ALLAN H. GRANT, (CSB No. 213658)
GRANTS LAW FIRM
3638 University Ave. #203
Riverside, CA 92501
Telephone: (951) 544-5248
Facsimile: (866) 858-6637
allan@grants-law.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ODEN INDUSTRIES, INC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ODEN INDUSTRIES, INC., Plaintiff, v. SHIPPING AND TRANSIT, LLC (f/k/a ARRIVALSTAR S.A.) Defendants.	CASE NO.: COMPLAINT FOR: (1) DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF PATENT INVALIDITY, AND (2) DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF PATENT NONINFRINGEMENT. **JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

Plaintiff ODEN INDUSTRIES, Inc. (hereafter "ODEN"), complains as follows against SHIPPING and Transit, LLC, formerly known as ArrivalStar S.A. ("SHIPPING").

1. ODEN seeks a declaratory judgment that four patents owned by SHIPPING are invalid. The four patents are (1) U.S. Patent No. 6,415,207 ("the '207 Patent"); (2) U.S. Patent No. 6,904,359 (the '359 Patent"); (3) U.S. Patent No. 6,763,299 ("the '299 Patent"); and (4) U.S. Patent No. 7,400,970 ("the '970 Patent").

2. ODEN also seeks a declaratory judgment that (1) its accused "PACTRAC" internal package tracking software, or certain accused functions of internal package tracking software platform, do not infringe the four SHIPPING

patents and (2) ODEN does not contribute to or induce infringement of the four SHIPPING patents by others.

3. ODEN seeks this relief because SHIPPING, the purported owner of the four patents, has sent ODEN two (2) Demand Letters dated April 11, 2016 and May 23, 2016 ("Demand Letters"), in which SHIPPING threatens to file suit if ODEN does not pay a substantial fee. A copy of the Demand Letters is attached as **Exhibit A**.

4. The threat of suit by SHIPPING is real and not idle because SHIPPING (either under its current name or its former name, ArrivalStar) has filed patent infringement actions in over two hundred fifty (250) cases in various jurisdictions, including in the Central District of California, asserting one or more of the four patents or other patents it owns directed to the same general subject matter.

5. Given the Demand Letters, and given the litigious past of SHIPPING, its predecessor ArrivalStar, its owners and officers, and its affiliates, SHIPPING's allegations have placed a cloud over ODEN and its "PacTrac" internal package tracking software, have injured or are injuring ODEN's business, and have created a concrete and immediate justiciable controversy between ODEN and SHIPPING. ODEN cannot simply stand by to await some filing of litigation at a date in the future. ODEN has filed this complaint so as to know with certainty that its business can move forward without the imminent and ever-present litigation hanging over its head.

PARTIES

6. Plaintiff ODEN INDUSTRIES, INC., is a California Corporation with its principal place of business located at 301 EAST VANDERBILT WAY SUITE 425, SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408.

7. Defendant SHIPPING is a Florida limited liability company with its principal place of business located at 711 SW 24th Avenue, Boynton Beach, FL 33435. SHIPPING is the successor-in-interest to ArrivalStar, S.A., and is also associated or under common ownership with Eclipse IP, LLC (now known as

Electronic Communication Technologies LLC). SHIPPING, ArrivalStar, and Eclipse all appear to have the same principal owners or officers, Peter Andrew Sirianni and/or Martin Kelly Jones. All own patents directed to the same subject matter (namely, advanced SHIPPING tracking and notification systems). All are notorious patent trolls. *See, e.g.*, https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2015/07/psa-shipping-and-transit-llc-and-electronic-communication-technologies-llc-are-not. SHIPPING does not appear to make or sell any product or service. Rather, its business appears to be licensing its patents to third parties under threat of patent litigation and actually suing such third parties for patent infringement.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

8. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338, and 2201 because this action arises under the patent laws and seeks relief under the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act.

9. SHIPPING is subject to personal jurisdiction in the Central District of California because SHIPPING has regularly conducted business in and directed at California and because SHIPPING, which appears to be in the business of licensing and enforcing its patent portfolio, has conducted business with the below companies based in California relating to the licensing and enforcement of its patents, including *inter alia,* Skechers, Petco, Safeway, Hewlett-Packard, Oakley, Gymboree, Seagate, and Toshiba. **Exhibit A**, Demand Letter dated April 11, 2016, at p. 11-13. Further, SHIPPING, under its previous name ArrivalStar, has filed and/or is involved in the following cases in California: *ArrivalStar S.A., et al. v. APL Logistics, Inc.*, 4:06cv4289 (Northern District of California); and *ArrivalStar, S.A., et al v. B E Logistics, Inc.,* 2:06cv4568 (Central District of California*); and Humble Abode, Inc., v. Shipping and Transit, Llc*, 3:16cv01353 (Northern District of California). Those cases concern the patents at issue in this case and/or similar patents directed to similar subject matter. Furthermore, the events giving rise to this action - namely, the demand

to take a license to the SHIPPING patents and the threat of enforcement - occurred primarily and substantially in California and in the Central District in California, where ODEN is headquartered.

10. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and (c) because, among other reasons, SHIPPING is subject to personal jurisdiction in this judicial district, SHIPPING conducts or has regularly conducted business in this judicial district, SHIPPING maintains business records in this judicial district, and/or because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to this action occurred in California and the Central District of California.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

11. ODEN is a software company that has been using and selling its PACTRAC software since before February 15, 1993. The PACTRAC software is an "internal" package tracking software product for tracking packages inside large companies own mail centers, own warehouse, own receiving docks, or inside the company itself. PACTRAC promotes validation and reconciliation with Couriers to ensure proper receipt and accounting of packages received.

12. ODEN's PACTRAC software does not and has never tracked any trucks or tracked packages inside any trucks. In fact, the PACTRAC software does not track any shipping whatsoever. If a client wants to track a package, they would go directly to the shipping company and its website through a link to companies such as FEDEX, UPS, or other delivery company and access that companies tracking information.

13. SHIPPING is in the business of licensing and enforcing patents. SHIPPING purports to have licensed its patents to, or entered into settlement agreements with, several hundred companies, including companies headquartered here in California and in the Central District. SHIPPING, under the names SHIPPING and ArrivalStar, has also filed over two hundred fifty (250) lawsuits to force licenses to its patents. These lawsuits exhibit the classic signs of patent troll litigation. For example,

1 the lawsuits tend to be filed in batches, and nearly all of them settle at an early stage
2 of the litigation, before substantial discovery or adjudication of the merits.
3 14. On April 11, 2016, a law firm claiming to represent SHIPPING, Leslie
4 Robert Evans & Associates, P.A., sent the Demand Letters alleging that certain
5 functions available through "PACTRAC" package tracking software (namely, the
6 "Advance Ship Notice" and "SHIPPING Confirmation Email" functions) infringe
7 certain claims of the four SHIPPING patents. In the Demand Letters, SHIPPING
8 demands that ODEN take a license and adds that "SHIPPING has, when necessary,
9 filed lawsuits to enforce its patent rights." **Exhibit A** Demand Letter dated April 11,
10 2016 at p. 11and 14. SHIPPING then gave ODEN 30 days to respond.
11
12 **The '970 Patent**
13 15. SHIPPING purports to own the '970 Patent, which is entitled "Systems
14 and Method for an Advanced Notification System for Monitoring and Reporting
15 Proximity of a Vehicle." The '970 Patent was issued on July 15, 2008. A copy of the
16 '970 Patent is attached as **Exhibit B**.
17 16. In the Demand Letters (**Exhibit A**), SHIPPING has accused ODEN of
18 infringing Claim 1 of the '970 Patent.
19 17. <u>Claim 1 of the '970 Patent recites the following limitations</u>:
20 **1.** A computer based notification system, comprising:
21 means for enabling communication with a user that is designated to
22 receive delivery of a package;
23 means for presenting one or more selectable options to the user, the
24 selectable options including at least an activation option for instigating
25 monitoring of travel data associated with a vehicle that is delivering the
26 package to the user;
27 means for requesting entry by the user of a package identification number
28 or package delivery number, each pertaining to delivery of the package;

means for identifying the vehicle based upon the entry;

means for requesting entry by the user of contact information indicating one or more communication media to be used in connection with a notification communication to the user;

means for monitoring the travel data; and

means for initiating the notification communication pertaining to the package via the one or more communication media, based upon the travel data.

