

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

SPYCURITY LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

EDGEWATER NETWORKS, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. _____

Patent Case

Jury Trial Demanded

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff Spycurity LLC (“Spycurity”), through its attorney, complains of Edgewater Networks, Inc. (“Edgewater”), and alleges the following:

PARTIES

1. Plaintiff Spycurity LLC is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of Texas that maintains its principal place of business at 15922 Eldorado Pkwy, Suite 500-1536, Frisco, Texas 75035.
2. Defendant Edgewater Networks, Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Delaware that maintains its principal place of business at 5225 Hellyer Avenue, Suite 100, Santa Clara, CA 95138.

JURISDICTION

3. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code.
4. This Court has exclusive subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

5. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Edgewater because it has engaged in systematic and continuous business activities in the District of Delaware. Specifically, Edgewater provides its full range of services to residents in this District. As described below, Edgewater has committed acts of patent infringement giving rise to this action within this District.

VENUE

6. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b) because Edgewater has committed acts of patent infringement in this District and has a regular and established place of business in this District. Specifically, Edgewater provides its full range of services to residents in this District. In addition, Spycurity has suffered harm in this district.

PATENT-IN-SUIT

7. Spycurity is the assignee of all right, title and interest in United States Patent No. 5,809,118 (the “’118 Patent” or the “Patent-in-Suit”), including all rights to enforce and prosecute actions for infringement and to collect damages for all relevant times against infringers of the Patent-in-Suit. Accordingly, Spycurity possesses the exclusive right and standing to prosecute the present action for infringement of the Patent-in-Suit by Edgewater.

The ’118 Patent

8. On September 15, 1998, the United States Patent and Trademark Office issued the ’118 Patent. The ’118 Patent is titled “System and Method for Triggering Actions at a Host Computer by Telephone.” The application leading to the ’118 Patent was filed on May 30, 1996. A true and correct copy of the ’118 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference.
9. The ’118 Patent is valid and enforceable.

10. The invention in the '118 Patent provides a system and method for remotely triggering a predetermined program, or sequence of events, at a host computer system using a ring signal, wherein the sequence of events is, for example, a stored script of commands that cause the host system to connect to a computer network, such as the Internet. Ex. A at 4:11-17.
11. The inventors recognized that small companies and individuals paid large costs to lease and support a dedicated connection to the Internet. *Id.* at 4:7-10. The invention allows small companies and individuals to have their own Internet server computers, without having to shoulder the expense and complexity of a dedicated link to an Internet Service Provider. *Id.* at 4:17-21.

I. Infringement of the '118 Patent

12. Spycurity incorporates the above paragraphs herein by reference.
13. **Direct Infringement.** Edgewater has been and continues to directly infringe at least claim 1 of the '118 Patent in this District and elsewhere in the United States by providing a system, for example, Edgewater's EdgeMarc IP-to-IP Session Border Controllers, EdgeMarc Multi-Service Gateways and EdgeProtect Unified Communication Platform (collectively, "EdgeMarc"), that performs the steps for triggering a program stored at a host computer system using a telephone ring signal, wherein the host system includes a ring detection circuit connected to a phone line. For example, Edgewater's EdgeMarc has a ringer equivalency number, which is split into five per port and twenty per system. Upon information and belief, Edgewater has performed each step of claim 1 by at least internal testing of the EdgeMarc.
14. Edgewater performs the step of dialing the telephone number of the phone line connected to the host system, thereby generating a ring signal on the phone line. For example,

Edgewater's EdgeMarc has a ringer equivalency number that generates a ring signal on the line.

15. Edgewater performs the step of detecting the ring signal on the phone line using a ring detection circuit, and then generating a trigger signal to the host system indicating a phone call has been detected. For example, Edgewater's EdgeMarc has a Call Admission Control feature allowing the EdgeMarc to detect incoming phone calls.
16. Edgewater performs the step of the host system receiving the trigger signal and executing a predetermined program stored at the host system, wherein the predetermined program executed by the host system creates a connection between the host system and the Internet using a communication device connected to the host system. For example, Edgewater's EdgeMarc has WAN interfaces, such as Ethernet and optical, that supports up to 500 calls for enterprises.
17. **Induced Infringement.** Edgewater has also actively induced, and continues to induce, the infringement of at least claim 1 of the '118 Patent by actively inducing its customers, including merchants and end-users to use Edgewater's products in an infringing manner as described above. Upon information and belief, Edgewater has specifically intended that its customers use its products that infringe at least claim 1 of the '118 Patent by, at a minimum, providing access to support for, training and instructions for, its system to its customers to enable them to infringe at least claim 1 of the '118 Patent, as described above. Even where performance of the steps required to infringe at least claim 1 of the '118 Patent is accomplished by Edgewater and Edgewater's customer jointly, Edgewater's actions have solely caused all of the steps to be performed.
18. Spycurity is entitled to recover damages adequate to compensate it for such infringement in

an amount no less than a reasonable royalty under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

19. Spycurity will continue to be injured, and thereby caused irreparable harm, unless and until this Court enters an injunction prohibiting further infringement.

JURY DEMAND

20. Under Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Spycurity respectfully requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Spycurity asks this Court to enter judgment against Edgewater, granting the following relief:

- A. A declaration that Edgewater has infringed the Patent-in-Suit;
- B. An award of damages to compensate Spycurity for Edgewater's direct infringement of the Patent-in-Suit;
- C. An order that Edgewater and its officers, directors, agents, servants, employees, successors, assigns, and all persons in active concert or participation with them, be preliminarily and permanently enjoined from infringing the Patent-in-Suit under 35 U.S.C. § 283;
- D. An award of damages, including trebling of all damages, sufficient to remedy Edgewater's willful infringement of the Patent-in-Suit under 35 U.S.C. § 284;
- E. A declaration that this case is exceptional, and an award to Spycurity of reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs under 35 U.S.C. § 285;
- F. An award of prejudgment and post-judgment interest; and
- G. Such other relief as this Court or jury may deem proper and just.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Stamatios Stamoulis
Counsel for Plaintiff

Stamatios Stamoulis (#4606)
Two Fox Point Centre
6 Denny Road, Suite 307
Wilmington, DE 19809
(302) 999-1540
Stamoulis@swdelaw.com

Richard C. Weinblatt (#5080)
Two Fox Point Centre
6 Denny Road, Suite 307
Wilmington, DE 19809
(302) 999-1540
Weinblatt@swdelaw.com

Isaac Rabicoff
(Pro Hac Vice Admission Pending)
RABICOFF LAW LLC
73 W Monroe St
Chicago, IL 60603
773.669.4590
isaac@rabilaw.com

Kenneth Matuszewski
(Pro Hac Vice Admission Pending)
RABICOFF LAW LLC
73 W Monroe St
Chicago, IL 60603
(708) 870-5803
kenneth@rabilaw.com