

1 George C. Summerfield
2 STADHEIM & GREAR, LTD.
3 400 North Michigan Avenue
4 Suite 2200
5 Chicago, Illinois 60611
6 (312) 755-4400
7 summerfield@stadheimgear.com

8 *Attorney for Plaintiff*
9 KINGLITE HOLDINGS INC.

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12 OAKLAND DIVISION

13 KINGLITE HOLDINGS INC., a Seychelles
14 Company,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 ELITEGROUP COMPUTER SYSTEMS CO.,
18 LTD., a Taiwan Corporation, and
19 ELITEGROUP COMPUTER SYSTEMS
20 INC. (USA) a California Corporation.

21 Defendants.

CASE NO. 4:16-cv-00912

COMPLAINT

[JURY TRIAL DEMANDED]

1 Plaintiff, Kinglite Holdings Inc. (“Kinglite”) alleges by way of complaint against
2 Defendants, Elitegroup Computer Systems Co., Ltd. and Elitegroup Computer Systems Inc.
3 (U.S.A.) (collectively “Defendants”) as follows:

4 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

5 **Plaintiff**

6 1. Kinglite is a company incorporated under the laws of the Republic of the
7 Seychelles with its principal place of business at 7 Temasek Boulevard, #15-01A Suntec Tower
8 One, Singapore 038987.

9 2. Kinglite is the owner of United States Patent Nos. 5,836,013 (“the ‘013 patent”)
10 [Ex. A], 6,401,202 (“the ‘202 patent”) [Ex. B] and 6,487,656 (“the ‘656 patent”) [Ex. C]
11 (collectively “the Asserted Patents”).

12 **Defendants**

13 3. Elitegroup Computer Systems Co., Ltd. (“ECS”) is a Taiwanese corporation with
14 its principal place of business at No. 239, Section 2, Ti Ding Boulevard, Taipei, Taiwan 11493.
15 It manufactures motherboards, notebooks, and tablets loaded with BIOS acquired from AMI
16 (“Accused Products”). ECS regularly conducts business in this Judicial District through its
17 subsidiary, Elitegroup Computer Systems Inc. (U.S.A.) (“ECS USA”).

18 4. ECS is a California corporation with its principal place of business at 6851
19 Mowry Avenue, Newark, California 94560. This defendant is registered to do business in the
20 State of California and has appointed Hsin-Chiang Liu at the same address as its agent for
21 service of process.

22 5. Defendants import, offer for sale, and/or sell motherboards loaded with a basic
23 input/output system (“BIOS”) acquired from American Megatrends, Inc. (“AMI”).

24 **Unified Extensible Firmware Interface**

25 6. The Unified Extensible Firmware Interface (“UEFI”) is a standard that defines a
26 BIOS software interface between an operating system and platform firmware.

27 7. The ‘013 and ‘202 patents are directed to inventions that cover implementations

1 of portions of the UEFI standard.

2 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

3 8. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and
4 1338(a).

5 9. Venue is proper in this Judicial District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b).

6 10. At all relevant times, Defendants have conducted business through in this Judicial
7 District.

8 **COUNT I – DIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF THE ‘656 PATENT**

9 11. Kinglite incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1-10,
10 above.

11 12. Defendants’ importation, sale and/or offer to sell the Accused Products constitute
12 direct infringement of claim 19 of the ‘656 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271 insofar as the
13 processors of such products interface a module to the BIOS to receive a BIOS service request,
14 receive device information, translate the device information, and translate and transfer such
15 information to a separate module.

16 13. Kinglite has been injured by such infringement.

17 **COUNT II – INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF THE ‘656 PATENT**

18 14. Kinglite incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1-13
19 above.

20 15. Users directly infringe claim 12 of the ‘656 Patent through operation of the
21 Accused Products, as explained in paragraph 41, above. When the Accused Products are used,
22 they practice each limitation of claim 19 of the ‘656 Patent.

23 16. Defendants have had knowledge of the ‘656 Patent and its infringement thereof as
24 a result of communication between the parties.

25 17. Defendants have induced and continue to induce infringement of claim 19 of the
26 ‘656 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) by selling the Accused Products to users who directly
27 infringe the patent, and instructing such users on the use of such products.

