written Decision in IPR2014-00790 is attached hereto as **Exhibit 5**.

36. On November 25, 2015, PTAB found claims 10-14 of the '349 Patent "have not been shown to be unpatentable." A true and correct copy of the Final Written Decision in IPR2014-00791 is attached hereto as **Exhibit 6**.

37. On October 2, 2015, Defendants Command Web Offset Company, Inc.; Worzalla Publishing Company; Sandy Alexander, Inc.; Publication Printers Corp.; Specialty Promotions, Inc.; and Trend Offset Printing Services, Inc. filed *inter partes* review petitions IPR2016-00008 seeking review of claims 4-9 of the '349 Patent.

38. Plaintiff filed its preliminary response to the Petition IPR2016-00008 on January 13, 2016.

39. PTAB has not yet determined whether to take up the Petition IPR2016-00008 and institute review.

40. PTAB previously has twice declined to institute *inter partes* review proceedings in response to petitions for *inter partes* review seeking invalidity of claims 4-9 of the '349 Patent, as well as denied a motion for rehearing and again declined to institute *inter partes* review of claims 4-9 of the '349 Patent.

41. PTAB's repeated denials of petitions to institute *inter partes* review of claims 4-9 of the '349 Patent should be given great weight in viewing the strength and validity of those claims.

VIII. INFRINGEMENT OF THE '349 AND '155 PATENTS IS "UBIQUITOUS"

42. Upon information and belief, PIA is the largest trade association representing the printing and graphic communications industry in the United States.

43. Michael Makin, president and CEO of PIA (petitioner in IPR2013-00474) testified before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, that the inventions in the ‘349 and ‘155 Patents

relate[] to how a digital file, like a PDF file, is handled and manipulated in a print production operation up until the time it is used to image a printing plate. This method of digital workflow and plate imaging was new in the 1990s when the patent was issued but has become ubiquitous in the industry now.

Statement of Michael F. Makin, MBA, President & CEO of Printing Industries of America, Before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, titled “Protecting Small Business and Promoting Innovation by Limiting Patent Troll Abuse,” dated December 17, 2013 (the “PIA Statement”), at 4-5 (emphasis in original). A true and correct copy of the PIA Statement is attached hereto as **Exhibit 7**.

44. In so making this statement, it is clear that Makin and PIA were able to determine from the face of the ‘349 and ‘155 Patents that infringement of the ‘349 and ‘155 Patents was “ubiquitous in the industry now.”

IX. CAUSES OF ACTION

COUNT I

INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,611,349

45. CTP incorporates the preceding paragraphs 1-44 as though fully set forth herein.

46. CTP owns, by assignment, the ‘349 Patent entitled “System and Method of Generating a Printing Plate File in Real Time Using a Communication Network.” A true and correct copy of the ‘349 Patent is attached hereto as **Exhibit 8**.

47. Upon information and belief, Defendant, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271, has infringed, literally or through the doctrine of equivalents, and continues to infringe at least claims

1, 3, 4, and 10 of the '349 Patent through Defendant's using a method of generating a plate-ready file configured for the creation of a printing plate, said plate-ready file being associated with page layouts and being provided in real time from a remote location using a communication network and selling and offering services that include this method (the "Infringing Services").

48. Defendant has not given the Infringing Services a specific and publicly-available name. Accordingly, Plaintiff cannot provide the name used by Defendant for such services without the benefit of discovery.

49. Exemplary Infringing Services include, without limitation, systems and methods used by Defendant in connection with, at least, its offset sheet-fed and web printing services that involve workflows related to plate-ready files and/or the generation of such files.

50. Exemplary Infringing Services do not include variable data printing because that type of printing does not involve the generation of a plate-ready file.

51. Defendant has sufficient experience and knowledge of computer to plate technology generally, and of its systems and methods specifically, to determine which of its systems and methods involve the generation of plate-ready files.

52. Defendant has sufficient experience and knowledge of computer to plate technology generally, and of its systems and methods specifically, to determine which of its systems and methods do not involve the generation of plate-ready files.

53. Defendant had actual notice of the '349 Patent since at least as early as the date of service of the initial complaint filed in this case.

54. Plaintiff's original Complaint placed Defendant on notice that its actions constituted infringement of the '349 Patent.

