

1 Rasheed McWilliams (SBN 281832)

[rasheed@cotmanip.com](mailto:rasheed@cotmanip.com)

2 Daniel Cotman (SBN 218315)

[dan@cotmanip.com](mailto:dan@cotmanip.com)

3 Obi Iloputaife (SBN 192271)

[obi@cotmanip.com](mailto:obi@cotmanip.com)

4 COTMAN IP LAW GROUP, PLC

5 35 Hugus Alley, Suite 210

6 Pasadena, CA 91103

7 (626) 405-1413/FAX: (626) 316-7577

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

8 *Si-Flash Drives, LLC*

9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

10 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

12 Si-Flash Drives, LLC, a California )

13 Limited Liability Company, )

14 Plaintiff, )

15 v. )

17 Kingston Technology Company, Inc., a )  
18 Delaware corporation, )

19 Defendant. )  
20 )  
21 )

Case No. 8:16-cv-02004

**FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT  
COMPLAINT FOR PATENT  
INFRINGEMENT**

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

1 Plaintiff Si-Flash Drives, LLC, (“Si-Flash” or “Plaintiff”), by and through its  
2 undersigned counsel, for its Complaint against Defendant Kingston Technology  
3 Company, Inc. (“Kingston” or “Defendant”) makes the following allegations. These  
4 allegations are made upon information and belief.

5 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

6 1. This is an action against Defendant for infringement of one or more  
7 claims of United States Patent No. 8,194,452 (“the 452 Patent”) and U.S. Patent No.  
8 7,855,916 (“the ‘916 Patent”).

9 **THE PARTIES**

10 2. Si-Flash Drives, LLC is a limited liability company organized under the  
11 laws of the State of California and has an office and principal place of business at 35  
12 Hugus Alley, Suite 210, Pasadena, California 91103.

13 3. Defendant Kingston Technology Company, Inc. is a corporation  
14 incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware. Defendant Kingston Technology  
15 Company, Inc. has an office and principal place of business at 17600 Newhope Street  
16 Fountain Valley, CA 92708 USA.

17 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

18 4. This patent infringement action arises under the patent laws of the United  
19 States including 35 U.S.C. §§ 271, et seq.

20 5. This Court has subject-matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28  
21 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a) because it arises under United States Patent law.

22 6. This Court has personal jurisdiction over the Defendant because they  
23 (either directly or through their subsidiaries, divisions, groups or divisions) have  
24 sufficient minimum contacts with the forum as a result of business conducted within  
25 the State of California and this district; and/or specifically over the Defendant (either  
26 directly or through their subsidiaries, divisions, groups or distributors) because of  
27 their infringing conduct within or directed at the State of California and this district.

28 7. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(b) and  
1400(b).

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

**FACTS**

8. Plaintiff is the owner, by assignment, of U.S. Patent No. 8,194,452 (“the ‘452 Patent”), entitled “Nonvolatile memory systems with embedded fast read and write memories,” which was duly and legally issued on June 5, 2012 by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”). A copy of the ‘452 Patent is attached to this Complaint as **Exhibit A**.

9. Plaintiff is the owner, by assignment, of U.S. Patent No. 7,855,916 (“the ‘916 Patent”), entitled “Nonvolatile memory systems with embedded fast read and write memories,” which was duly and legally issued on December 21, 2010 by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”). A copy of the ‘916 Patent is attached to this Complaint as **Exhibit B**.

10. Plaintiff is owner of all rights, titles and interests in and to the ‘452 Patent, and the ‘916 Patent (collectively, “Patents-In-Suit”) including the right to assert all causes of action arising from the infringement of the Patents-in-Suit and the right to all damages, past and present, for any infringement of the Patents-in-Suit.

11. The claims of the Patents-In-Suit are valid and enforceable.

**COUNT I**  
**CLAIM FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT**  
**UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) (‘452 PATENT)**  
**(AGAINST DEFENDANT)**

12. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 11 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

13. Defendant makes, has made, sells, offer for sale, uses and/or imports into the United States, storage devices, including without limitation the V300 SSD, FURY SSD, SSD*Now* KC380 Drive, SSD*Now* E50, and SSD*Now* mS200 (“Accused Product(s)”).

