

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION**

VOXX INTERNATIONAL CORP., and)
ROSEN ENTERTAINMENT)
SYSTEMS, LLP)

Plaintiffs,)

vs.)

JOHNSON SAFETY, INC.)

Defendant.)
_____)

Cause No.: 1:16-cv-01780-LJM-MJD

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

VOXX International Corp. (“VOXX”) and Rosen Entertainment Systems, LLP (“Rosen”), by counsel, for its First Amended Complaint against Defendant Johnson Safety, Inc. (“JSI”), hereby alleges and states:

Nature of the Action

1) This is an action under the Patent Act, 35 U.S.C. §§ 1, *et seq.*, for patent infringement. The products accused of infringement include several models of video systems for vehicles.

Parties

2) VOXX is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, and has a business address in Indiana of 3502 Woodview Trace, Suite 200, Indianapolis, IN 46268.

3) Rosen is a limited liability partnership organized and existing under the laws of the State of California, and has a business address of 1120 California Avenue, Corona, CA 92881.

4) Upon information and belief, JSI is a California corporation with its corporate headquarters and principal place of business at 1425 Cooley Ct., San Bernardino, CA 92408.

Jurisdiction and Venue

5) This is an action under the Patent Act, 35 U.S.C. §§ 1, *et seq.*, for patent infringement, including §§ 271, 281, 283, 284, and 285.

6) This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over these claims for patent infringement pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

7) Upon information and belief, this Court has personal jurisdiction over JSI because, *inter alia*, JSI has committed, or aided, abetted, contributed to, or participated in, acts of patent infringement in the State of Indiana and in this Judicial District and has sold products complained of herein in this Judicial District.

8) Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400 because, *inter alia*, upon information and belief JSI transacts business in this Judicial District by offering for sale and selling products complained of herein in Indiana. JSI is subject to personal jurisdiction in this Judicial District, and a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred in this Judicial District.

- 9) VOXX is being damaged in this Judicial District.

Background

10) For over 50 years, VOXX has been a leading manufacturer and supplier of consumer electronic products in the automotive, premium audio, and consumer accessory industry.

11) VOXX has a broad range of products sold under a portfolio of well-known consumer brands such as Klipsch®, RCA®, Audiovox®, Magnet®, Heco®, Acoustic Research®, and automotive Original Equipment Manufacturer (“OEM”) brands such as Hirschmann Car Communication®, Invision® and Code-Alarm®.

12) VOXX has spent millions of dollars in research and product development, including two product lines consisting of video units that can be mounted to the ceilings of vehicles or that can be positioned in vehicle headrests.

13) VOXX has a substantial patent portfolio covering a broad range of innovations for overhead and headrest video units for passenger vehicles.

14) VOXX is also an exclusive licensee with the right to enforce patents owned by others, namely Rosen Entertainment Systems, LLP (n/k/a Rosen Electronics, LLC).

15) Of the following patents-in-suit, VOXX is the exclusive licensee having the exclusive right to enforce the following Rosen patents: 6,124,902; 6,157,418; 6,115,086 and 6,246,449.

16) VOXX's exclusive license from Rosen grants VOXX the exclusive right to enforce the Rosen patents and all its rights through litigation and to institute suit in Rosen's name or to join Rosen in such suit.

17) VOXX has constitutional and prudential standing to maintain this suit against JSI. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 281.

18) VOXX joins Rosen as a party plaintiff as it retained certain rights to enforce the patents in markets other than OEM and TIER suppliers. It is possible that JSI would be exposed to suit from Rosen if not joined herein.

Patents-in-Suit

U.S. Patent No. 8,255,958

19) On August 28, 2012, United States Patent No. 8,255,958, entitled "Automobile Entertainment System Linking Multiple Video Systems for Coordinated Sharing of Video Content" (the "'958 Patent"), was duly and legally issued by the USPTO. A true and correct copy of the '958 Patent is attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**.

20) Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 282, the '958 Patent is presumed valid.

21) VOXX owns all right, title, and interest in and to the '958 Patent.

22) Prior to filing this action, VOXX complied with the marking requirements pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 287(a) and is entitled to recover for past damages for JSI's infringement of the '958 Patent.

U.S. Patent No. 9,114,745

23) On August 25, 2015, United States Patent No. 9,114,745, entitled “Portable Video System” (the “’745 Patent”), was duly and legally issued by the USPTO. A true and correct copy of the ’745 Patent is attached hereto as **Exhibit 2**.

24) Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 282, the ’745 Patent is presumed valid.

25) VOXX is the owner of all right, title, and interest in and to the ’745 Patent.

26) Prior to filing this action, VOXX complied with the marking requirements pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 287(a) and is entitled to recover for past damages for JSI’s infringement of the ’745 Patent.

U.S. Patent No. 9,348,368

27) On May 24, 2016, United States Patent No. 9,348,368, entitled “Entertainment Apparatus” (the “’368 Patent”), was duly and legally issued by the USPTO. A true and correct copy of the ’368 Patent is attached hereto as **Exhibit 3**.

28) Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 282, the ’368 Patent is presumed valid.

29) VOXX owns all right, title, and interest in and to the ’368 Patent.

30) Prior to filing this action, VOXX complied with the marking requirements pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 287(a) and is entitled to recover for past damages for JSI’s infringement of the ’368 Patent.

U.S. Patent No. 6,124,902

31) On September 26, 2000, United States Patent No. 6,124,902 “Automotive Display Unit” (the “’902 Patent”), was duly and legally issued by the USPTO. A true and correct copy of the ’902 Patent is attached hereto as **Exhibit 4**.

32) Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 282, the `902 Patent is presumed valid.

33) VOXX owns the exclusive right to enforce the `902 Patent granted to it by Rosen with respect to OEMs and TIER Suppliers (one who directly or indirectly supplies services or products to and for an original equipment manufacturer of vehicles (“OEM”)).

34) Prior to filing this action, VOXX complied with the marking requirements pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 287(a) and is entitled to recover for past damages for JSI’s infringement of the `902 Patent.

U.S. Patent No. 6,157,418

35) On December 5, 2000, United States Patent No. 6,157,418 entitled “Automotive Display Unit” (the “`418 Patent”), was duly and legally issued by the USPTO. A true and correct copy of the `418 Patent is attached hereto as **Exhibit 5**.

36) Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 282, the `418 Patent is presumed valid.

37) VOXX owns the exclusive right to enforce the `418 Patent granted to it by Rosen against OEM and TIER Suppliers.

38) Prior to filing this action, VOXX complied with the marking requirements pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 287(a) and is entitled to recover for past damages for JSI’s infringement of the `418 Patent.

U.S. Patent No. 6,115,086

39) On September 5, 2000, United States Patent No. 6,115,086, entitled “Automotive Display Unit” (the “`086 Patent”), was duly and legally

issued by the USPTO. A true and correct copy of the `086 Patent is attached hereto as **Exhibit 6**.

40) Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 282, the `086 Patent is presumed valid.