55. Defendant has had constructive and actual notice of the '349 Patent due to the significant publicity in the printing industry regarding the '349 Patent and lawsuits involving allegations of infringement of the '349 Patent.

56. Upon information and belief, Defendant was a member of PIA on December 17, 2013, when PIA's CEO, Mr. Makin testified before Congress. PIA issued a number of press releases regarding Mr. Makin's testimony, and during his testimony he directly referenced a cease and desist letter sent by CTP's counsel to an alleged infringer.

57. Despite Defendant's knowledge of the '349 Patent, this lawsuit, and that its actions constitute infringement of the '349 Patent, Defendant has continued and, on information and belief, will continue to infringe the '349 Patent unless enjoined by this Court.

58. On information and belief, Defendant's infringement of the '349 Patent is, has been, and continues to be willful and deliberate in whole or in part because Defendant was aware of the '349 Patent from service of the original Complaint, the substantial publicity in the printing industry relating to the '349 Patent, Defendant's membership in PIA, and/or Mr. Makin's testimony and related press releases. Defendant has also received this First Amended Complaint, and yet continues to engage in its infringing conduct.

59. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's infringement of the '349 Patent, CTP has been and continues to be damaged in an amount yet to be determined.

60. Unless Defendant's ongoing infringement is enjoined, CTP will suffer irreparable injury for which there is no adequate remedy at law.

61. This is an exceptional case such that CTP should be entitled to its reasonable attorney fees and expenses incurred in prosecuting this action and defending any counterclaims brought by Defendant.

COUNT II

INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,738,155

62. CTP incorporates the preceding paragraphs 1-61 as though fully set forth herein.

63. CTP owns, by assignment, the '155 Patent entitled "System and Method of Providing Publishing and Printing Services Via a Communications Network." A true and correct copy of the '155 Patent is attached hereto as **Exhibit 9**.

64. Defendant, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271, has infringed, literally or through the doctrine of equivalents, and continues to infringe at least claims 10 and 16 of the '155 Patent through Defendant's making, using, selling, and/or offering for sale in the United States, and specifically in this district, at least printing and publishing services via a communication network that include, without limitation, the Infringing Services.

65. Defendant has not given the Infringing Services a specific and publicly-available name. Accordingly, Plaintiff cannot provide the name used by Defendant for such services without the benefit of discovery.

66. Exemplary Infringing Services include, without limitation, the systems and methods used by Defendant in connection with, at least, its offset sheet-fed printing services that involve workflows related to plate-ready files and/or the generation of a plate-ready file.

67. Defendant has sufficient experience and knowledge of computer to plate technology generally and of its systems and methods specifically, to determine which of its systems and methods involve the generation of plate-ready files.

68. Defendant had actual notice of the '155 Patent since at least as early as the date of service of the initial complaint filed in this case.

69. Defendant had actual notice of the '155 Patent at least as early as the date this action was transferred to Case No. 1:14-md-02581 for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings.

70. Defendant had actual notice of the '155 Patent at least as early as the date of filing Plaintiff's Response [Lead Action, Doc. 145] to the Court's Order [Lead Action, Doc. 141] instructing Plaintiff to state whether Plaintiff intended to add claims then-pending before PTAB to the tag-along actions, including this action.

71. Defendant had actual notice of the '155 Patent at least as early as the date of the Court's Order [Lead Action, Doc. 162] stating that Plaintiff "may seek to add in any claims that survive the pending PTAB decision" to the tag-along actions, including this action.

72. On information and belief, Plaintiff's original Complaint placed Defendant on notice that its actions constituted infringement of the '155 Patent.

73. On information and belief, Plaintiff's Response [Lead Action, Doc. 145] to the Court's Order [Lead Action, Doc. 141] placed Defendant on notice that its actions constituted infringement of the '155 Patent.

74. On information and belief, the Court's Order [Lead Action, Doc. 162] placed Defendant on notice that its action constituted infringement of the '155 Patent.

75. Defendant has had constructive and actual notice of the '155 Patent due to the significant publicity in the printing industry regarding the '349 Patent and lawsuits involving allegations of infringement of the '155 Patent.

76. Upon information and belief, Defendant was a member of PIA on December 17, 2013, when PIA's CEO, Mr. Makin testified before Congress. PIA issued a number of press releases regarding Mr. Makin's testimony, and during his testimony he directly referenced a cease and desist letter sent by CTP's counsel to an alleged infringer.