18. ODEN does not infringe Claim 1 for at least the following reasons. As but one example, Claim 1 requires, *inter alia*, "means for initiating the notification communication pertaining to the package via the one or more communication media, based upon the travel data." The accused ODEN "PACTRAC" internal package tracking software, however, does not initiate a notification communication "based upon the travel data." The '970 Patent defines travel data in the context of real time, periodically updated information about the delivery vehicle containing the package, such as its location or distance and time from the delivery address. *See, e.g*., **Exh. B**, '970 Patent at 6:17-30. To the extent that the ODEN system sends any notification communication at all, however, it is done regarding internal tracking of packages by client itself for tracking packages inside large companies own mail centers, own warehouse, own receiving docks, or inside the company itself. ODEN's PACTRAC promotes validation and reconciliation with Couriers to ensure proper receipt and accounting of packages received. ODEN does not initiate a notification to the customer with travel data (*e.g*., the current location of the package as it travels in the delivery vehicle). PACTRAC software does not and has never tracked any trucks or tracked packages inside any trucks. In fact, the PACTRAC software does not track any shipping whatsoever.

19. Claim 1 also requires "means for identifying the vehicle based upon the entry [of the package identification number]." The ODEN system does not identify the

vehicle delivering the package.

20. Claim 1 of the '970 Patent, as well as other claims, are invalid for failure to comply with one or more of the sections of the Patent Code governing validity, namely, 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112. Without limiting further arguments to be developed during the litigation, the claims of the '970 Patent are anticipated or rendered obvious by certain prior art references, alone or in combination, that were not considered by the USPTO in issuing the patent. Such prior art includes, *inter alia*, Labell, *et al.*, "Advanced Public Transportation Systems: The State of the Art Update '92" (April 1992)[1]; U.S. Patent No. 4,804,937, "Vehicle monitoring arrangement and system" (1989); and Williams, "Radiodetermination Satellite Service: Applications in Railroad Management," IEEE (1986). As one example, the Labell (1992) reference describes systems for automatic vehicle location (AVL) for monitoring and real time reporting on the status and location of vehicles.

21. Further, the claims are directed to unpatentable subject matter and thus do not meet the threshold of § 101, as the Supreme Court has interpreted that provision in *Alice Corp. Pty. v. CLS Bank Int'l*, 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014). Under the *Alice* two-part test for subject matter eligibility, a court first determines whether the challenged patent claim is directed to an "abstract idea" or other category of ineligible subject matter and, if so, whether the claim recites an "inventive concept" that transforms the abstract idea into an eligible invention. *Id*. at 2355-57. Claim 1 and the other claims of the '970 Patent are directed to the abstract idea of letting a customer know when his or her package will arrive. That can be done by human beings with a telephone and a watch or calendar. The claims recite no inventive concept that somehow elevates the claims. Indeed, although the claims nominally recite "a computer based" system in the preamble, the claims do not actually identify any

[1] During reexamination, the United States Patent and Trademark Office found several claims of a related SHIPPING patent invalid in view of the Labell reference. Reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 7,030,781, Control No. 90/012,612.

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
28

specific computer hardware. Nor do the claims identify a technical solution to any particular technical problem. As the Federal Circuit recognized, *Alice* "made clear that a claim directed to an abstract idea does not move into § 101 eligibility territory by merely requiring generic computer implementation." *buySAFE, Inc. v. Google, Inc.*, 765 F.3d 1350, 1354-55 (Fed. Cir. 2014). As the Federal Circuit also observed, claims directed to fundamental economic activity (*e.g.*, e-commerce, business methods, and the like) implemented by generic computer technology are the most like to be found invalid under § 101. *See Mortgage Grader, Inc. v. First Choice Loan Servs. Inc.,* No. 2015-1415, 2015 WL 9854966, at *9 (Fed. Cir. Jan. 20, 2015). The '970 patent is directed to fundamental economic activity or business methods (*i.e.*, logistics, essentially) and, at best, are implemented by generic computer technology. As such, the claims fail the Alice test and thus § 101.

The '299 Patent

22. SHIPPING also purports to own the '299 Patent, which is entitled "Notification Systems and Methods with Notifications Based Upon Prior Stop Locations." The '299 Patent was issued on July 13, 2004. A copy of the '299 Patent is attached as **Exhibit C**.

23. In the Demand Letters (**Exhibit A**), SHIPPING has accused ODEN of infringing Claim 79 of the '299 Patent.

24. Claim 79 of the '299 patent recites the following limitations:

79. A system, comprising:

means for maintaining delivery information identifying a plurality of stop locations;

means for monitoring travel data associated with a vehicle in relation to the delivery information;

means for, when the vehicle approaches, is at, or leaves a stop location:

determining a subsequent stop location in the delivery information;

determining user defined preferences data associated with the stop location, the user defined preferences data including a distance between the vehicle and the subsequent stop that corresponds to when the party wishes to receive the communication; and

sending a communication to a party associated with the subsequent stop location in accordance with the user defined preferences data to notify the party of impending arrival at the subsequent stop location.

