

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

**AUTOMATION MIDDLEWARE
SOLUTIONS, INC.,**

Plaintiff,

V.

**KOLLMORGEN CORPORATION and
DANAHER CORPORATION,**

Defendants.

[illegible]

C.A. No. 2:15-cv-01539

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff Automation Middleware Solutions, Inc. (“AMS” or “Plaintiff”) files this First Amended Complaint against Kollmorgen Corporation (“Kollmorgen Corp”) and Danaher Corporation (“Danaher”) (collectively, “Kollmorgen” or “Defendants”) for infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,513,058 (“the ’058 patent”), U.S. Patent No. 6,516,236 (“the ’236 patent”), U.S. Patent No. 8,073,557 (“the ’557 patent”), U.S. Patent No. 5,691,897 (“the ’897 patent”), and U.S. Patent No. 6,941,543 (“the ’543 patent”).

THE PARTIES

1. Automation Middleware Solutions, Inc. is a Texas corporation with its principal place of business at 505 E. Travis St., Suite 203, Marshall, TX 75670.

2. Kollmorgen Corporation is a New York corporation with its principal place of business at 203A West Rock Road, Radford, Virginia 24141. This Defendant may be served with process through its agent, CT Corporation System, at 111 Eighth Avenue, New York, New York 10011. This Defendant does business in the State of Texas and in the Eastern District of Texas.

3. Danaher Corporation, is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 2200 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W., Suite 800W, Washington, D.C. 20037. This Defendant may be served with process through its agent Corporation Service Company, at 2711 Centerville Rd., Wilmington, Delaware 19808. This Defendant does business in the State of Texas and in the Eastern District of Texas.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This action arises under the patent laws of the United States, namely 35 U.S.C. §§ 271, 281, and 284-285, among others.

5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a), and 1367.

6. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and (c), and 1400(b). On information and belief, each Defendant is deemed to reside in this judicial district. Each Defendant has committed acts of infringement in this judicial district, has regular and established places of business in this judicial district, and/or has purposely transacted business in this judicial district, including but not limited to making sales in this district, providing service and support to their respective customers in this district, and/or operating an interactive website, available to persons in this district that advertises, markets, and/or offers for sale infringing products.

7. On information and belief, each Defendant is subject to this Court's specific and general personal jurisdiction pursuant to due process and/or the Texas Long Arm Statute, due at least to their substantial business in this State and judicial district, including: (A) at least part of their infringing activities alleged herein; and (B) regularly doing or soliciting business, engaging in other persistent conduct, and/or deriving substantial revenue from goods sold and services

provided to Texas residents. Each Defendant has purposefully availed itself of the privileges of conducting business in the United States, and more specifically in Texas and this District. Kollmorgen has sought protection and benefit from the laws of the State of Texas by placing infringing products into the stream of commerce through an established distribution channel with the awareness and/or intent that they will be purchased by consumers in this District.

BACKGROUND

8. In the early 1990s, inventors Dave Brown and Jay Clark conceived of a system for motion control utilized in the products and services offered by the company they founded, ROY-G-BIV Corp. (“RGB”). The ’058 patent, the ’236 patent, the ’557 patent, the ’897 patent, and the ’543 patent (“the patents-in-suit”) asserted in this Complaint are the subject of Dave Brown and Jay Clark’s inventions. The inventors’ patented approach to universal connectivity has since become the industry standard.

9. The patentability of the patents-in-suit has been confirmed through both reexamination and *inter partes* review before the United States Patent and Trademark Office. Specifically, on June 28, 2011, the USPTO issued reexamination certificates confirming the patentability of all 10 claims of the ’236 patent and all 5 claims of the ’058 patent, without amendment. On January 11, 2011, the USPTO issued a reexamination certificate confirming the patentability of all 25 claims of the ’897 patent without amendment. And on September 4, 2012, the USPTO issued a reexamination certificate confirming the patentability of all 16 claims of the ’543 patent without amendment. Additionally, the claims of the ’058 patent, ’236 patent, and ’557 patent were challenged in five *inter partes* review proceedings. In each case, the Patent Trial and Appeal Board confirmed the patentability of all claims without amendment.