1 18. Defendants have contributed to and continue to contribute to the infringement of
2 claim 19 of the '656 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(c) by providing the entire
3 instrumentality for direct infringement in the form of the Accused Products to the users of such
4 products.

5 19. Kinglite has been injured by such infringement.

6 **COUNT III – DIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF THE '202 PATENT**

7 20. Kinglite incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1-19,
8 above.

9 21. Defendants' importation, sale and/or offer to sell the Accused Products constitute
10 direct infringement of claim 31 of the '202 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) insofar as the
11 processor of such products enables interrupt signals in response to which the processor performs
12 a task, and, thereafter, performs a second task in advance of the next interrupt signal.

13 22. Kinglite has been injured by such infringement.

14 **COUNT IV – INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF THE '202 PATENT**

15 23. Kinglite incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1-23
16 above.

17 24. Users directly infringe claim 31 of the '202 Patent through operation of the
18 Accused Products, as shown in paragraph 21. When the Accused Products are used, they
19 practice each limitation of claim 31 of the '202 Patent.

20 25. Defendants have had knowledge of the '202 Patent and its infringement thereof as
21 a result of correspondence between the parties.

22 26. Defendants have induced and continue to induce infringement of claim 31 of the
23 '202 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) by selling the Accused Products to users who directly
24 infringe the patent, and instructing such users on the use of such products.

25 27. Defendants have contributed to and continue to contribute to the infringement of
26 claim 31 of the '202 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(c) by providing the entire
27 instrumentality for direct infringement in the form of the Accused Products to the users of such

1 products.

2 28. Kinglite has been injured by such infringement.

3 **COUNT V – DIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF THE ‘013 PATENT**

4 29. Kinglite incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1-28,
5 above.

6 30. Defendants’ importation, sale and/or offer to sell the Accused Products constitute
7 direct infringement of claim 23 of the ‘013 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), insofar as the
8 processor of the Accused Products executes instructions in a decompression program copying a
9 compressed system ROM file from ROM to RAM, and decompresses the compressed data from
10 the RAM to an associated memory location.

11 31. Kinglite has been injured by such infringement.

12 **COUNT VI – INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF THE ‘013 PATENT**

13 32. Kinglite incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1-31
14 above.

15 33. Users directly infringe claim 23 of the ‘013 Patent through operation of the
16 Accused Products as shown in paragraph 30. When the Accused Products are used, they practice
17 each limitation of claim 23 of the ‘013 Patent.

18 34. Defendants have had knowledge of the ‘013 Patent and its infringement thereof as
19 a result of correspondence between the parties.

20 35. Defendants have induced and continue to induce infringement of claim 23 of the
21 ‘013 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) by selling the Accused Products to users who directly
22 infringe the patent, and instructing such users on the use of such products.

23 36. Defendants have contributed to and continue to contribute to the infringement of
24 claim 23 of the ‘013 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(c) by providing the entire
25 instrumentality for direct infringement in the form of the Accused Products to the users of such
26 products.

27 37. Kinglite has been injured by such infringement.

PRAYERS FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Kinglite respectfully requests that this Court:

- a) Find that Defendants infringe the Kinglite patents;
- b) Order Defendants to pay Kinglite damages equal to no less than a reasonable royalty to compensate for the infringement of the Kinglite patents pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284;
- c) Order Defendants to pay Kinglite prejudgment interest;
- d) Enjoin Defendants from further infringement of the Kinglite patents; and
- e) Award such other relief the Court finds just and equitable.

DATED: February 24, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ George C. Summerfield
 George C. Summerfield
 STADHEIM & GREAR, LTD.
 400 North Michigan Avenue
 Suite 2200
 Chicago, Illinois 60611
 (312) 755-4400
summerfield@stadheimgear.com

Attorney for Plaintiff
 KINGLITE HOLDINGS INC.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all claims so triable pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. § 38(b).

DATED: February 24, 2016

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ George C. Summerfield
George C. Summerfield
STADHEIM & GREAR, LTD.
400 North Michigan Avenue
Suite 2200
Chicago, Illinois 60611
(312) 755-4400
summerfield@stadheimgrear.com

Attorney for Plaintiff
KINGLITE HOLDINGS INC.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27