41) VOXX owns the exclusive right to enforce the `086 Patent granted to it by Rosen against OEM and TIER Suppliers.

42) Prior to filing this action, VOXX complied with the marking requirements pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 287(a) and is entitled to recover for past damages for JSI's infringement of the `086 Patent.

U.S. Patent No. 6,246,449

43) On June 12, 2001, United States Patent No. 6,246,449, entitled "Display Unit" (the "`449 Patent"), was duly and legally issued by the USPTO. A true and correct copy of the `449 Patent is attached hereto as **Exhibit 7**.

44) Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 282, the `449 Patent is presumed valid.

45) VOXX owns the exclusive right to enforce the `449 Patent granted to it by Rosen against OEM and TIER Suppliers.

46) Prior to filing this action, VOXX complied with the marking requirements pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 287(a) and is entitled to recover for past damages for JSI's infringement of the `449 Patent.

Accused Products

47) JSI makes, has made, sells, offers to sell, imports and uses several vehicle video systems, including at least the following:

- a. SDM185 an overhead entertainment system with an 8.5" screen, DVD player and USB port, <http://www.myronanddavis.com/product/67.html>;

b. SDM108 an overhead entertainment system with a 10.2” screen, DVD player, USB port, SPSC port and Miracast;

<http://www.myronanddavis.com/product/104.html>;

c. KHDM7 a bottom load dual DVD headrest monitor product; <http://www.myronanddavis.com/product/KHDM.html>;

d. AMSA104 sold under the ARTIS trademark, an overhead entertainment system with a 10.4” monitor with built in multi-media disc player; and

e. Upon information and belief, JSI has sold, offered for sale, and/or imported into the United States various other overhead entertainment systems and headrest entertainment systems under various model identifiers that infringe one or more the patents-in-suit including, but not limited to the SDM 107 overhead entertainment system.

COUNT I

Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 8,255,958

48) VOXX repeats and realleges each and every averment contained in paragraphs 1-47 as though fully set forth herein.


49) JSI has been and is now making, using, selling, offering for sale within the United States, and/or importing into the United States, at least the KHDM7 that infringes one or more claims of the `958 Patent. Upon information and belief, JSI sells, offers for sale, and/or imported or has sold,


offered for sale, and/or imported other headrest video units that also infringe one or more claims of the '958 Patent.

Direct Infringement

50) JSI has directly infringed and continues to directly infringe at least claims 1-4 and 8-9 of the '958 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

51) The following chart provides an exemplary infringement analysis as to claim 1:

Claim Language	KHDM7
1. An automobile entertainment system, comprising:	Yes, it is an automobile entertainment system. http://www.myronanddavis.com/product/KHDM.html .
a plurality of video systems, each video system mounted within an automobile headrest, the headrest including a headrest body and a first downwardly extending extension arm having a passage extending therethrough;	Yes, it has a plurality of video systems mounted within an automobile headrest. The kit contains 2 head restraints with screens including a DVD player. <i>Id.</i> Each headrest has an extension arm, i.e. the support bar extending from the headrest into the seat. The extension arm has a passage through it as shown below. 
a central switching assembly linking the plurality of video systems;	The entertainment system also has a central switching assembly linking the video systems. Inherent in functionality, i.e. the video systems can play the same or different audio/video signals.
each of the plurality of video systems includes a video	Yes, each video system has a monitor and a video source, (DVD and auxiliary. input)

Claim Language	KHDM7
<p>monitor and a video source, each of the plurality of video systems also including an output transmitting signals to the central switching assembly to transfer to the remaining video systems and each of the plurality of video systems including an input transmitting signals from the central switching assembly to the respective video systems;</p>	<div style="text-align: center;">  </div> <p>Each unit has output transmitting signals to the switching assembly to transfer to the other video system signals, i.e. to transmit video signal from one video system to the other and vice versa.</p>
<p>the output of each of the plurality of video systems includes wiring for power, right and left audio output signals, and a video output signal which pass through a back of a vehicle seat and are coupled to the central switching assembly; and</p>	<p>Yes, the cable includes a power source wire and an audio wire. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5UFO0gx_2x0&feature=youtu.be.</p> <p>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_JiEazY0wlE</p>
<p>the input for each of the plurality of video systems includes wiring for power, right and left audio output signals, and video output signals which pass through the back of the vehicle seat and are coupled to the central switching assembly.</p>	<p>Yes, the cable includes a power source wire and an audio wire. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5UFO0gx_2x0&feature=youtu.be.</p> <p>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_JiEazY0wlE.</p>

Indirect Infringement (Inducement)

52) JSI has had actual knowledge of the `958 Patent at least since the filing of this lawsuit.

53) Upon information and belief, JSI knew of, or was willfully blind towards, the `958 Patent since at least August 2013, when the `958 Patent

was cited as a prior art reference during prosecution of the `193 Patent, which is purportedly owned by JSI.

54) Upon information and belief, Chung L. Chang is the sole inventor of the `193 Patent.

55) Mr. Chang is the President of JSI and a principal involved in the formation of JSI.

56) Mr. Chang is a shareholder and at least part owner of JSI.

57) JSI is a closely-held, family owned and operated business.

58) Upon information and belief, Mr. Chang is the sole inventor on numerous U.S. Patents owned by JSI that relate to the KHDM7 that may be used in vehicles which are the subject of this action and thus is intimately aware of patents in this field.

59) Upon information and belief, by way of Mr. Chang's involvement with JSI, Mr. Chang's ownership interest in JSI, Mr. Chang being listed as the sole inventor on the `193 Patent that cited the `958 Patent as being known prior art to JSI, JSI alleging in a related action that VOXX is a direct competitor of JSI, JSI knew of, or was willfully blind towards, the `958 Patent since at least August 2013.

60) Since becoming aware of, or willfully blind towards, the `958 Patent, JSI's advertising, sales, instructions, and/or installation in relation to at least the KHDM7 have intentionally, actively, knowingly, and willfully contained and continue to contain instructions, directions, suggestions, and/or invitations that intentionally, actively, and knowingly invite, entice, lead on, influence, encourage,

prevail on, move by persuasion, cause, and/or influence the public, JSI's distributors, retailers and/or customers to, at least, make, use, sell, offer to sell, and/or import one or more of the KHDM7 to practice the inventions claimed in the '958 Patent, and thus directly infringe at least claim 1 of the '958 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

61) Since becoming aware of, or being willfully blind towards, the '958 Patent, JSI knew or should have known that the public's, distributor's, retailer's, and/or customer's acts relative to the KHDM7 practice the inventions claimed in the '958 Patent, directly infringe, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, at least claim 1 of the '958 Patent.

62) JSI is liable for inducing infringement of at least claim 1 of the '958 Patent.

Contributory Infringement

63) JSI has had actual know of, or was willfully blind towards, the '958 Patent.

64) Since becoming aware of, or being willfully blind towards, the '958 Patent, JSI has intentionally, actively, and knowingly sold and offered to sell the KHDM7 within the United States, or imported the KHDM7 into the United States.