10. The ’897, ’058, ’236, and ’543 patents have been previously asserted in this District in *ROY-G-BIV Corp. v. Fanuc Ltd. et al.*, Case No. 2:07-cv-00418-DF (E.D. Texas) and the ’058,

'236, '543, and '557 patents were previously asserted in this District in the matters of *ROY-G-BIV Corp. v. ABB, Ltd., et al.*, Case No. 6:11-cv-00622-LED-ZJH (E.D. Texas), *ROY-G-BIV Corp. v. Honeywell Int'l., Inc., et al.*, Case No. 6:11-cv-00623-LED-ZJH (E.D. Texas), and *ROY-G-BIV Corp. v. Siemens Corp., et al.*, Case No. 6:11-cv-00624-LED-ZJH (E.D. Texas). In those proceedings, over fifty claim terms from the patents-in-suit were construed by the Court in this District.

11. Upon information and belief, Defendants make, use, offer to sell, and/or sell within, and/or import into the United States motion control systems that incorporate the fundamental technologies covered by the patents-in-suit.

COUNT I

(INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,513,058)

12. AMS incorporates paragraphs 1 through 11 herein by reference.

13. U.S. Patent No. 6,513,058, entitled "Distribution of Motion Control Commands Over a Network," was duly and legally issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on January 28, 2003 after full and fair examination. The '058 patent has been assigned to AMS, and AMS holds all rights, title, and interest in the '058 patent, including the right to exclude others and to enforce, sue, and recover damages for past, present, and future infringements. A true and correct copy of the '058 patent is attached as Exhibit A.

14. The '058 patent is valid, enforceable, and was duly issued in full compliance with Title 35 of the United States Code.

15. Upon information and belief, to the extent any marking or notice was required by 35 U.S.C. § 287, Plaintiff and all predecessors-in-interest to the '058 patent have complied with the requirements of that statute by providing actual or constructive notice to Defendants of their alleged infringement.

16. Defendants have and continue to directly and/or indirectly infringe (by inducing infringement and/or contributing to infringement) one or more claims of the '058 patent in this judicial district and elsewhere in Texas and the United States without the consent or authorization of AMS, by or through their making, having made, offering for sale, selling, importing, and/or using motion control systems including, for example, the Kollmorgen Automation Suite of products which includes but is not limited to Kollmorgen Visualization Builder, KAS Integrated Development Environment, and Kollmorgen Pipe Network and software (the "Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems").

17. Defendants directly infringe the apparatus claims of the '058 patent by making, using, offering to sell, selling, and/or importing the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems. Defendants are thereby liable for direct infringement.

18. Additionally, Defendants are liable for indirect infringement of the '058 patent because they induce and/or contribute to the direct infringement of the patent by their customers and other end users who use the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems to practice the claimed inventions. Since obtaining knowledge of the '058 patent, Defendants have specifically intended and continue to specifically intend for persons who acquire and use the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems, including Defendants' customers to use such systems in a manner that infringes the '058 patent.

19. Specifically, as an example of the infringing features in this case,¹ the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems comprise components that, either individually or in conjunction with each other, allow an application program to communicate with any one of a group of supported

¹ The exemplar description of Kollmorgen's infringement is merely representative, but not exhaustive or limited, and therefore should not be construed as limiting Plaintiff's theories of infringement, whether direct, indirect, literal, or pursuant to the Doctrine of Equivalents.

hardware devices. The Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems include an application program comprising a series of component functions defining a desired motion sequence. The Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems include a set of motion control operations in the form of primitive and/or non-primitive operations for operating motion control devices. The Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems also include a set of core driver functions that are associated with the primitive operations, and a set of extended driver functions that are associated with the non-primitive operations. The Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems include a motion control component comprising component code that associates a set of component functions with the driver functions. The Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems also include a set of software drivers, each being associated with a selected hardware device and further comprising driver code for implementing the driver functions. The Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems include a control command generating module for generating control commands and a network communication protocol that allows the control commands to be communicated to the supported hardware devices over a network. Through the incorporation and use of these elements, the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems infringe the claims of the '058 patent, including at least Claim 1.

20. Defendants have had knowledge of the '058 patent, at least as early as service of the Original Complaint. *See, e.g., Patent Harbor, LLC v. Dreamworks Animation SKG, Inc.*, No. 6:11-cv-229, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 114199, at *17 (E.D. Tex. Jul. 27, 2012).