25. ODEN does not infringe Claim 79 for at least the following reasons. Claim 79 requires, *inter alia*, "monitoring travel data associated with a vehicle," "determining a subsequent stop location," and then sending a communication notifying the customer "of the impending arrival" of the vehicle at the delivery address. The '299 Patent specification teaches that the claimed systems track in real time the progress of the delivery vehicle at each predefined stop and then report that information to the ultimate destination. The accused ODEN "PACTRAC" internal package tracking software, however, does not monitor the progress of the delivery vehicle at any time, nor does it track in real time and lastly it does not send an email to update the customer on the progress of the vehicle. Rather, to the extent that the ODEN system sends any notification communication at all, it is done within an internal tracking system for tracking packages inside large companies own mail centers, own warehouse, own receiving docks, or inside the company itself. ODEN's PACTRAC promotes validation and reconciliation with Couriers to ensure proper receipt and accounting of packages received. ODEN does not initiate a notification to the customer with travel data (*e.g.*, the current location of the package as it travels in the delivery vehicle).

26. Claim 79 of the '299 Patent, as well as other claims, are invalid for failure to comply with one or more of the sections of the Patent Code governing validity, namely, 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112. Without limiting further

1 arguments to be developed during the litigation, the claims of the '207 Patent are
2 anticipated or rendered obvious by certain prior art references, alone or in
3 combination, that were not considered by the USPTO in issuing the patent. Such prior
4 art includes, *inter alia*, Labell, *et al.*, "Advanced Public Transportation Systems: The
5 State of the Art Update '92" (April 1992)[2]; U.S. Patent No. 4,804,937, "Vehicle
6 monitoring arrangement and system" (1989); and Williams, "Radiodetermination
7 Satellite

8 27. Further, the claims are directed to unpatentable subject matter and thus
9 do not meet the threshold of § 101, as the Supreme Court has interpreted that
10 provision in *Alice Corp. Pty. v. CLS Bank Int'l*, 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014). Under the
11 *Alice* two-part test for subject matter eligibility, a court first determines whether the
12 challenged patent claim is directed to an "abstract idea" or other category of ineligible
13 subject matter and, if so, whether the claim recites an "inventive concept" that
14 transforms the abstract idea into an eligible invention. *Id.* at 2355-57. Claim 79 and
15 the other claims of the '299 Patent are directed to the abstract idea of letting a
16 customer know when his or her package will arrive. That can be done by human
17 beings with a telephone and a watch or calendar. The claims recite no inventive
18 concept that somehow elevates the claims. Indeed, the claims do not even recite any
19 particular computer hardware or other gadgets. Nor do the claims identify a technical
20 solution to any particular technical problem. Even if the claims were interpreted as
21 reciting some computer system, it would be generic computer components at best. As
22 the Federal Circuit recognized, *Alice* "made clear that a claim directed to an abstract
23 idea does not move into § 101 eligibility territory by merely requiring generic
24 computer implementation." *buySAFE, Inc. v. Google, Inc.*, 765 F.3d 1350, 1354-55
25
26
27 [2] During reexamination, the United States Patent and Trademark Office found several claims of a related SHIPPING patent invalid in view of the Labell reference. Reexamination of U.S. Patent
28 No. 7,030,781, Control No. 90/012,612. Service: Applications in Railroad Management," IEEE (1986). As one example, the Labell (1992) reference describes systems for automatic vehicle location (AVL) for monitoring and real time reporting on the status and location of vehicles.

(Fed. Cir. 2014). As the Federal Circuit also observed, claims directed to fundamental economic activity (*e.g*., e-commerce, business methods, and the like) implemented by generic computer technology are the most like to be found invalid under § 101. *See Mortgage Grader,* 2015 WL 9854966, at *9. The '970 patent is directed to fundamental economic activity or business methods (*i.e*., logistics, essentially) and, at best, are implemented by generic computer
technology. As such, the claims fail the Alice test and thus § 101.

The '207 Patent

28. SHIPPING further purports to own the '207 Patent, which is entitled "System and Method for Automatically Providing Vehicle Status Information." The '207 Patent was issued on July 2, 2002. A copy of the '207 Patent is attached as **Exhibit D**.