65) The KHDM7 is a component of a patented machine, manufacture, and/or combination because the KHDM7 meet at least one

element of at least claim 1 of the `958 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

66) The KHDM7 is a material part of the invention of at least claim 1 of the `958 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, because the majority of the elements of claim 1 are present in the KHDM7, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, and lack a substantial non-infringing use.

67) The KHDM7 are especially made or especially adapted for use in an infringement, at least because of the act of using in any manner, making, selling, offering to sell, or importing one or more of the KHDM7 when not used in a vehicle, as well as the act of using one or more of the KHDM7 in a vehicle, are both a direct infringement of at least claim 1 of the `958 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

68) Since becoming aware of, or being willfully blind towards, the `958 Patent, JSI was willfully blind or knew that the KHDM7 were especially made or especially adapted for use in an infringement.

69) The KHDM7 are not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use because the KHDM7 meet every element of at least claim 1 of the `958 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, and thus cannot be used, sold, offered for sale, or imported without infringing at least claim 1 of the `958 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

70) Since becoming aware of, or willfully blind towards, the `958 Patent, JSI was willfully blind or knew that the KHDM7 were not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.

71) By selling, offering to sell, and/or importing into the United States one or more of the KHDM7 and/or components thereof, JSI has contributed toward the infringement by the public, distributors, retailers, and customers who would use one or more of the in a vehicle, or otherwise import, make, use, sell, offer to sell, lease, and/or offer to lease one or more of the, and thus directly infringe at least claims 1-4 and 8-9 of the `958 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

72) JSI is a contributory infringer of at least claims 1-4 and 8-9 of the `958 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

COUNT II

Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 9,114,745



73) VOXX repeats and realleges each and every averment contained in paragraphs 1-72 above as though fully set forth herein.

74) JSI has been and is now making, using, selling, offering for sale within the United States, and/or importing into the United States, at least the KHDM7 that infringes one or more claims of the `745 Patent. Upon information and belief, JSI sells, offers for sale, and/or imported or has sold, offered for sale, and/or imported other headrest video units that also infringe one or more claims of the `958 Patent.

Direct Infringement

75) JSI has directly infringed and continues to directly infringe at least claims 1-11, 13-16 and 18 of the '745 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

76) The following chart provides an exemplary infringement analysis as to claim 1:

Claim Language	KHDM7
1. A video system comprising:	Yes, the KHDM7 is a bottom load dual DVD headrest monitor package. http://www.myronanddavis.com/product/KHDM.html .
a base portion mounted in a vehicle seat headrest;	Yes, the KHDM7 has a base portion mounted in a vehicle headrest. 
a door pivotally attached to the base portion, wherein the door includes a display and a media player mounted to the door; and	Yes, the KHDM7 has a door pivotally attached to the base portion and the door includes a display and media player mounted to the door. 
a loading point for a data storage medium for the media player is located on[e] the door.	Yes, in the above picture the loading point for receiving a DVD is located at the bottom edge on the door.

Indirect Infringement (Inducement)

77) JSI has had actual knowledge of the `745 Patent at least since the filing of this lawsuit.

78) Upon information and belief, JSI has had actual knowledge of the `745 Patent prior to the filing of the present suit.

79) Since becoming aware of, or willfully blind towards, the `745 Patent, JSI's advertising, sales, instructions, and/or installation in relation to the KHDM7 have intentionally, actively, knowingly, and willfully contained and continue to contain instructions, directions, suggestions, and/or invitations that intentionally, actively, and knowingly invite, entice, lead on, influence, encourage, prevail on, move by persuasion, cause, and/or influence the public, JSI's distributors, retailers and/or customers to, at least, make, use, sell, offer to sell, and/or import one or more of the KHDM7 to practice the inventions claimed in the `745 Patent, and thus directly infringe at least claim 1 of the `745 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

80) Since becoming aware of, or being willfully blind towards, the `745 Patent, JSI knew or should have known that the public's, distributor's, retailer's, and/or customer's acts relative to the KHDM7 practice the inventions claimed in the `745 Patent, directly infringe, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, at least claim 1 of the `745 Patent.

81) For these reasons, JSI is liable for inducing infringement of at least claims 1-11, 13-16 and 18 of the `745 Patent.

Contributory Infringement

82) At least for the reasons set forth above, JSI has had actual know of, or was willfully blind towards, the `745 Patent.

83) Since becoming aware of, or being willfully blind towards, the `745 Patent, JSI has intentionally, actively, and knowingly sold and offered to sell the KHDM7 within the United States, or imported the KHDM7 into the United States.

84) The KHDM7 are a component of a patented machine, manufacture, and/or combination because the KHDM7 meet at least one element of at least claim 1 of the `745 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

85) The KHDM7 is a material part of the invention of at least claims 1-11, 13-16 and 18 of the `745 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, because the majority of the elements of claim 1 are present in the KHDM7, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, and lack a substantial non-infringing use.

86) The KHDM7 is especially made or especially adapted for use in an infringement, at least because of the act of using in any manner, making, selling, offering to sell, or importing one or more of the KHDM7 when not used in a vehicle, as well as the act of using one or more of the KHDM7 in a vehicle, are both a direct infringement of at least claim 1 of the `745 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

87) Since becoming aware of, or being willfully blind towards, the `745 Patent, JSI was willfully blind or knew that the KHDM7 were especially made or especially adapted for use in an infringement.

88) The KHDM7 is not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing use because the KHDM7 themselves meet every element of at least claim 1 of the `745 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, and thus cannot be used, sold, offered for sale, or imported without infringing at least claim 1 of the `745 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

89) Since becoming aware of, or willfully blind towards, the `745 Patent, JSI was willfully blind or knew that the KHDM7 were not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing use.

90) By selling, offering to sell, and/or importing into the United States one or more of the KHDM7 and/or components thereof, JSI has contributed toward the infringement by the public, distributors, retailers, and customers who would use one or more of the KHDM7 in a vehicle, or otherwise import, make, use, sell, offer to sell, lease, and/or offer to lease one or more of the KHDM7, and thus directly infringe at least claims 1-11, 13-16 and 18 of the `745 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

91) JSI is a contributory infringer of at least claim 1-11, 13-16 and 18 of the `745 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

COUNT III

Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 9,348,368

92) VOXX repeats and realleges each and every averment contained in paragraphs 1-91 above as though fully set forth herein.

93) JSI has been and is now making, using, selling, offering for sale within the United States, and/or importing into the United States, at least the KHDM7 that infringes one or more claims of the `368 Patent. Upon information and belief, JSI sells, offers for sale, and/or imported or has sold, offered for sale, and/or imported other headrest video units that also infringe one or more claims of the `368 Patent.


Direct Infringement

94) JSI has directly infringed and continues to directly infringe at least claim 1-3, 10-15 and 18-19 of the `368 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

95) The following chart provides an exemplary infringement analysis regarding claim 1:

Claim Language	KHDM7
1. An entertainment apparatus, comprising:	KHDM7 is a bottom load dual DVD headrest monitor package. http://www.myronanddavis.com/product/KHDM.html .
a casing having a top edge region, a bottom edge region and two side edge regions interconnecting	The KHDM7 has a casing with a top edge region, a bottom edge region and two side edge regions interconnecting the top and bottom edge regions.