21. Despite having knowledge of the '058 patent, Defendants named in this Count have specifically intended and continue to specifically intend for persons who acquire and use the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems, including Defendants' customers, to use such systems in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '058 patent. This is evident when Defendants encourage and instruct customers and other end users in the use and operation of the

Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems via advertisement and instructional materials, in addition to providing consulting services on the use and operation of the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems.

22. In particular, despite having knowledge of the '058 patent, Defendants have provided, and continue to provide, product descriptions and instructional materials, such as user guides, owner manuals, and similar online resources (available for example, via <http://www.kollmorgen.com/en-us/products/machine-controls/automation-platform/kollmorgen-automation-suite-components/>, <http://www.kollmorgen.com/en-us/products/machine-controls/software/>, and <https://www.youtube.com/user/KollmorgenMotion>, and other instructional materials and documentation provided or made available by Defendants to customers after purchase) that specifically teach the customers and other end users to use the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems in an infringing manner. By providing such instructions, Defendants know (and have known), or should know (and should have known), that their actions have, and continue to, actively induce infringement.

23. Additionally, Defendants named in this Count know, and have known, that the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems include proprietary hardware components and software instructions that work in concert to perform specific, intended functions. Such specific, intended functions, carried out by these hardware and software combinations, are a material part of the inventions of the '058 patent and are not staple articles of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.

24. Kollmorgen Corp is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Danaher. On information and belief, Defendants Kollmorgen Corp and Danaher test, make, use, offer for sale, sell, and/or import the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems described in this Count, pursuant to one or more contractual agreements between them relating to, at least, the distribution, sale, and operation of

such systems. Accordingly, Kollmorgen Corp and Danaher are jointly, severally, or alternatively liable for infringements described in this Count.

25. AMS has been damaged as a result of Defendants' infringing conduct described in this Count. Defendants are, thus, liable to AMS in an amount that adequately compensates AMS for Defendants' infringements, which, by law, cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

COUNT II

(INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,516,236)

26. AMS incorporates paragraphs 1 through 25 herein by reference.

27. U.S. Patent No. 6,516,236, entitled "Motion Control Systems," was duly and legally issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on February 4, 2003 after full and fair examination. The '236 patent has been assigned to AMS, and AMS holds all rights, title, and interest in the '236 patent, including the right to exclude others and to enforce, sue, and recover damages for past, present, and future infringements. A true and correct copy of the '236 patent is attached as Exhibit B.

28. The '236 patent is valid, enforceable, and was duly issued in full compliance with Title 35 of the United States Code.

29. Upon information and belief, to the extent any marking or notice was required by 35 U.S.C. § 287, Plaintiff and all predecessors-in-interest to the '236 patent have complied with the requirements of that statute by providing actual or constructive notice to Defendants of their alleged infringement.

30. Defendants have and continue to directly and/or indirectly infringe (by inducing infringement and/or contributing to infringement) one or more claims of the '236 patent in this

judicial district and elsewhere in Texas and the United States without the consent or authorization of AMS, by or through their making, having made, offering for sale, selling, importing, and/or using motion control systems including, for example, the Kollmorgen Automation Suite of products which includes but is not limited to Kollmorgen Visualization Builder, KAS Integrated Development Environment, and Kollmorgen Pipe Network and software (the “Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems”).

31. Defendants directly infringe the apparatus claims of the ’236 patent by making, using, offering to sell, selling, and/or importing the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems. Defendants are thereby liable for direct infringement.

32. Additionally, Defendants are liable for indirect infringement of the ’236 patent because they induce and/or contribute to the direct infringement of the patent by their customers and other end users who use the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems to practice the claimed inventions. Since obtaining knowledge of the ’236 patent, Defendants have specifically intended and continue to specifically intend for persons who acquire and use the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems, including Defendants’ customers to use such systems in a manner that infringes the ’236 patent.

33. Specifically, as an example of the infringing features in this case,² the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems comprise components that, either individually or in conjunction with each other, generate a sequence of control commands for controlling a selected motion control device selected from a group of supported motion control devices. The Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems include a set of motion control operations in the form of primitive and/or non-primitive

² The exemplar description of Kollmorgen’s infringement is merely representative, but not exhaustive or limited, and therefore should not be construed as limiting Plaintiff’s theories of infringement, whether direct, indirect, literal, or pursuant to the Doctrine of Equivalents.

operations for operating motion control devices. The Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems also include a set of core driver functions that are associated with the primitive operations, and a set of extended driver functions that are associated with the non-primitive operations. The Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems include an application program comprising a series of component functions. The Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems include a motion control component comprising component code that associates a set of component functions with the driver functions. The Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems also include a set of software drivers, each being associated with a selected motion control device. Through the incorporation and use of these elements, the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems infringe the claims of the '236 patent, including at least Claim 1.