14. The product datasheet of each of the Accused Products, attached to this Complaint as **Exhibits C-G**, indicates that each product contains a pool of NAND flash

1 memory. As provided in Defendant’s website, each NAND flash memory is arranged  
2 as a plurality of blocks with each block comprising a plurality of pages. A copy of the  
3 description of the different types of NAND flash memory obtained from Defendant’s  
4 website is attached to this Complaint as **Exhibit H**.

5 15. Each of the Accused Product(s) includes either a SandForce Client  
6 Controller, i.e. SF-2000 series (e.g. SF-2241, or SF-2281), or SandForce Enterprise  
7 Controller, i.e. 2500/2600 series (e.g. SF-2581), that is “customized for Kingston”. See  
8 Exhibits C-G. The SF-2000 series and the 2500/2600 series implement a pool of  
9 volatile memory indicated as “Buffer” in the system block diagrams obtained from  
10 Seagate. See **Exhibits I and J**.

11 16. The SandForce Client Controller and the SandForce Enterprise Controllers  
12 include a Central Processing Unit (CPU) coupled to the pool of NAND flash, through  
13 the “NAND Interface” and to the Buffer, i.e. pool of volatile memory.

14 17. Each of the Accused Products includes a SATA interface as indicated in  
15 Exhibits C-G. And as indicated in Exhibits I and J, the SATA interface is coupled to  
16 the controller.

17 18. As illustrated in Exhibit H, a block of NAND with a page size of 2112  
18 bytes is coupled to an input/output register (“Buffer”) that has the same page size (i.e.  
19 2112 bytes), and illustrates data programmed from the register to a flash page and data  
20 read from a flash page to the register.

21 19. As illustrated in Exhibits I and J, the SandForce Controller in each of the  
22 Accused Products implements “DuraClass™ Technology”. DuraClass™ includes  
23 DuraWrite™ which, according to Seagate, uses data deduplication: “One simple  
24 method for extending endurance of the flash is to not write to it in the first place. This  
25 might sound crazy, like making a gallon of fuel last longer by not burning it, but there  
26 are many techniques in use today for storage applications including data deduplication,  
27 compression, and data differencing that reduce the amount of data that must be written  
28 to the drive. This technique, which SandForce implements with its DuraWrite  
technology is a very complex process and requires a significant investment in the

1 controller.” Key Challenges in SSD Controller Development,  
2 www.electronicdesign.com, Jan. 17, 2011, by Kent Smith, SandForce Sr. Director of  
3 Corporate Marketing. “All solid state drives (SSDs) using NAND flash feature a basic  
4 mapping table, typically called the flash translation layer (FTL)”. *Id.* Thus, in each  
5 accused product, “each page of a block of the pool of NAND flash is adapted to be  
6 substituted on the fly for any other page of a different block of the pool of NAND flash  
7 through address mapping” as required by Claim 1 of the ‘452 patent.

8 20. Each one of the functionalities itemized in paragraphs 14-19 above, is an  
9 element in Claim 1 of the ‘452 patent.

10 21. Thus, each of the Accused Products infringes at least Claim 1 of the ‘452  
11 patent.

12 22. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's infringement of the ‘452  
13 Patent, Plaintiff has been and will continue to be damaged in an amount yet to be  
14 determined, including but not limited to Plaintiff's lost profits and/or a reasonable  
15 royalty.

## 16 COUNT II

### 17 CLAIM FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

#### 18 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) ('916 PATENT)

#### 19 (AGAINST DEFENDANT)

20 23. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations of paragraphs 1-  
21 11 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

22 24. Defendant makes, has made, sells, offer for sale, uses and/or imports into  
23 the United States, storage devices, including without limitation the V300 SSD, FURY  
24 SSD, SSDNow KC380 Drive, SSDNow E50, and SSDNow mS200 ("Accused  
25 Product(s)").

26 25. The product datasheet of each of the Accused Products, attached to this  
27 Complaint as **Exhibits C-G**, indicates that each product contains a pool of NAND flash  
28 memory, which is non-volatile memory. As provided in Defendant's website, each

1 NAND flash memory is arranged as a plurality of blocks with each block comprising a  
2 plurality of pages. See **Exhibit H**.