Claim Language	KHDM7
<p>the top and bottom edge regions; and</p>	
<p>a frictional disc holder associated with an opening, wherein the frictional disc holder comprises two members adapted to receive an optically-readable disc therebetween and to apply friction to the optically-readable disc when received,</p>	<p>The KHDM7 has a frictional disc holder associated with an opening. The opening is shown below. It includes a built in DVD player (frictional disc holder) and felt linings in the opening (top and bottom of the slot) to receive a DVD (optically readable disc) and to apply friction to the disc when the disc is inserted into the slot such that the DVD is pulled into the DVD player.</p> 
<p>wherein the friction is sufficient to prevent the optically-readable disc from falling out of the opening under the effect of gravity, and is insufficient to cause damage to the optically-readable disc or to prevent the optically-readable disc from being manually pushed past the two members either for receipt in a disc playing mechanism mounted within the casing or to</p>	<p>The friction prevents the disc from falling out of the opening. As mounted as a headrest in a vehicle, one accesses the slot position on the bottom edge of the pivoting media player. The bottom edge also has an “eject” button which means the media player has internal means to eject the disc. Therefore, the friction must be sufficient to prevent the disc from falling out under the effect of gravity. Furthermore, the friction must be insufficient to damage the disc, otherwise every time a disc is inserted it would be damaged and therefore unplayable in the DVD player. The friction must not prevent the disc from being manually pushed past the two members for receipt into the player within the casing or to remove the disc from the apparatus upon ejection; if not, the</p>

Claim Language	KHDM7
remove the optically-readable disc from the entertainment apparatus upon ejection,	DVD player would not be able to receive or eject discs.
wherein the top edge region, the bottom edge region, and the two side edge regions frame and define a front side of the entertainment apparatus, and the front side comprises a monitor screen,	<p>The top edge region, the bottom edge region, and the two side edge regions frame and define a front side of the entertainment apparatus, and the front side comprises a monitor screen.</p> 
wherein the entertainment apparatus is adapted to play the optically-readable disc, and comprises the opening in the bottom edge region of the casing for receiving and ejecting the optically-readable disc in a substantially vertical plane,	Yes, the apparatus is a bottom-loading DVD player and the DVD opening is positioned on the bottom edge of the casing for receiving and ejecting the DVD in a substantially vertical plane. <i>See images above.</i>
wherein the entertainment apparatus is adapted to be mounted to a more forward seat of a vehicle for use by a passenger when seated behind the more forward seat of the vehicle.	Yes, the apparatus comprises a vehicle headrest containing the casing described above and is adapted to be mounted to a forward seat of a vehicle for use by a passenger seated behind the headrest. http://youtu.be/5UFO0gx_2x0 .

Indirect Infringement (Inducement)

96) JSI has had actual knowledge of the '368 Patent at least since the filing of this lawsuit.

97) Upon information and belief, JSI has had actual knowledge of the `368 Patent prior to the filing of the present suit.

98) Since becoming aware of, or willfully blind towards, the `368 Patent, JSI's advertising, sales, instructions, and/or installation in relation to the KHDM7 have intentionally, actively, knowingly, and willfully contained and continue to contain instructions, directions, suggestions, and/or invitations that intentionally, actively, and knowingly invite, entice, lead on, influence, encourage, prevail on, move by persuasion, cause, and/or influence the public, JSI's distributors, retailers and/or customers to, at least, make, use, sell, offer to sell, and/or import one or more of the KHDM7 to practice the inventions claimed in the `368 Patent, and thus directly infringe at least claim 1 of the `368 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

99) Since becoming aware of, or being willfully blind towards, the `368 Patent, JSI knew or should have known that the public's, distributor's, retailer's, and/or customer's acts relative to the KHDM7 practice the inventions claimed in the `368 Patent, directly infringe, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, at least claims 1-3, 10-15 and 18-19 of the `368 Patent.

100) JSI is liable for inducing infringement of at least claims 1-3, 10-15 and 18-19 of the `368 Patent.

Contributory Infringement

101) At least for the reasons set forth above, JSI has had actual know of, or was willfully blind towards, the `368 Patent.

102) Since becoming aware of, or being willfully blind towards, the `368 Patent, JSI has intentionally, actively, and knowingly sold and offered to sell the KHDM7 within the United States, or imported the KHDM7 into the United States.

103) The KHDM7 is a component of a patented machine, manufacture, and/or combination because the KHDM7 meet at least one element of at least claim 1 of the `368 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

104) The KHDM7 is a material part of the invention of at least claim 1 of the `368 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, because the majority of the elements of claim 1 are present in the KHDM7, and lack a substantial non-infringing use.

105) The KHDM7 is especially made or especially adapted for use in an infringement, at least because of the act of using in any manner, making, selling, offering to sell, or importing one or more of the KHDM7 when not used in a vehicle, as well as the act of using one or more of the KHDM7 in a vehicle, are both a direct infringement of at least claim 1 of the `368 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

106) Since becoming aware of, or being willfully blind towards, the `368 Patent, JSI was willfully blind or knew that the KHDM7 were especially made or especially adapted for use in an infringement.

107) The KHDM7 are not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use because the KHDM7 themselves meet every element of at least claim 1 of the `368 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, and thus cannot be used, sold, offered for sale, or imported without infringing at least claim 1 of the `368 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

108) Since becoming aware of, or willfully blind towards, the `368 Patent, JSI was willfully blind or knew that the KHDM7 were not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.

109) By selling, offering to sell, and/or importing into the United States one or more of the KHDM7 and/or components thereof, JSI has contributed toward the infringement by the public, distributors, retailers, and customers who would use one or more of the KHDM7 in a vehicle, or otherwise import, make, use, sell, offer to sell, lease, and/or offer to lease one or more of the KHDM7, and thus directly infringe at least claims 1-3, 10-15 and 18-19 of the `368 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

110) JSI is a contributory infringer of at least claims 1-3, 10-15 and 18-19 of the `368 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

COUNT IV

Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,124,902


111) VOXX repeats and realleges each and every averment contained in paragraphs 1-110 above as though fully set forth herein.



112) JSI has been and is now making, using, selling, offering for sale within the United States, and/or importing into the United States, at least the SDM 107, 108 and 185 that upon information and belief infringe one or more claims of the '902 Patent.

Direct Infringement

113) JSI has directly infringed and continues to directly infringe at least claims 1-3, 5-7 and 13 of the '902 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

114) The following chart provides an exemplary infringement analysis regarding claim 1.