34. Defendants have had knowledge of the '236 patent, at least as early as service of the Original Complaint. *See, e.g., Patent Harbor, LLC v. Dreamworks Animation SKG, Inc.*, No. 6:11-cv-229, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 114199, at *17 (E.D. Tex. Jul. 27, 2012).

35. Despite having knowledge of the '236 patent, Defendants named in this Count have specifically intended and continue to specifically intend for persons who acquire and use the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems, including Defendants' customers, to use such systems in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '236 patent. This is evident when Defendants encourage and instruct customers and other end users in the use and operation of the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems via advertisement and instructional materials, in addition to providing consulting services on the use and operation of the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems.

36. In particular, despite having knowledge of the '236 patent, Defendants have provided, and continue to provide, product descriptions and instructional materials, such as user guides, owner manuals, and similar online resources (available for example, via

<http://www.kollmorgen.com/en-us/products/machine-controls/automation-platform/kollmorgen-automation-suite-components/>, <http://www.kollmorgen.com/en-us/products/machine-controls/software/>, and <https://www.youtube.com/user/KollmorgenMotion>, and other instructional materials and documentation provided or made available by Defendants to customers after purchase) that specifically teach the customers and other end users to use the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems in an infringing manner. By providing such instructions, Defendants know (and have known), or should know (and should have known), that their actions have, and continue to, actively induce infringement.

37. Additionally, Defendants named in this Count know, and have known, that the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems include proprietary hardware components and software instructions that work in concert to perform specific, intended functions. Such specific, intended functions, carried out by these hardware and software combinations, are a material part of the inventions of the '236 patent and are not staple articles of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.

38. Kollmorgen Corp is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Danaher. On information and belief, Defendants Kollmorgen Corp and Danaher test, make, use, offer for sale, sell, and/or import the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems described in this Count, pursuant to one or more contractual agreements between them relating to, at least, the distribution, sale, and operation of such systems. Accordingly, Kollmorgen Corp and Danaher are jointly, severally, or alternatively liable for infringements described in this Count.

39. AMS has been damaged as a result of Defendants' infringing conduct described in this Count. Defendants are, thus, liable to AMS in an amount that adequately compensates AMS for Defendants' infringements, which, by law, cannot be less than a reasonable royalty,

together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

COUNT III

(INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,073,557)

40. AMS incorporates paragraphs 1 through 39 herein by reference.

41. U.S. Patent No. 8,073,557, entitled “Motion Control Systems,” was duly and legally issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on December 6, 2011 after full and fair examination. The ’557 patent has been assigned to AMS, and AMS holds all rights, title, and interest in the ’557 patent, including the right to exclude others and to enforce, sue, and recover damages for past, present, and future infringements. A true and correct copy of the ’557 patent is attached as Exhibit C.

42. The ’557 patent is valid, enforceable, and was duly issued in full compliance with Title 35 of the United States Code.

43. Upon information and belief, to the extent any marking or notice was required by 35 U.S.C. § 287, Plaintiff and all predecessors-in-interest to the ’557 patent have complied with the requirements of that statute by providing actual or constructive notice to Defendants of their alleged infringement.

44. Defendants have and continue to directly and/or indirectly infringe (by inducing infringement and/or contributing to infringement) one or more claims of the ’557 patent in this judicial district and elsewhere in Texas and the United States without the consent or authorization of AMS, by or through their making, having made, offering for sale, selling, importing, and/or using motion control systems including, for example, the Kollmorgen Automation Suite of products which includes but is not limited to Kollmorgen Visualization

Builder, KAS Integrated Development Environment, and Kollmorgen Pipe Network and software (the “Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems”).

45. Defendants directly infringe the apparatus claims of the ’557 patent by making, using, offering to sell, selling, and/or importing the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems. Defendants are thereby liable for direct infringement.

46. Additionally, Defendants are liable for indirect infringement of the ’557 patent because they induce and/or contribute to the direct infringement of the patent by their customers and other end users who use the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems to practice the claimed inventions. Since obtaining knowledge of the ’557 patent, Defendants have specifically intended and continue to specifically intend for persons who acquire and use the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems, including Defendants’ customers to use such systems in a manner that infringes the ’557 patent.