29. In the Demand Letters (**Exhibit A**), SHIPPING has accused ODEN of infringing Claim 5 of the '207 Patent.

30. Claim 5 of the '207 patent recites the following limitations:

> **5.** A system for monitoring and reporting status of vehicles, comprising:
>
> means for maintaining status information associated with a vehicle, said status information indicative of a current proximity of said identified vehicle;
>
> means for communicating with a remote communication device, said means for communicating including a means for receiving caller identification information automatically transmitted to said communicating means;
>
> means for utilizing said caller identification information to automatically search for and locate a set of said status information; and
>
> means for automatically retrieving and transmitting said set of said status information.

31. ODEN does not infringe Claim 5 for at least the following reasons. Claim 5 is directed to a system "for monitoring and reporting status of vehicles." To do so, Claim 5 requires, *inter alia*, "means for maintaining status information associated with a vehicle, said status information indicative of a current proximity of said identified vehicle." The '207 Patent specification teaches that the claimed systems track in real time the progress of the delivery vehicle and then report that information to the customer expecting the package. The accused ODEN "PACTRAC" internal package tracking software, however, does not monitor the progress of the delivery vehicle in real time nor does it update the customer on the progress of the vehicle. Nor does the system maintain status information on the vehicle, let alone identify it. Rather, to the extent that the ODEN system sends any notification communication at all, however, it is done regarding internal tracking of packages by client itself for tracking packages inside large companies own mail centers, own warehouse, own receiving docks, or inside the company itself. ODEN's PACTRAC promotes validation and reconciliation with Couriers to ensure proper receipt and accounting of packages received. ODEN does not initiate a notification to the customer with travel data. ODEN does not update the current location of the package as it travels in the delivery vehicle. PACTRAC software does not and has never tracked any trucks or tracked packages inside any trucks. In fact, the PACTRAC software does not track any shipping whatsoever.

32. Claim 5 of the '207 Patent, as well as other claims, are invalid for failure to comply with one or more of the sections of the Patent Code governing validity, namely, 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112. Without limiting further arguments to be developed during the litigation, the claims of the '207 Patent are anticipated or rendered obvious by certain prior art references, alone or in combination, that were not considered by the USPTO in issuing the patent. Such prior art includes, *inter alia*, Labell, *et al.*, "Advanced Public Transportation Systems: The State of the Art Update

'92" (April 1992)[3]; U.S. Patent No. 4,804,937, "Vehicle monitoring arrangement and system" (1989); and Williams, "Radiodetermination Satellite Service: Applications in Railroad Management," IEEE (1986). As one example, the Labell

33. Further, the claims are directed to unpatentable subject matter and thus do not meet the threshold of § 101, as the Supreme Court has interpreted that provision in *Alice Corp. Pty. v. CLS Bank Int'l*, 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014). Under the *Alice* two-part test for subject matter eligibility, a court first determines whether the challenged patent claim is directed to an "abstract idea" or other category of ineligible subject matter and, if so, whether the claim recites an "inventive concept" that transforms the abstract idea into an eligible invention. *Id.* at 2355-57. Claim 5 and the other claims of the '207 Patent are directed to the abstract idea of letting a customer know when his or her package will arrive. That can be done by human beings with a telephone and a watch or calendar. The claims recite no inventive concept that somehow elevates the claims. Indeed, the claims do not even recite any particular computer hardware or other gadgets. Nor do the claims identify a technical solution to any particular technical problem. Even if the claims were interpreted as reciting some computer system, it would be generic computer components at best. As the Federal Circuit recognized, *Alice* "made clear that a claim directed to an abstract idea does not move into § 101 eligibility territory by merely requiring generic computer implementation." *buySAFE, Inc. v. Google, Inc.*, 765 F.3d 1350, 1354-55 (Fed. Cir. 2014). As the Federal Circuit also observed, claims directed to fundamental economic activity (*e.g.*, e-commerce, business methods, and the like) implemented by generic computer technology are the most like to be found invalid under § 101. *See Mortgage Grader,* 2015 WL 9854966, at *9. The '970 patent is directed to fundamental economic activity or business methods (*i.e.*, logistics, essentially) and, at best, are

---

[3] During reexamination, the United States Patent and Trademark Office found several claims of a related SHIPPING patent invalid in view of the Labell reference. Reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 7,030,781, Control No. 90/012,612. (1992) reference describes systems for automatic vehicle location (AVL) for monitoring and real time reporting on the status and location of vehicles.

implemented by generic computer technology. As such, the claims fail the Alice test and thus § 101.