77. Despite Defendant's knowledge of the '155 Patent, this lawsuit, and that its actions constitute infringement of the '155 Patent, has continued and, on information and belief, Defendant will continue to infringe the '155 Patent unless enjoined by this Court.

78. On information and belief, Defendant's infringement of the '155 Patent is, has been, and continues to be willful and deliberate in whole or in part because Defendant was aware of the '155 Patent from service of the original Complaint, filings in the MDL proceedings, the substantial publicity in the printing industry relating to the '155 Patent, Defendant's membership in PIA, and/or Mr. Makin's testimony and related press releases. Defendant has also received this First Amended Complaint, and yet continues to engage in its infringing conduct.

79. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's infringement of the '155 Patent, CTP has been and continues to be damaged in an amount yet to be determined.

80. Unless Defendant's ongoing infringement is enjoined, CTP will suffer irreparable injury for which there is no adequate remedy at law.

81. This is an exceptional case such that CTP should be entitled to its reasonable attorney fees and expenses incurred in prosecuting this action and defending any counterclaims brought by Defendant.

X. REQUEST FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, CTP requests the following relief:

1. A judgment in favor of CTP that Defendant has infringed the '349 Patent and that such infringement was willful;
2. A judgment in favor of CTP that Defendant has infringed the '155 Patent and that such infringement was willful;
3. A permanent injunction enjoining Defendant and its officers, directors, agents, servants, affiliates, employees, divisions, branches, subsidiaries, parents, and all other actors acting in active concert therewith from infringing the '349 Patent;
4. A permanent injunction enjoining Defendant and its officers, directors, agents, servants, affiliates, employees, divisions, branches, subsidiaries, parents, and all other actors acting in active concert therewith from infringing the '155 Patent;
5. A judgment and order requiring Defendant to pay CTP its damages in an amount not less than a reasonable royalty, treble damages, costs, expenses, and prejudgment and post-judgment interest for Defendant's infringement of the '349 Patent, as provided under 35 U.S.C. § 284;
6. A judgment and order requiring Defendant to pay CTP its damages in an amount not less than a reasonable royalty, treble damages, costs, expenses, and prejudgment and post-

judgment interest for Defendant's infringement of the '155 Patent, as provided under 35 U.S.C. § 284;

7. A judgment and order finding that this is an exceptional case within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 285, and awarding to CTP its reasonable attorney fees and expenses; and

8. Any and all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

XI. JURY DEMAND

CTP requests a jury for all issues so triable.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Samuel F. Miller

Samuel F. Miller, MD Bar ID: 802749

(admitted pro hac vice)

Maia T. Woodhouse, MD Bar ID: 802751

(admitted pro hac vice)

BAKER, DONELSON, BEARMAN,

CALDWELL & BERKOWITZ, P.C.

Baker Donelson Center

211 Commerce Street, Suite 800

Nashville, Tennessee 37201

Telephone: (615) 726-5594

Fax: (615) 744-5594

Email: smiller@bakerdonelson.com

mwoodhouse@bakerdonelson.com

L. Clint Crosby, MD Bar ID: 802809

(admitted pro hac vice)

BAKER, DONELSON, BEARMAN,

CALDWELL & BERKOWITZ, P.C.

Monarch Plaza, Suite 1600

3414 Peachtree Road, N.E.

Atlanta, Georgia 30326

Telephone: (678) 406-8702

Fax: (678) 406-8802

Email: ccrosby@bakerdonelson.com

Attorneys for CTP Innovations, LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On February 1, 2016, the foregoing document was electronically filed. Notice of this filing will be sent by operation of the Court's electronic filing system to all parties indicated on the electronic filing receipt. All other parties will be served by regular U.S. mail, postage prepaid. Parties may access this filing through the Court's electronic filing system.

Eric W. Schweibenz
Scott A. McKeown
Christopher Ricciuti
Oblon McClelland Maier and Neustadt LLP
1940 Duke Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
Email: eschweibenz@oblon.com
smckeown@oblon.com
cricciuti@oblon.com

/s/ Samuel F. Miller
Samuel F. Miller, MD Bar ID: 802749
(admitted pro hac vice)