3 26. Each of the Accused Product(s) includes either a SandForce Client  
4 Controller, i.e. SF-2000 series (e.g. SF-2241, or SF-2281), or SandForce Enterprise  
5 Controller, i.e. 2500/2600 series (e.g. SF-2581), that is “customized for Kingston”. See  
6 Exhibits C-G. The SF-2000 series and the 2500/2600 series implement a pool of  
7 volatile memory indicated as “Buffer” in the system block diagrams obtained from  
8 Seagate. See **Exhibits I and J**.

9 27. The SandForce Client Controller and the SandForce Enterprise Controllers  
10 include a Central Processing Unit (CPU) coupled to the pool of NAND flash, through  
11 the “NAND Interface” and to the Buffer, i.e. pool of volatile memory.

12 28. Each of the Accused Products includes a SATA interface as indicated in  
13 Exhibits C-G. And as indicated in Exhibits I and J, the SATA interface is coupled to  
14 the controller.

15 29. As illustrated in Exhibits I and J, the SandForce Controller block diagrams  
16 show the NAND memory is accessible through the “Buffer”.

17 30. As illustrated in Exhibits I and J, the SandForce Controller in each of the  
18 Accused Products implements “DuraClass™ Technology”. DuraClass™ includes  
19 DuraWrite™ which, according to Seagate, uses data deduplication: “One simple  
20 method for extending endurance of the flash is to not write to it in the first place. This  
21 might sound crazy, like making a gallon of fuel last longer by not burning it, but there  
22 are many techniques in use today for storage applications including data deduplication,  
23 compression, and data differencing that reduce the amount of data that must be written  
24 to the drive. This technique, which SandForce implements with its DuraWrite  
25 technology is a very complex process and requires a significant investment in the  
26 controller.” Key Challenges in SSD Controller Development,  
27 [www.electronicdesign.com](http://www.electronicdesign.com), Jan. 17, 2011, by Kent Smith, SandForce Sr. Director of  
28 Corporate Marketing. “All solid state drives (SSDs) using NAND flash feature a basic  
mapping table, typically called the flash translation layer (FTL)”. *Id.* Thus, “each page

1 of a block is adapted to be substituted on the fly for any other page of a different block  
2 through address mapping” as required by claim 1 of the ‘916 patent.

3 31. Each one of the functionalities itemized in paragraphs 25-30 above, is an  
4 element in Claim 1 of the ‘916 patent.

5 32. Thus, each of the Accused Products infringes at least Claim 1 of the ‘916  
6 patent.

7 33. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's infringement of the ‘916  
8 Patent, Plaintiff has been and will continue to be damaged in an amount yet to be  
9 determined, including but not limited to Plaintiff's lost profits and/or a reasonable  
10 royalty.

11 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

12 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief against Defendant as follows:

13 A. In favor of Plaintiff that Defendant has infringed one or more claims of the  
14 ‘452 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents;

15 B. In favor of Plaintiff that Defendant has infringed one or more claims of the  
16 ‘916 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents;

17 C. Requiring Defendant to pay Plaintiff its damages, costs, expenses, and  
18 prejudgment and post-judgment interest for Defendant’s infringement of the ‘452 Patent  
19 and the ‘916 patent as provided under 35 U.S.C. § 284, but not less than a reasonable  
20 royalty; and

21 D. For such other and further relief as may be just and equitable.

22 **DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY**

23 Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff hereby  
24 demands a jury trial on all issues and causes of action triable to a jury.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

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

Respectfully submitted,

DATED: January 6, 2017

**COTMAN IP LAW GROUP, PLC**

*s/Rasheed M. McWilliams*

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Daniel C. Cotman

Rasheed M. McWilliams

Obi I. Iloputaife

COTMAN IP LAW GROUP, PLC

35 Hugus Alley, Suite 210

Pasadena, CA 91103

(626) 405-1413/FAX: (626) 316-7577

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

*Si-Flash Drives, LLC*