47. Specifically, as an example of the infringing features in this case,³ the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems comprise components that, either individually or in conjunction with each other, form a motion control system. The Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems include an application program comprising a series of component functions. The Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems include a plurality of unique controller languages associated with a plurality of motion control devices, each controller language comprising control commands for processing information associated with motion control devices. The Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems include, as part of each motion control device, a controller capable of generating electrical signals based on the control commands associated with the motion control device. The Kollmorgen

³ The exemplar description of Kollmorgen’s infringement is merely representative, but not exhaustive or limited, and therefore should not be construed as limiting Plaintiff’s theories of infringement, whether direct, indirect, literal, or pursuant to the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Motion Control Systems also include a mechanical system capable of causing a motion control operation. The Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems include a set of motion control operations in the form of primitive and/or non-primitive operations for operating motion control devices. The Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems also include service provider interface defining a set of core driver functions that are associated with the primitive operations, and a set of extended driver functions that are associated with the non-primitive operations. The Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems also include a set of software drivers, each being associated with a selected motion control device and further comprising driver code for associating the driver functions with the control commands generated in the controller language of the associated motion control device. The Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems include a motion component exposing an application programming interface comprising a set of component functions implemented by component code that is independent of the plurality of controller languages. The component code included as part of the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems associates a set of component functions with the driver functions. Through the incorporation and use of these elements, the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems infringe the claims of the '557 patent, including at least Claims 16 and 46.

48. Defendants have had knowledge of the '557 patent, at least as early as service of the Original Complaint. *See, e.g., Patent Harbor, LLC v. Dreamworks Animation SKG, Inc.*, No. 6:11-cv-229, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 114199, at *17 (E.D. Tex. Jul. 27, 2012).

49. Despite having knowledge of the '557 patent, Defendants named in this Count have specifically intended and continue to specifically intend for persons who acquire and use the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems, including Defendants' customers, to use such systems in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '557 patent. This is evident when Defendants encourage and instruct customers and other end users in the use and operation of the

Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems via advertisement and instructional materials, in addition to providing consulting services on the use and operation of the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems.

50. In particular, despite having knowledge of the '557 patent, Defendants have provided, and continue to provide, product descriptions and instructional materials, such as user guides, owner manuals, and similar online resources (available for example, via <http://www.kollmorgen.com/en-us/products/machine-controls/automation-platform/kollmorgen-automation-suite-components/>, <http://www.kollmorgen.com/en-us/products/machine-controls/software/>, and <https://www.youtube.com/user/KollmorgenMotion>, and other instructional materials and documentation provided or made available by Defendants to customers after purchase) that specifically teach the customers and other end users to use the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems in an infringing manner. By providing such instructions, Defendants know (and have known), or should know (and should have known), that their actions have, and continue to, actively induce infringement.

51. Additionally, Defendants named in this Count know, and have known, that the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems include proprietary hardware components and software instructions that work in concert to perform specific, intended functions. Such specific, intended functions, carried out by these hardware and software combinations, are a material part of the inventions of the '557 patent and are not staple articles of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.

52. Kollmorgen Corp is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Danaher. On information and belief, Defendants Kollmorgen Corp and Danaher test, make, use, offer for sale, sell, and/or import the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems described in this Count, pursuant to one or more contractual agreements between them relating to, at least, the distribution, sale, and operation of

such systems. Accordingly, Kollmorgen Corp and Danaher are jointly, severally, or alternatively liable for infringements described in this Count.

53. AMS has been damaged as a result of Defendants' infringing conduct described in this Count. Defendants are, thus, liable to AMS in an amount that adequately compensates AMS for Defendants' infringements, which, by law, cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

COUNT IV

(INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 5,691,897)

54. AMS incorporates paragraphs 1 through 53 herein by reference.

55. U.S. Patent No. 5,691,897, entitled "Motion Control Systems," was duly and legally issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on November 25, 1997 after full and fair examination. The '897 patent has been assigned to AMS, and AMS holds all rights, title, and interest in the '897 patent, including the right to exclude others and to enforce, sue, and recover damages for past, present, and future infringements. A true and correct copy of the '897 patent is attached as Exhibit D.