The '359 Patent

34. Finally, SHIPPING purports to own the '359 Patent, which is entitled "Notification Systems and Methods with User-Definable Notifications Based upon Occurance [*sic*] of Events." The '359 Patent was issued on June 7, 2005. Certain claims of the '359 Patent were amended in the course of an *inter partes* reexamination. A reexamination certificate with the amended claims issued on May 25, 2010. A copy of the '359 Patent and associated reexamination certificate is attached as **Exhibit E**.

35. In the Demand Letters (**Exhibit A**), SHIPPING has accused ODEN of infringing Claim 41 of the '359 Patent.

36. Claim 41 of the '359 patent recites the following limitations[4]:

41. A notification system, comprising:

(a) means for permitting a user to predefine one or more events that will cause creation and communication of a notification relating to the status of a mobile vehicle in relation to a location, comprising:

(1) means for permitting the user to electronically communicate during a first communication link with the notification system from a user communications device that is remote from the notification system *and the vehicle whose travel is being monitored, the notification system being located remotely from the vehicle*; and

[4] In its Demand Letters, SHIPPING cited to an old version of Claim 41. But Claim 41 was amended during a reexamination. Below is the current version of Claim 41 as amended. (The italicized portions were added by amendment.)

(2) means for receiving during the first communication link an identification of the one or more events relating to the status of the vehicle, wherein the one or more events comprises at least one of the following: distance information specified by the user that is indicative of a distance between the vehicle and the location, location information specified by the user that is indicative of a location or region that the vehicle achieves during travel, time information specified by the user that is indicative of a time for travel of the vehicle to the location, or a number of one or more stops that the vehicle accomplishes prior to arriving at the location; and

(b) means for establishing a second communication link between the system and the user upon occurrence of the one or more events *achieved by mobile vehicle during the travel.*

37. ODEN does not infringe Claim 41 for at least the following reasons. Claim 41 is directed to a notification system that requires, inter alia, "means for establishing a second communication link between the system and the user upon occurrence of the one or more events *achieved by the mobile vehicle during the travel*." The '359 Patent specification teaches that the claimed systems track in real time the progress of the delivery vehicle and then report that information to the customer expecting the package. The accused ODEN "PACTRAC" internal package tracking software, however, does not monitor the progress of the delivery vehicle in real time and does not update the customer on the progress of the vehicle. Specifically, it does not send or establish reporting on events "achieved by the mobile vehicle during travel." Rather, to the extent that the ODEN system sends any notification communication at all, however, it is done regarding internal tracking of packages by client itself for tracking packages inside large companies own mail centers, own

warehouse, own receiving docks, or inside the company itself. ODEN's PACTRAC promotes validation and reconciliation with Couriers to ensure proper receipt and accounting of packages received. ODEN does not initiate a notification to the customer with travel data. ODEN does not update the current location of the package as it travels in the delivery vehicle. PACTRAC software does not and has never tracked any trucks or tracked packages inside any trucks. In fact, the PACTRAC software does not track any shipping whatsoever.

38. Claim 41 of the '359 Patent, as well as other claims, are invalid for failure to comply with one or more of the sections of the Patent Code governing validity, namely, 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112. Without limiting further arguments to be developed during the litigation, the claims of the '359 Patent are anticipated or rendered obvious by certain prior art references, alone or in combination, that were not considered by the USPTO in issuing the patent. Such prior art includes, *inter alia*, Labell, *et al.*, "Advanced Public Transportation Systems: The State of the Art Update '92" (April 1992)[5]; U.S. Patent No. 4,804,937, "Vehicle monitoring arrangement and system" (1989); and Williams, "Radiodetermination Satellite Service: Applications in Railroad Management," IEEE (1986). As one example, the Labell (1992) reference describes systems for automatic vehicle location (AVL) for monitoring and real time reporting on the status and location of vehicles.

39. Further, the claims are directed to unpatentable subject matter and thus do not meet the threshold of § 101, as the Supreme Court has interpreted that provision in *Alice Corp. Pty. v. CLS Bank Int'l*, 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014). Under the *Alice* two-part test for subject matter eligibility, a court first determines whether the challenged patent claim is directed to an "abstract idea" or other category of ineligible subject matter and, if so, whether the claim recites an "inventive concept" that transforms the

[5] During reexamination, the United States Patent and Trademark Office found several claims of a related SHIPPING patent invalid in view of the Labell reference. Reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 7,030,781, Control No. 90/012,612.