Claim Language	SDM 107, 108 & 185
<p>1. In an automobile having a generally planar ceiling, with windows and a passenger seating area through which a driver has a view of an interior and exterior of the automobile, a ceiling-mounted automotive display unit comprising:</p>	<p>All are overhead entertainment systems for vehicles.</p> 
<p>a direct-view screen structure operatively hinged to the ceiling in a location overhead and generally forward of the passenger seating area in the automobile for reversibly</p>	<p>Once installed, yes. http://www.myronanddavis.com/product/67.html.</p>

Claim Language	SDM 107, 108 & 185
<p>swaying in an upright plane which extends through the passenger seating area, the screen structure being configured to pivot between a stowed position wherein the screen structure is in coplanar relation to the ceiling in an orientation which does not obstruct the driver's view, and a deployed position wherein the screen structure projects downwardly from the ceiling at an angle relative to the ceiling in an orientation which accommodates the driver's access to the driver's view, the deployed position presenting a viewing surface generally rearward of the windshield in a central region of the ceiling in a disposition overhead-viewable by passengers seated in the passenger seating area; and</p>	 <p>The first photograph shows the screen structure in its stowed position, appearing as a flat, white, oval-shaped panel mounted to the ceiling. The second photograph shows the screen structure in its deployed position, pivoted downwards at an angle. The third photograph shows the screen structure mounted on a control console, displaying a video image.</p>
<p>a video control module configured to direct operation of the direct-view screen structure, the video control module being electrically connected to the screen structure, but mounted in a location laterally spaced from the screen structure when the screen structure is in the stowed position.</p>	<p>Yes. The video control module (buttons across the front of the housing) are configured to direct operation of the direct-view screen structure, electrically connected to the screen structure, but mounted in a location laterally spaced from the screen structure when the screen structure is in the stowed position.</p>  <p>The photograph shows the video control module, which is a white, rectangular housing with a small screen on the front. The screen displays a video image of a bridge. The housing has several buttons and a control knob on the top surface.</p>

Indirect Infringement (Inducement)

115) JSI has had actual knowledge of the `902 Patent at least since the filing of this lawsuit.

116) Upon information and belief, JSI knew of, or was willfully blind towards, the `902 Patent since at least August 2004, when the `902 Patent was cited as a prior art reference during prosecution of U.S. Patent No. 7,036,879 (the “879 Patent”), which is purportedly owned by JSI.

117) Upon information and belief, Chung L. Chang is the sole inventor of the `879 Patent.

118) Mr. Chang is the President of JSI and a principal involved in the formation of JSI.

119) Mr. Chang is a shareholder and at least part owner of JSI.

120) JSI is a closely-held, family owned and operated business.

121) Upon information and belief, Mr. Chang is the sole inventor on numerous U.S. Patents owned by JSI and thus is intimately aware of patents in this field.

122) Upon information and belief, by way of Mr. Chang’s involvement with JSI, Mr. Chang’s ownership interest in JSI, Mr. Chang being listed as the sole inventor on the `879 Patent that cited the `902 Patent as being known prior art to JSI, JSI knew of, or was willfully blind towards, the `902 Patent since at least August 2004.

123) Since becoming aware of, or willfully blind towards, the `902 Patent, JSI’s advertising, sales, instructions, and/or installation in relation to

the SDM 107, 108 and 185 have intentionally, actively, knowingly, and willfully contained and continue to contain instructions, directions, suggestions, and/or invitations that intentionally, actively, and knowingly invite, entice, lead on, influence, encourage, prevail on, move by persuasion, cause, and/or influence the public, JSI's distributors, retailers and/or customers to, at least, make, use, sell, offer to sell, and/or import one or more of the SDM 107, 108 and 185 to practice the inventions claimed in the `902 Patent, and thus directly infringe at least claims 1-3, 5-7 and 13 of the `902 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

124) Since becoming aware of, or being willfully blind towards, the `902 Patent, JSI knew or should have known that the public's, distributor's, retailer's, and/or customer's acts relative to the SDM 107, 108 and 185 practice the inventions claimed in the `902 Patent, directly infringe, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, at least claim 1-3, 5-7 and 13 of the `902 Patent.

125) JSI is liable for inducing infringement of at least claim 1-3, 5-7 and 13 of the `902 Patent.

Contributory Infringement

126) At least for the reasons set forth above, JSI has had actual know of, or was willfully blind towards, the `902 Patent.

127) As alleged above, since becoming aware of, or being willfully blind towards, the `902 Patent, JSI has intentionally, actively, and knowingly sold and offered to sell the SDM 107, 108 and 185 within the United States, or imported the SDM 107, 108 and 185 into the United States.

128) The SDM 107, 108 and 185 are a component of a patented machine, manufacture, and/or combination because the SDM 107, 108 and 185 meet at least one element of at least claims 1-3, 5-7 and 13 of the `902 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

129) The SDM 107, 108 and 185 are a material part of the invention of at least claims 1-3, 5-7 and 13 of the `902 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, because the majority of the elements of claim 1 are present in the SDM 107, 108 and 185, and lack a substantial non-infringing use.

130) The SDM 107, 108 and 185 are especially made or especially adapted for use in an infringement, at least because of the act of using in any manner, making, selling, offering to sell, or importing one or more of the SDM 107, 108 and 185 when not used in a vehicle, as well as the act of using one or more of the SDM 107, 108 and 185 in a vehicle, are both a direct infringement of at least claim 1 of the `902 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

131) Since becoming aware of, or being willfully blind towards, the `902 Patent, JSI was willfully blind or knew that the SDM 107, 108 and 185 were especially made or especially adapted for use in an infringement.

132) The SDM 107, 108 and 185 are not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use because the SDM 107, 108 and 185 themselves meet every element of at least claim 1 of the

`902 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, and thus cannot be used, sold, offered for sale, or imported without infringing at least claim 1 of the `902 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

133) Since becoming aware of, or willfully blind towards, the `902 Patent, JSI was willfully blind or knew that the SDM 107, 108 and 185 were not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.

134) By selling, offering to sell, and/or importing into the United States one or more of the SDM 107, 108 and 185 and/or components thereof, JSI has contributed toward the infringement by the public, distributors, retailers, and customers who would use one or more of the SDM 107, 108 and 185 in a vehicle, or otherwise import, make, use, sell, offer to sell, lease, and/or offer to lease one or more of the SDM 107, 108 and 185, and thus directly infringe at least claims 1-3, 5-7 and 13 of the `902 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

135) JSI is a contributory infringer of at least claim 1-3, 5-7 and 13 of the `902 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

COUNT V

Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,418

136) VOXX repeats and realleges each and every averment contained in paragraphs 1-135 above as though fully set forth herein.



137) JSI has been and is now making, using, selling, offering for sale within the United States, and/or importing into the United States, at least the SDM 107, 108 and 185 and that upon information and belief infringe one or more claims of the


`418 Patent. Upon information and belief, JSI has sold, offered for sale, and/or imported other overhead video units that also infringe one or more claims of the `418 Patent.

Direct Infringement

138) JSI has directly infringed and continues to directly infringe at least claims 1, 3-5 and 8 of the `418 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

139) The chart following provides an exemplary infringement analysis regarding claim 1.

