1	John E Gartman (SBN 152300)
2	GARTMAN LAW GROUP, P.C.
3	490 Pine Needles Drive Del Mar, CA 92014
4	Telephone: 619.517.1010
	john@gartmanlawgroup.com
5	Timethy E. Crash sainsti (Bus Has Visa to be submitted)
6	Timothy E. Grochocinski (<i>Pro Hac Vice to be submitted</i>) IL Bar No. 6295055
7	MO Bar No. 59607
8	Joseph P. Oldaker (<i>Pro Hac Vice to be submitted</i>)
9	IL Bar No. 6295319 Nelson Bumgardner, P.C.
10	15020 S. Ravinia Avenue, Suite 29
11	Orland Park, IL 60462
	Telephone: 708.675.1975
12	Attorneys for Plaintiff
13	CONTENT AGGREGATION SOLUTIONS LLC
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

- 1 -

ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

25

26

27

28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CONTENT AGGREGATION SOLUTIONS LLC, a Texas limited liability company,

Plaintiff,

V.

ZTE CORPORATION, a China corporation, and ZTE (USA), Inc., a New Jersey corporation,

Defendants.

'16CV0533 BTM BLM

PLAINTIFF'S ORIGINAL COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Jury Trial Demanded

Plaintiff Content Aggregation Solutions LLC files this complaint against ZTE Corporation and ZTE (USA), Inc. (collectively "Defendants") for infringement of U.S. Patent No. 8,756,155.

THE PARTIES

- 1. Content Aggregation Solutions LLC ("CAS" or "Plaintiff") is a Texas limited liability company with its principal place of business at 8616 Turtle Creek Blvd., Suite 521, Dallas, Texas 75225. CAS is the owner by assignment of U.S. Patent No. 8,756,155 ("the '155 patent").
- 2. On information and belief, ZTE Corporation is a company incorporated under the laws of China with its principal place of business located at ZTE Plaza, Keji Road South, Hi-Tech Industrial Park, Nanshan District, Shenzhen, Guangdong, China 51807. ZTE Corporation may be served with process in China pursuant to the Hague Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil or Commercial Matters. This Defendant does business in the State of California and in the Southern District of California.
- 3. On information and belief, ZTE (USA), Inc. (with ZTE Corporation, "ZTE") is a New Jersey corporation with its principal place of business at 33 Wood

7 8

6

10

9

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

Avenue, South 7th Floor, Iselin, New Jersey 08830. This Defendant may be served with process through its agent, Jing Li, 2425 N. Central Expy, Suite 323 Richardson, TX 75080. This Defendant does business in the State of California and in the Southern District of California.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 4. CAS brings this action for patent infringement under the patent laws of the United States, namely 35 U.S.C. §§ 271, 281, and 284-285, among others. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338.
- 5. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b)-(d) and 1400(b). On information and belief, ZTE (USA), Inc. transacts business in this District. ZTE Corporation is an alien that conducts business in this District through its wholly-owned subsidiary ZTE (USA), Inc. On information and belief, ZTE has committed acts of infringement in this District.
- 6. Each Defendant is subject to this Court's specific and general personal jurisdiction pursuant to due process and/or the California Long Arm Statute, due at least to its substantial business in this State and judicial district, including: (A) at least part of its 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 California residents.

COUNT I

(Patent Infringement - U.S. Patent No. 8,756,155)

- 7. CAS incorporates paragraphs 1 through 6 herein by reference.
- 8. This cause of action arises under the patent laws of the United States, and in particular, 35 U.S.C. §§ 271, et seq.
- 9. CAS is the owner of the '155 patent, entitled "Web Based Communication of Information with Reconfigurable Format," with ownership of all substantial rights in the '155 patent, including the right to exclude others and to enforce, sue, and recover damages for past and future infringement. A true and correct copy of the '155

6

7

11 12

10

13 14

> 15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25

26 27 28 patent is attached as Exhibit A.