abstract idea into an eligible invention. *Id*. at 2355-57. Claim 41 and the other claims of the '359 Patent are directed to the abstract idea of letting a customer know when his or her package will arrive. That can be done by human beings with a telephone and a watch or calendar. The claims recite no inventive concept that somehow elevates the claims. Indeed, the claims do not even recite any particular computer hardware or other gadgets. Nor do the claims identify a technical solution to any particular technical problem. Even if the claims were interpreted as reciting some computer system, it would be generic computer components at best. As the Federal Circuit recognized, *Alice* "made clear that a claim directed to an abstract idea does not move into § 101 eligibility territory by merely requiring generic computer implementation." *buySAFE, Inc. v. Google, Inc*., 765 F.3d 1350, 1354-55 (Fed. Cir. 2014). As the Federal Circuit also observed, claims directed to fundamental economic activity (*e.g*., e-commerce, business methods, and the like) implemented by generic computer technology are the most like to be found invalid under § 101. *See Mortgage Grader,* 2015 WL 9854966, at *9. The '970 patent is directed to fundamental economic activity or business methods (*i.e*., logistics, essentially) and, at best, are implemented by generic computer technology. As such, the claims fail the Alice test and thus § 101.

40. ODEN respectfully asserts that it has been using its "internal package tracking software" for its clients' needs under the trademark PACTRAC having a date of first use and date of first use in commerce dating back to before February 15, 1993, which pre-date all of the above Patents that were filed in March and May of 1993 as well as March of 1999.

COUNT I

Declaratory Judgment of Non-infringement of the '970 Patent

41. ODEN re-alleges and incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

42. A concrete and immediate controversy has arisen between the parties

regarding infringement of the '970 Patent and ODEN's obligation, if any, to pay SHIPPING for rights in the patent. SHIPPING has indicated that it will seek to enforce the patent in litigation against ODEN at some future, albeit unspecified, date.

43. For at least the reasons alleged above, ODEN has not infringed, induced others to infringe, or contributed to the infringement by others of the '970 Patent.

44. ODEN seeks and is entitled to a declaratory judgment that neither it nor its "PACTRAC" internal package tracking software infringe or have infringed under 35 U.S.C. § 271 (or any sub-section thereof) either Claim 1 or any other claim of the '970 patent.

COUNT II

Declaratory Judgment of Patent Invalidity of the '970 Patent

45. ODEN re-alleges and incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

46. A concrete and immediate controversy has arisen between the parties regarding infringement of the '970 Patent and ODEN's obligation, if any, to pay SHIPPING for rights in the patent. SHIPPING has indicated that it will seek to enforce the patent in litigation against ODEN at some future, albeit unspecified, date.

47. For at least the reasons alleged above, the '970 Patent is invalid for failure to comply with the requirements of Title 35 of the United States Code, including, without limitation, one or more of §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112. In particular, the claims are anticipated or obvious in view of prior art not considered by the USPTO. Further, the claims are directed to ineligible abstract ideas and thus fail to meet the requirements of § 101.

48. ODEN seeks and is entitled to a declaratory judgment that all claims in the '970 Patent are invalid.

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
28

COUNT III

Declaratory Judgment of Non-infringement of the '299 Patent

49. ODEN re-alleges and incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

50. A concrete and immediate controversy has arisen between the parties regarding infringement of the '299 Patent and ODEN's obligation, if any, to pay SHIPPING for rights in the patent. SHIPPING has indicated that it will seek to enforce the patent in litigation against ODEN at some future, albeit unspecified, date.

51. For at least the reasons alleged above, ODEN has not infringed, induced others to infringe, or contributed to the infringement by others of the '299 Patent.

52. ODEN seeks and is entitled to a declaratory judgment that neither it nor its "PACTRAC" internal package tracking software infringe or have infringed under 35 U.S.C. § 271 (or any sub-section thereof) either Claim 79 or any other claim of the '299 Patent.

COUNT IV

Declaratory Judgment of Patent Invalidity of the '299 Patent

53. ODEN re-alleges and incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

54. A concrete and immediate controversy has arisen between the parties regarding infringement of the '299 Patent and ODEN's obligation, if any, to pay SHIPPING for rights in the patent. SHIPPING has indicated that it will seek to enforce the patent in litigation against ODEN at some future, albeit unspecified, date. The '299 Patent is invalid for failure to comply with the requirements of Title 35 of the United States Code, including, without limitation, one or more of §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112. In particular, the claims are anticipated or obvious in view of prior art not considered by the USPTO. Further, the claims are directed to ineligible abstract ideas and thus fail to meet the requirements of § 101.