Claim Language	SDM 107, 108 & 185
<p>1. In an automobile having a passenger seating area and a ceiling, a ceiling-mounted automotive display unit comprising:</p>	<p>Yes, all are ceiling-mounted automotive display units for vehicles.</p> 
<p>a screen structure operatively hinged to the ceiling in a location overhead and generally forward of the passenger seating area in the automobile for reversibly swaying in an upright plane which extends through the passenger seating area, the screen structure being configured to pivot under a first torque between a stowed position wherein the screen structure is generally parallel to the ceiling and a deployed position wherein the screen</p>	<p>Yes. http://www.myronanddavis.com/product/67.html.</p> 

Claim Language	SDM 107, 108 & 185
<p>structure projects downwardly from the ceiling to occupy generally upright plane, and the screen structure further being configured to pivot under a second torque between the deployed position and a break-away position wherein the screen structure is generally parallel to the ceiling to provide for emergency collapse of the screen structure.</p>	

Indirect Infringement (Inducement)

140) JSI has had actual knowledge of the `418 Patent at least since the filing of this lawsuit.

141) Upon information and belief, JSI knew of, or was willfully blind towards, the `418 Patent since at least August 2004, when the `418 Patent was cited as a prior art reference during prosecution of the `879 Patent, which is purportedly owned by JSI.

142) Upon information and belief, Chung L. Chang is the sole inventor of the `879 Patent.

143) Mr. Chang is the President of JSI and a principal involved in the formation of JSI.

144) Mr. Chang is a shareholder and at least part owner of JSI.

145) JSI is a closely-held, family owned and operated business.

146) Upon information and belief, Mr. Chang is the sole inventor on numerous U.S. Patents owned by JSI and thus is intimately aware of patents in this field.

147) Upon information and belief, by way of Mr. Chang's involvement with JSI, Mr. Chang's ownership interest in JSI, Mr. Chang being listed as the sole inventor on the '879 Patent that cited the '418 Patent as being known prior art to JSI, JSI knew of, or was willfully blind towards, the '418 Patent since at least August 2004.

148) Since becoming aware of, or willfully blind towards, the '418 Patent, JSI's advertising, sales, instructions, and/or installation in relation to the SDM 107, 108 & 185 have intentionally, actively, knowingly, and willfully contained and continue to contain instructions, directions, suggestions, and/or invitations that intentionally, actively, and knowingly invite, entice, lead on, influence, encourage, prevail on, move by persuasion, cause, and/or influence the public, JSI's distributors, retailers and/or customers to, at least, make, use, sell, offer to sell, and/or import one or more of the SDM 107, 108 & 185 to practice the inventions claimed in the '418 Patent, and thus directly infringe at least claim 1 of the '418 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

149) Since becoming aware of, or being willfully blind towards, the '418 Patent, JSI knew or should have known that the public's, distributor's, retailer's, and/or customer's acts relative to the SDM 185, 107 & 108 practice

the inventions claimed in the `418 Patent, directly infringe, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, at least claims 1, 3-5 and 8 of the `418 Patent.

150) JSI is liable for inducing infringement of at least claims 1, 3-5 and 8 of the `418 Patent.

Contributory Infringement

151) At least for the reasons set forth above, JSI has had actual know of, or was willfully blind towards, the `418 Patent.

152) As set forth above, since becoming aware of, or being willfully blind towards, the `418 Patent, JSI has intentionally, actively, and knowingly sold and offered to sell the SDM 107, 108 & 185 within the United States, or imported the SDM 107, 108 & 185 into the United States.

153) The SDM 107, 108 & 185 are a component of a patented machine, manufacture, and/or combination because the SDM 107, 108 & 185 meet at least one element of at least claim 1 of the `418 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

154) The SDM 107, 108 & 185 are a material part of the invention of at least claim 1 of the `418 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, because the majority of the elements of claim 1 are present in the SDM 107, 108 & 185, and lack a substantial non-infringing use.

155) The SDM 107, 108 & 185 are especially made or especially adapted for use in an infringement, at least because of the act of using in any manner, making, selling, offering to sell, or importing one or more of the SDM 107, 108 & 185 when

not used in a vehicle, as well as the act of using one or more of the SDM 107, 108 & 185 in a vehicle, are both a direct infringement of at least claims 1, 3-5 and 8 of the `418 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

156) Since becoming aware of, or being willfully blind towards, the `418 Patent, JSI was willfully blind or knew that the SDM 107, 108 & 185 were especially made or especially adapted for use in an infringement.

157) The SDM 107, 108 & 185 are not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use because the SDM 107, 108 & 185 themselves meet every element of at least claim 1 of the `418 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, and thus cannot be used, sold, offered for sale, or imported without infringing at least claim 1 of the `418 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

158) Since becoming aware of, or willfully blind towards, the `418 Patent, JSI was willfully blind or knew that the SDM 107, 108 & 185 were not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.

159) By selling, offering to sell, and/or importing into the United States one or more of the SDM 107, 108 & 185 and/or components thereof, JSI has contributed toward the infringement by the public, distributors, retailers, and customers who would use one or more of the SDM 107, 108 & 185 in a vehicle, or otherwise import, make, use, sell, offer to sell, lease, and/or offer to lease one or more of the SDM 107, 108 & 185, and thus

directly infringe at least claims 1, 3-5 and 8 of the `418 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

160) JSI is a contributory infringer of at least claim 1 of the `418 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

COUNT VI

Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,115,086


161) VOXX repeats and realleges each and every averment contained in paragraphs 1-160 above as though fully set forth herein.


162) JSI has been and is now making, using, selling, offering for sale within the United States, and/or importing into the United States, at least the SDM 107, 108 and 185 that upon information and belief infringe one or more claims of the `086 Patent.


Direct Infringement

163) JSI has directly infringed and continues to directly infringe at least claims 15, 21, 22, 25 and 26 of the `086 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

164) The following chart provides an exemplary infringement analysis regarding claim 15.

Claim Language	SDM 107, 108 & 185
15. In an automobile having a passenger seating area and a ceiling, a ceiling-mounted automotive display unit comprising:	Yes, all are ceiling-mounted automotive display units for vehicles. 

Claim Language	SDM 107, 108 & 185
<p>a mounting frame structure mounted to the ceiling in a location overhead and generally forward of the passenger seating area in the automobile; and</p>	<p>Yes, see above.</p>
<p>a screen structure hinged to the mounting frame structure for reversibly swaying in an upright plane which extends through the passenger seating area, the screen structure being configured to pivot about a hinge between a stowed position wherein the screen structure lies in a plane generally paralleling the mounting frame structure and a deployed position wherein the screen structure occupies a generally upright plane at an angle relative to the mounting frame structure with a disposition overhead-viewable by a passenger seated in the passenger seating area; and</p>	<p>Yes. The screen is hinged to the mounting frame to allow the screen to rotate into a viewing position from a stowed position where the screen is generally parallel with the mounting frame. In the deployed position, the screen is in a generally upright plane relative to the mounting frame.</p> <div style="text-align: center;">  </div>
<p>a video control module mounted on the mounting frame structure separately from the screen structure in laterally spaced</p>	<p>Yes, the control module is in the frame structure separate from the screen structure but electrically connected to the same. All three models have video control modules on</p>

Claim Language	SDM 107, 108 & 185
<p>relation to the screen structure, but electrically connected to the screen structure to direct operation of the screen structure.</p>	<p>the mounting frame structure laterally spaced from the screen that is electrically connected to the screen to direct operations thereof.</p> 

Indirect Infringement (Inducement)

165) JSI has had actual knowledge of the `086 Patent at least since the filing of this lawsuit.