56. The '897 patent is valid, enforceable, and was duly issued in full compliance with Title 35 of the United States Code.

57. Defendants have and continue to directly infringe one or more claims of the '897 patent in this judicial district and elsewhere in Texas and the United States without the consent or authorization of AMS, by or through their making, having made, offering for sale, selling, importing, and/or using motion control systems including, for example, the Kollmorgen Automation Suite of products which includes but is not limited to Kollmorgen Visualization

Builder, KAS Integrated Development Environment, and Kollmorgen Pipe Network and software (the “Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems”).

58. Defendants directly infringe the method claims of the ’897 patent by operating, making, using, testing, servicing, and/or maintaining the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems that practice the claimed methods. Defendants are thereby liable for direct infringement.

59. Specifically, as an example of the infringing features in this case,⁴ the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems comprise components that, either individually or in conjunction with each other, generate a sequence of control commands for controlling a motion control device to perform a given series of motion steps defined by an application program. Kollmorgen and/or the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems define a set of motion control operations in the form of primitive and/or non-primitive operations for operating motion control devices. Kollmorgen and/or the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems also define a set of core driver functions that are associated with the primitive operations, and a set of extended driver functions that are associated with the non-primitive operations. Kollmorgen and/or the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems define a set of component functions and provide component code which cross-references the component functions with the driver functions. Kollmorgen and/or the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems also develop a set of software drivers comprising driver code for implementing the motion control operations, each selected software driver developed for and associated with a selected motion control device. Kollmorgen and/or the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems generate control commands based on the application program, the component code, and the driver code of the selected software driver. Through the incorporation and use of these elements,

⁴ The exemplar description of Kollmorgen’s infringement is merely representative, but not exhaustive or limited, and therefore should not be construed as limiting Plaintiff’s theories of infringement, whether direct, indirect, literal, or pursuant to the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Kollmorgen and/or the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems infringe the claims of the '897 patent, including at least Claim 17.

60. Defendants have had knowledge of the '897 patent, at least as early as service of this First Amended Complaint. *See, e.g., Patent Harbor, LLC v. Dreamworks Animation SKG, Inc.*, No. 6:11-cv-229, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 114199, at *17 (E.D. Tex. Jul. 27, 2012).

61. Kollmorgen Corp is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Danaher. On information and belief, Defendants Kollmorgen Corp and Danaher test, make, use, offer for sale, sell, and/or import the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems described in this Count, pursuant to one or more contractual agreements between them relating to, at least, the distribution, sale, and operation of such systems. Accordingly, Kollmorgen Corp and Danaher are jointly, severally, or alternatively liable for infringements described in this Count.

62. AMS has been damaged as a result of Defendants' infringing conduct described in this Count. Defendants are, thus, liable to AMS in an amount that adequately compensates AMS for Defendants' infringements, which, by law, cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

COUNT V

(INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,941,543)

63. AMS incorporates paragraphs 1 through 62 herein by reference.

64. U.S. Patent No. 6,941,543, entitled "Motion Control System and Method," was duly and legally issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on September 6, 2005 after full and fair examination. The '543 patent has been assigned to AMS, and AMS holds all rights, title, and interest in the '543 patent, including the right to exclude others and to enforce, sue, and

recover damages for past, present, and future infringements. A true and correct copy of the '543 patent is attached as Exhibit E.

65. The '543 patent is valid, enforceable, and was duly issued in full compliance with Title 35 of the United States Code.

66. Defendants have and continue to directly infringe one or more claims of the '543 patent in this judicial district and elsewhere in Texas and the United States without the consent or authorization of AMS, by or through their making, having made, offering for sale, selling, importing, and/or using motion control systems including, for example, the Kollmorgen Automation Suite of products which includes but is not limited to Kollmorgen Visualization Builder, KAS Integrated Development Environment, and Kollmorgen Pipe Network and software (the "Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems").

67. Defendants directly infringe the method claims of the '543 patent by operating, making, using, testing, servicing, and/or maintaining the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems that practice the claimed methods. Defendants are thereby liable for direct infringement.