55. ODEN seeks and is entitled to a declaratory judgment that all claims in the ‘299 Patent are invalid.

COUNT V

Declaratory Judgment of Non-infringement of the ‘207 Patent

56. ODEN re-alleges and incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

57. A concrete and immediate controversy has arisen between the parties regarding infringement of the ‘207 Patent and ODEN’s obligation, if any, to pay SHIPPING for rights in the patent. SHIPPING has indicated that it will seek to enforce the patent in litigation against ODEN at some future, albeit unspecified, date.

58. For at least the reasons alleged above, ODEN has not infringed, induced others to infringe, or contributed to the infringement by others of the ‘207 Patent.

59. ODEN seeks and is entitled to a declaratory judgment that neither it nor its “PACTRAC” internal package tracking software infringe or have infringed under 35 U.S.C. § 271 (or any sub-section thereof) either Claim 5 or any other claim of the ‘207 Patent.

COUNT VI

Declaratory Judgment of Patent Invalidity of the ‘207 Patent

60. ODEN re-alleges and incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

61. A concrete and immediate controversy has arisen between the parties regarding infringement of the ‘207 Patent and ODEN’s obligation, if any, to pay SHIPPING for rights in the patent. SHIPPING has indicated that it will seek to enforce the patent in litigation against ODEN at some future, albeit unspecified, date. The ‘207 Patent is invalid for failure to comply with the requirements of Title 35 of the United States Code, including, without limitation, one or more of §§ 101, 102,

1 103, and 112. In particular, the claims are anticipated or obvious in view of prior art
2 not considered by the USPTO. Further, the claims are directed to ineligible abstract
3 ideas and thus fail to meet the requirements of § 101.
4 62. ODEN seeks and is entitled to a declaratory judgment that all claims in
5 the '207 Patent are invalid.
6
7 **COUNT VII**
8 **Declaratory Judgment of Non-infringement of the '359 Patent**
9 63. ODEN re-alleges and incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if fully set
10 forth herein.
11 64. A concrete and immediate controversy has arisen between the parties
12 regarding infringement of the '359 Patent and ODEN's obligation, if any, to pay
13 SHIPPING for rights in the patent. SHIPPING has indicated that it will seek to
14 enforce the patent in litigation against ODEN at some future, albeit unspecified, date.
15 65. For at least the reasons alleged above, ODEN has not infringed, induced
16 others to infringe, or contributed to the infringement by others of the '359 Patent.
17 66. ODEN seeks and is entitled to a declaratory judgment that neither it nor
18 its "PACTRAC" internal package tracking software infringe or have infringed under
19 35 U.S.C. § 271 (or any sub-section thereof) either Claim 41 or any other claim of the
20 '359 Patent.
21
22 **COUNT VIII**
23 **Declaratory Judgment of Patent Invalidity of the '359 Patent**
24 67. ODEN re-alleges and incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if fully set
25 forth herein.
26 68. A concrete and immediate controversy has arisen between the parties
27 regarding infringement of the '359 Patent and ODEN's obligation, if any, to pay
28 SHIPPING for rights in the patent. SHIPPING has indicated that it will seek to

1 enforce the patent in litigation against ODEN at some future, albeit unspecified, date.
2 The '359 Patent is invalid for failure to comply with the requirements of Title 35 of
3 the United States Code, including, without limitation, one or more of §§ 101, 102,
4 103, and 112. In particular, the claims are anticipated or obvious in view of prior art
5 not considered by the USPTO. Further, the claims are directed to ineligible abstract
6 ideas and thus fail to meet the requirements of § 101.
7 69. ODEN seeks and is entitled to a declaratory judgment that all claims in
8 the '359 Patent are invalid.
9
10 **REQUEST FOR RELIEF**
11 WHERFORE, ODEN respectfully requests the Court to enter judgment in its
12 favor and against SHIPPING as follows:
13 1. that neither ODEN nor its "PACTRAC" internal package tracking
14 software infringe or have infringed under 35 U.S.C. § 271 (or any subsection thereof)
15 any claim of the four asserted SHIPPING patents;
16 2. that the four asserted SHIPPING patents and each of their claims are
17 invalid;
18 3. awarding ODEN costs and reasonable attorneys' fees incurred in
19 connection with this action; and
20 4. for such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.
21
22 DATED: June 9, 2016 GRANT'S LAW FIRM
23
24 By:_ / Allan Howard_Grant /_
25 ALLAN HOWARD GRANT
Attorneys for Plaintiff,
26 ODEN INDUSTRIES, INC.
27
28