166) Upon information and belief, JSI knew of, or was willfully blind towards, the `086 Patent since at least August 2004, when the `086 Patent was cited as a prior art reference during prosecution of the `879 Patent, which is purportedly owned by JSI.

167) Upon information and belief, Chung L. Chang is the sole inventor of the `879 Patent.

168) Mr. Chang is the President of JSI and a principal involved in the formation of JSI.

169) Mr. Chang is a shareholder and at least part owner of JSI.

170) JSI is a closely-held, family owned and operated business.

171) Upon information and belief, Mr. Chang is the sole inventor on numerous U.S. Patents owned by JSI and thus is intimately aware of patents in this field.

172) Upon information and belief, by way of Mr. Chang's involvement with JSI, Mr. Chang's ownership interest in JSI, Mr. Chang being listed as the sole inventor on the '879 Patent that cited the '086 Patent as being known prior art to JSI, JSI knew of, or was willfully blind towards, the '086 Patent since at least August 2004.

173) Since becoming aware of, or willfully blind towards, the '086 Patent, JSI's advertising, sales, instructions, and/or installation in relation to the SDM 107, 108 and 185 have intentionally, actively, knowingly, and willfully contained and continue to contain instructions, directions, suggestions, and/or invitations that intentionally, actively, and knowingly invite, entice, lead on, influence, encourage, prevail on, move by persuasion, cause, and/or influence the public, JSI's distributors, retailers and/or customers to, at least, make, use, sell, offer to sell, and/or import one or more of the SDM 107, 108 and 185 to practice the inventions claimed in the '086 Patent, and thus directly infringe at least claims 15, 21, 22, 25 and 26 of the '086 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

174) Since becoming aware of, or being willfully blind towards, the '086 Patent, JSI knew or should have known that the public's, distributor's, retailer's, and/or customer's acts relative to the SDM 107, 108 and 185

practice the inventions claimed in the `086 Patent, directly infringe, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, at least claims 15, 21, 22, 25 and 26 of the `086 Patent.

175) JSI is liable for inducing infringement of at least claims 15, 21, 22, 25 and 26 of the `086 Patent.

Contributory Infringement

176) At least for the reasons set forth above, JSI has had actual know of, or was willfully blind towards, the `086 Patent.

177) As set forth above, since becoming aware of, or being willfully blind towards, the `086 Patent, JSI has intentionally, actively, and knowingly sold and offered to sell the SDM 107, 108 and 185 within the United States, or imported the SDM 107, 108 and 185 into the United States.

178) The SDM 107, 108 and 185 are a component of a patented machine, manufacture, and/or combination because the SDM 107, 108 and 185 meet at least one element of at least claim 1 of the `086 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

179) The SDM 107, 108 and 185 are a material part of the invention of at least claim 1 of the `086 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, because the majority of the elements of claim 1 are present in the SDM 107, 108 and 185, and lack a substantial non-infringing use.

180) The SDM 185, 107 & 108 are especially made or especially adapted for use in an infringement, at least because of the act of using in any manner, making,

selling, offering to sell, or importing one or more of the SDM 107, 108 and 185 when not used in a vehicle, as well as the act of using one or more of the SDM 107, 108 and 185 in a vehicle, are both a direct infringement of at least claim 1 of the `086 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

181) Since becoming aware of, or being willfully blind towards, the `086 Patent, JSI was willfully blind or knew that the SDM 107, 108 and 185 were especially made or especially adapted for use in an infringement.

182) The SDM 107, 108 and 185 are not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing use because the SDM 107, 108 and 185 themselves meet every element of at least claim 1 of the `086 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, and thus cannot be used, sold, offered for sale, or imported without infringing at least claim 1 of the `086 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

183) Since becoming aware of, or willfully blind towards, the `086 Patent, JSI was willfully blind or knew that the SDM 107, 108 and 185 were not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.

184) By selling, offering to sell, and/or importing into the United States one or more of the SDM 107, 108 and 185 and/or components thereof, JSI has contributed toward the infringement by the public, distributors, retailers, and customers who would use one or more of the SDM 107, 108 and 185 in a vehicle, or otherwise import, make, use, sell, offer to sell, lease,

and/or offer to lease one or more of the SDM 107, 108 and 185, and thus directly infringe at least claims 15, 21, 22, 25 and 26 of the '086 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

185) JSI is a contributory infringer of at least claims 15, 21, 22, 25 and 26 of the '086 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

COUNT VII

Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,246,449


186) VOXX repeats and realleges each and every averment contained in paragraphs 1-185 above as though fully set forth herein.



187) JSI has been and is now making, using, selling, offering for sale within the United States, and/or importing into the United States, at least the KHDM7 that upon information and belief infringe one or more claims of the `449 Patent.


Direct Infringement

188) JSI has directly infringed and continues to directly infringe at least claims 2-4 of the `449 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

189) The following chart provides an exemplary infringement analysis regarding claim 2:

Claim Language	SDM 107, 108 & 185
<p>2. In an automobile having a ceiling, with windows and a passenger seating area through which a driver has a view of an interior and exterior of the automobile, an above-seat-level, ceiling-mounted display unit comprising:</p>	<p>Yes, all are ceiling-mounted display units for vehicles.</p> <div style="text-align: center;">  </div>
<p>a housing having a lower surface generally coextensive with a lower surface of the ceiling;</p>	<p>Yes. All three models have housings having a lower surface generally coextensive with a lower surface of the ceiling when installed.</p>

Claim Language	SDM 107, 108 & 185
	
<p>a mounting frame structure joined with the ceiling in a location overhead of the passenger seating area in the automobile, the mounting frame structure being joined generally co-planarly with the ceiling and having a proximal portion closer to the passenger seating area and distal portion more remote from the passenger seating area; and</p>	<p>Yes, see preceding images.</p>
<p>a direct-view screen structure hinged to the mounting frame structure for reversibly swaying in an upright plane, extending both through the mounting frame structure and the passenger seating area, between a stowed position wherein the screen structure lies in a plane generally paralleling the housing and a deployed position wherein the screen structure is pivoted downwardly from the stowed position to lie at an angle relative to the ceiling with a disposition which is overhead-viewable by any passenger seated in the passenger seating area;</p>	<p>Yes, all three models include a screen structure hinged to the mounting frame structure for reversibly swaying in an upright plane.</p> <p>The following pictures show the screen stowed, deployed and in a breakaway position.</p> 

Claim Language	SDM 107, 108 & 185
	
<p>a video control module configured to direct operation of the direct-view screen structure, the video control module being electrically connected to the screen structure, mounted adjacent the screen structure and supported by the frame structure at a fixed location separate from the screen structure and above the lower surface of the housing; and</p>	<p>As shown in the images, the video control module directs operation of the screen; it is electrically connected to the screen, mounted adjacent the screen and supported by the frame at a fixed location separate from the screen structure above the lower surface of the housing.</p>
<p>wherein the screen structure has a thickness of less than 1.5 inches.</p>	<p>The screen structure is about 0.75” thick.</p>

Indirect Infringement (Inducement)

190) JSI has had actual knowledge of the `449 Patent at least since the filing of this lawsuit.