68. Specifically, as an example of the infringing features in this case,⁵ the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems comprise components that, either individually or in conjunction with each other, move an object in a desired manner using a motion control device. Kollmorgen and/or the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems select a software driver comprising driver code to control one or more motion control devices. Kollmorgen and/or the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems generate control commands based on an application program comprising a sequence of component functions, the driver code of the selected software driver, and driver functions defining one or more

⁵ The exemplar description of Kollmorgen's infringement is merely representative, but not exhaustive or limited, and therefore should not be construed as limiting Plaintiff's theories of infringement, whether direct, indirect, literal, or pursuant to the Doctrine of Equivalents.

incremental motion steps that may be performed by the motion control device. Kollmorgen and/or the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems associate at least some of the component functions with the driver functions. Kollmorgen and/or the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems also operate the selected motion control device in accordance with the control command to move the object. The driver functions of the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems comprise a first subset of driver functions identifying an incremental motion step that may be performed by a motion control device, and a second subset of driver functions identifying a plurality of incremental motion steps that may be performed by a motion control device. Through the incorporation and use of these elements, Kollmorgen and/or the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems infringe the claims of the '543 patent, including at least Claims 1-4.

69. Defendants have had knowledge of the '543 patent, at least as early as service of this First Amended Complaint. *See, e.g., Patent Harbor, LLC v. Dreamworks Animation SKG, Inc.*, No. 6:11-cv-229, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 114199, at *17 (E.D. Tex. Jul. 27, 2012).

70. Kollmorgen Corp is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Danaher. On information and belief, Defendants Kollmorgen Corp and Danaher test, make, use, offer for sale, sell, and/or import the Kollmorgen Motion Control Systems described in this Count, pursuant to one or more contractual agreements between them relating to, at least, the distribution, sale, and operation of such systems. Accordingly, Kollmorgen Corp and Danaher are jointly, severally, or alternatively liable for infringements described in this Count.

71. AMS has been damaged as a result of Defendants' infringing conduct described in this Count. Defendants are, thus, liable to AMS in an amount that adequately compensates AMS for Defendants' infringements, which, by law, cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

JOINDER OF PARTIES

72. AMS incorporates paragraphs 1 through 71 herein by reference.

73. On information and belief, Kollmorgen Corp is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Danaher and both entities participates in or are responsible for the making, having made, offering for sale, selling, importing, and/or using the Kollmorgen Motion Control systems that are the subject of Counts I through V (or some subset thereof). Thus, for these Counts, the right to relief against Kollmorgen Corp is asserted jointly and severally with Danaher.

74. The alleged infringements set forth in Counts I through V arise out of the same transaction, occurrence, or series of transactions or occurrences relating to the testing, making, using, offering for sale, selling, and/or importing of the Kollmorgen systems made the subject of Counts I through V.

75. Questions of fact common to all Defendants will arise in this action including, for example, infringement by, or through use of, Kollmorgen systems.

76. Thus, joinder of Kollmorgen Corp and Danaher is proper in this litigation pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 299(a).

JURY DEMAND

AMS hereby requests a trial by jury pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

AMS requests that the Court find in its favor and against Defendants, and that the Court grant AMS the following relief:

- a. Judgment that one or more claims of the '058, '236, '557, '897, and '543 patents have been infringed, either literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, by Defendants and/or by others whose infringements have been induced by

Defendants and/or by others to whose infringements Defendants have contributed;

- b. Judgment that Defendants account for and pay to AMS all damages to and costs incurred by AMS because of Defendants' infringing activities and other conduct complained of herein;
- c. That AMS be granted pre-judgment and post-judgment interest on the damages caused by Defendants' infringing activities and other conduct complained of herein;
- d. A judgment and order finding this to be an exceptional case and requiring Defendants to pay the costs of this action (including all disbursements) and attorneys' fees as provided by 35 U.S.C. § 285; and
- e. That AMS be granted such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper under the circumstances.

Dated: February 4, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Monte Bond

Monte Bond (lead attorney)

Texas Bar No. 02585625

Jeffrey R. Bragalone

Texas Bar No. 02855775

Patrick J. Conroy

Texas Bar No. 24012448

Terry A. Saad

Texas Bar No. 24066015

Bragalone Conroy PC

2200 Ross Avenue

Suite 4500W

Dallas, TX 75201

Tel: (214) 785-6670

Fax: (214) 785-6680

mbond@bcpc-law.com

jbragalone@bcpc-law.com

pconroy@bcpc-law.com

tsaad@bcpc-law.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

**AUTOMATION MIDDLEWARE
SOLUTIONS, INC.**