- 10. The '155 patent is valid, enforceable and was duly issued in full compliance with Title 35 of the United States Code.
- 11. The claims of the '155 patent are directed to solving a variety of technical problems arising from the significant limitations of the Internet, and in doing so improve the operation of certain types of devices using the Internet.
- 12. The claims are addressed, among other things, to the technical problem of how to efficiently and practically assemble a combination of different information from different sources on the Internet and return that information to a handheld device, such as a Smartphone, that on its own would have been incapable of assembling the information in a practical and useful way without modification of the different sources. The claims additionally reduce technical complexity and improve efficiency in the handheld device by allowing the aggregation to take place upon the selection of at least one indicator with a single actuation. The precise way in which these problems have been solved with the improvements of the '155 patent claims is specified in each of the separate claims.
- 13. The Patent Office found that the claimed inventions were different from any pre-existing technology known to the Patent Office and that a person of ordinary skill in the technology related to the '155 patent would not have found it obvious to combine preexisting technologies to arrive at the solutions set forth in the '155 patent.
- 14. The integrations in the claims of the '155 patent provide new results that allow handheld devices to operate in a superior way that was not available before the invention of the '155 claims, providing benefits that did not exist before the '155 claims.
- 15. None of the claims of the '155 patent preempts the use of handheld devices, such as Smartphones, on the Internet. Nor do any of the claims preempt commerce on the Internet, electronic shopping, Internet auctions, web browsing, or any other fundamental and long prevalent Internet or economic practice.

- 16. There are technical alternatives to the claims of the '155 patent that are directed to the same problems addressed by the patent claims.
- 17. Each claim of the '155 patent claims an apparatus for a specific computing device, not a mere general computer or generic handheld device.

DIRECT INFRINGEMENT (35 U.S.C. § 271(a))

- 18. Defendants have directly infringed, and continue to directly infringe, one or more claims of the '155 patent in this judicial district and elsewhere in California and the United States.
- 19. Defendants have infringed at least claims 1, 15 and 16 of the '155 patent, by using, selling, and/or offering to sell, within the United States, and/or by importing into the United States, products, including, but not limited to, smartphones and/or tablets that include Android operating systems with Google Now Cards functionality.
- 20. Defendants are liable for these direct infringements pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.

WHEREFORE, CAS asks that the Court find in its favor and against Defendants, and that the Court grant CAS the following relief:

- Judgment that one or more claims of the '155 patent has been infringed, either literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, by one or more Defendants;
- b. Judgment that Defendants account for and pay to CAS all damages and costs incurred by CAS because of Defendants' infringing activities and other conduct complained of herein;
- c. Judgment that Defendants account for and pay to CAS a reasonable, ongoing, post judgment royalty because of Defendants' infringing activities and other conduct complained of herein;
- d. That CAS be granted pre judgment and post judgment interest on the damages caused by Defendants' infringing activities and other conduct complained of herein; and

1	e. That CAS be granted such other and further relief as the Court may dee		
2	just and proper	r under the circumstances	
3			
4			
5	Dated: 03/02/2016	GARTMAN LAW GROUP, P.C.	
6			
7		By: <u>/s/ John E. Gartman</u> John E. Gartman	
8		Attorney for Plaintiff Content Aggregation Solutions LLC	
9		Aggregation Solutions LLC	
10	REQUEST FOR TRIAL BY JURY		
11	Plaintiffs claim trial	by jury on all issues so triable.	
12			
13	Dated: 03/02/2016	GARTMAN LAW GROUP, P.C.	
14	Dated: 03/02/2010	GARTMAN LAW GROOT, T.C.	
15		Ry: /s/ John F. Gartman	
16		By: /s/ John E. Gartman John E. Gartman	
17		Attorney for Plaintiff Content Aggregation Solutions LLC	
18 19		Aggregation Solutions LLC	
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	ORIGINAL COMPLAINT	- 6 -	