191) Upon information and belief, JSI knew of, or was willfully blind towards, the `449 Patent since at least August 2004, when the `449 Patent was cited as a prior art reference during prosecution of the `879 Patent, which is purportedly owned by JSI.

192) Upon information and belief, Chung L. Chang is the sole inventor of the `879 Patent.

193) Mr. Chang is the President of JSI and a principal involved in the formation of JSI.

194) Mr. Chang is a shareholder and at least part owner of JSI.

195) JSI is a closely-held, family owned and operated business.

196) Upon information and belief, Mr. Chang is the sole inventor on numerous U.S. Patents owned by JSI and thus is intimately aware of patents in this field.

197) Upon information and belief, by way of Mr. Chang's involvement with JSI, Mr. Chang's ownership interest in JSI, Mr. Chang being listed as the sole inventor on the `879 Patent that cited the `449 Patent as being known prior art to JSI, JSI knew of, or was willfully blind towards, the `086 Patent since at least August 2004.

198) Since becoming aware of, or willfully blind towards, the `449 Patent, JSI's advertising, sales, instructions, and/or installation in relation to the SDM 107, 108 and 185 have intentionally, actively, knowingly, and willfully contained and continue to contain instructions, directions, suggestions, and/or invitations that

intentionally, actively, and knowingly invite, entice, lead on, influence, encourage, prevail on, move by persuasion, cause, and/or influence the public, JSI's distributors, retailers and/or customers to, at least, make, use, sell, offer to sell, and/or import one or more of the SDM 107, 108 and 185 to practice the inventions claimed in the `449 Patent, and thus directly infringe at least claims 2-4 of the `449 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

199) Since becoming aware of, or being willfully blind towards, the `449 Patent, JSI knew or should have known that the public's, distributor's, retailer's, and/or customer's acts relative to the SDM 107, 108 and 185 practice the inventions claimed in the `449 Patent, directly infringe, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, at least claims 2-4 of the `449 Patent.

200) JSI is liable for inducing infringement of at least claims 2-4 of the `449 Patent.

Contributory Infringement

201) At least for the reasons set forth above, JSI has had actual know of, or was willfully blind towards, the `449 Patent.

202) Since becoming aware of, or being willfully blind towards, the `449 Patent, JSI has intentionally, actively, and knowingly sold and offered to sell the SDM 107, 108 and 185 within the United States, or imported the SDM 107, 108 and 185 into the United States.

203) The SDM 107, 108 and 185 are a component of a patented machine, manufacture, and/or combination because the SDM 107, 108 and 185 meet at least one element of at least claim 1 of the `449 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

204) The SDM 107, 108 and 185 are a material part of the invention of at least claim 1 of the `449 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, because the majority of the elements of claim 1 are present in the SDM 107, 108 and 185, and lack a substantial non-infringing use.

205) The SDM 107, 108 and 185 are especially made or especially adapted for use in an infringement, at least because of the act of using in any manner, making, selling, offering to sell, or importing one or more of the 107, 108 and 185 when not used in a vehicle, as well as the act of using one or more of the 107, 108 and 185 in a vehicle, are both a direct infringement of at least claim 1 of the `449 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

206) Since becoming aware of, or being willfully blind towards, the `449 Patent, JSI was willfully blind or knew that the SDM 107, 108 and 185 were especially made or especially adapted for use in an infringement.

207) The SDM 185, 107 & 108 are not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use because the SDM 107, 108 and 185 themselves meet every element of at least claim 1 of the `449 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, and thus cannot be used, sold, offered

for sale, or imported without infringing at least claim 1 of the `449 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

208) Since becoming aware of, or willfully blind towards, the `449 Patent, JSI was willfully blind or knew that the SDM 107, 108 and 185 were not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.

209) By selling, offering to sell, and/or importing into the United States one or more of the SDM 107, 108 and 185 and/or components thereof, JSI has contributed toward the infringement by the public, distributors, retailers, and customers who would use one or more of the SDM 107, 108 and 185 in a vehicle, or otherwise import, make, use, sell, offer to sell, lease, and/or offer to lease one or more of the SDM 107, 108 and 185, and thus directly infringe at least claims 2-4 of the `449 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

210) For these reasons, JSI is a contributory infringer of at least claims 2-4 of the `449 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

Demand for Jury Trial

VOXX demands a trial by jury for all counts.

Prayer for Relief

WHEREFORE, VOXX prays for the following:

- (a) Entry of a judgment adjudging that Johnson has infringed the `958 Patent, `745 Patent, `368 Patent, `902 Patent, `418 Patent, `086 Patent, and `449 Patent.
- (b) Entry of a judgment that permanently restrains and enjoins JSI, its officers, directors, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, affiliates, divisions, subsidiaries, parents, and those persons in active concert or participation with any of them, from directly and/or indirectly infringing the `958 Patent, `745 Patent, and `368 Patent, 902 Patent, `418 Patent, `086 Patent, and `449 Patent.
- (c) Entry of a judgment awarding damages pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284 sufficient to compensate VOXX for JSI's past infringement and any continuing and/or future infringement up until the date JSI is permanently enjoined from further infringement, including compensatory damages;
- (d) Entry of a judgment assessing pre-judgment and post-judgment interests and costs against JSI, together with an award of such interests and costs, in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 284;
- (e) A declaration that this is an exceptional case and an award to VOXX of its attorneys' fees and expenses to 35 U.S.C. § 285;

- (f) An award to VOXX of its costs of suit; and
- (g) All such other relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: August 23, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Dean E. McConnell
Dean E. McConnell Atty. No. 20254-49
INDIANO & MCCONELL
9795 Crosspoint Blvd., Suite 185
Indianapolis, IN 46256

Phone: (317) 912-1331
Email: dean@im-iplaw.com

Attorneys for VOXX International Corp.

Alastair J. Warr
FISHER BROYLES LLP
203 North LaSalle Street
Suite 2100
Chicago, IL 60601
Tel.: 317.408.5260
Email: alastair.warr@fisherbroyles.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that on this date, the foregoing document, with attachment(s), was electronically transmitted to the Court's Electronic Filing System and is being served by such system on counsel of record who are deemed to have consented for purposes of F.R.Civ.P. 5(b)(2)(E) to receive electronic service of documents through the Court's CM/ECF System.

Dated: August 23, 2016

/s/ Dean E. McConnell