

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

SECURE CAM, LLC, a Wyoming limited liability company,

Plaintiff,

v.

NETATMO, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Civil Action No.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Secure Cam, LLC (“Plaintiff”) brings this complaint against Netatmo, LLC (“Defendant”). As its complaint against Defendant, Plaintiff alleges as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This is an action under 35 U.S.C. § 271 for infringement of United States Patent No. 8,531,555 (“the ‘555 Patent”), United States Patent No. 8,350,928 (“the ‘928 Patent”), United States Patent No. 8,836,819 (“the ‘819 Patent”), and United States Patent No. 9,363,408 (“the ‘408”).

THE PARTIES

2. Plaintiff Secure Cam, LLC, is a Wyoming limited liability company having a principal place of business at 30 N. Gould St. STE R, Sheridan, WY 82801.

3. Defendant Netatmo, LLC is a Delaware limited liability company having a principal place of business at 895 Rue Yves Kermen, Boulogne-Billancourt, 92100 France, and a registered office in the State of Delaware at The Corporation Trust Company, Corporation Trust Center 1209 Orange St., Wilmington, County of New Castle, DE 19801.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

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

5. This Court has personal jurisdiction over the Defendant because, *inter alia*, it resides in the State of Delaware; regularly conducts business in the State of Delaware; and continues to commit acts of patent infringement in the State of Delaware including by making, using, offering to sell, and/or selling Accused Products within the State of Delaware and this district.

6. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b), 1391(c) and 1400(b). Defendant is subject to this Court's personal jurisdiction because, *inter alia*, Defendants have committed and continue to commit acts of patent infringement including making, using, offering to sell, and/or selling Accused Products in this district, and/or importing Accused Products into this district; Defendant has a principal place of business in this judicial district, and Defendant employs personnel in this judicial district.

FACTS

7. Plaintiff is the owner, by assignment, of U.S. Patent No. 8,531,555 ("the '555 Patent"), entitled "Method and Apparatus for Automatically Categorizing Images in a Digital Camera," which was duly and legally issued on September 10th, 2013 by the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO").

8. A copy of the '555 Patent is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit A.

9. The claims of the '555 Patent are valid and enforceable.

10. Plaintiff is the owner, by assignment, of U.S. Patent No. 8,350,928 ("the '928 Patent"), entitled "Method and Apparatus for Automatically Categorizing Images in a Digital Camera," which was duly and legally issued on January 8th, 2013 by the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO").

11. A copy of the '928 Patent is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit B.

12. The claims of the '928 Patent are valid and enforceable.

13. Plaintiff is the owner, by assignment, of U.S. Patent No. 8,836,819 (“the ‘819 Patent”), entitled “Method and Apparatus for Automatically Categorizing Images in a Digital Camera,” which was duly and legally issued on September 16th, 2014 by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”).

14. A copy of the ‘819 Patent is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit C.

15. The claims of the ‘819 Patent are valid and enforceable.

16. Plaintiff is the owner, by assignment, of U.S. Patent No. 9,363,408 (“the ‘408 Patent”), entitled “Method and Apparatus for Automatically Categorizing Images in a Digital Camera,” which was duly and legally issued on June 7th, 2016 by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”).

17. A copy of the ‘408 Patent is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit D.

18. The claims of the ‘408 Patent are valid and enforceable.

COUNT I: CLAIM FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) (‘555 PATENT)

19. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 18 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

20. Claim 1 of the ‘555 Patent covers “a device, comprising a processing circuit configured to automatically generate at least one tag for an image captured using the device in response to analyzing data associated with the image at a time of image capture, and a memory circuit configured to store the at least one tag with the data to thereby categorize the image.”

21. Defendant manufactures, imports into the United States, offers for sale, and/or sells security cameras, which infringe at least Claim 1 of the ‘555 Patent (hereafter “Accused Product(s)”).

22. Defendant’s Accused Product(s) include, without limitation Netatmo Presence Outdoor Security Camera and Netatmo Welcome Indoor Security Camera.

23. A claim chart comparing Claim 1 of the ‘555 Patent to the Accused Product(s) is attached as Exhibit E.

24. The Accused Product(s) is an outdoor security camera with people, car and animal detection. See Exhibit E, p. 1.

25. Upon information and belief, the Accused Product(s) includes a processor that captures images of moving objects and categorize the captured images as a person, a car, or an animal. See Exhibit E, p. 2.

26. The Accused Product(s) include local storage for storing captured images and tags. See Exhibit E, p. 3.

27. Each one of the elements included in the Infringing System, itemized in paragraphs 24 – 26 above, is an element in Claim 1 of the ‘555 Patent.

28. Plaintiff has been, and will continue to be, irreparably harmed by Defendant’s ongoing infringement of the ‘555 Patent.

29. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant’s infringement of the ‘555 Patent, Plaintiff has been and will continue to be damaged in an amount yet to be determined.

COUNT II: CLAIM FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) (‘928 PATENT)

30. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 18 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

31. Claim 1 of the ‘928 Patent covers “a digital camera for automatically categorizing captured image data, the digital camera comprising a processor within the digital camera for capturing image data, an analysis module within the digital camera coupled to the processor and configured to perform image data analysis on the captured image data at the time of image capture by the digital camera and to automatically generate, responsive to the preformed image data analysis, a category tag for the captured image data; and a memory for storing the generated

category tag in association with the captured image data for categorizing the captured image data.”

32. Defendant manufactures, imports into the United States, offers for sale, and/or sells security cameras, which infringe at least Claim 1 of the ‘928 Patent (hereafter “Accused Product(s)”).

33. Defendant’s Accused Product(s) include, without limitation Netatmo Presence Outdoor Security Camera and Netatmo Welcome Indoor Security Camera.

34. A claim chart comparing Claim 1 of the ‘928 Patent to the Accused Product(s) is attached as Exhibit F.

35. The Accused Product(s) is an outdoor security camera with people, car and animal detection. See Exhibit F, p. 1.

36. Upon information and belief, the Accused Product(s) includes a camera that captures images. See Exhibit F, p. 2.

37. The Accused Product(s) an analysis module that analyzes the captured image and categorizes the captured image as a person, a car, or an animal. See Exhibit F, p. 3.

38. The Accused Product(s) includes local storage for storing captured images and tags. See Exhibit F, p. 3.

39. Each one of the elements included in the Infringing System, itemized in paragraphs 35 – 38 above, is an element in Claim 1 of the ‘928 Patent.

40. Plaintiff has been, and will continue to be, irreparably harmed by Defendant’s ongoing infringement of the ‘928 Patent.

41. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant’s infringement of the ‘928 Patent, Plaintiff has been and will continue to be damaged in an amount yet to be determined.

COUNT III: CLAIM FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) ('819 PATENT)

42. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 18 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

43. Claim 1 of the '819 Patent covers “An apparatus comprising a processing device configured to detect a predetermined characteristic in an image file in response to capturing an image, automatically generate at least one category tag for the image file at a time of capturing the image based at least in part on the predetermined characteristic, attach the at least one category tag to the image file; and a memory device configured to store the image file with the attached at least one category tag.”

44. Defendant manufactures, imports into the United States, offers for sale, and/or sells security cameras, which infringe at least Claim 1 of the '819 Patent (hereafter “Accused Product(s)”).

45. Defendant's Accused Product(s) include, without limitation Netatmo Presence Outdoor Security Camera and Netatmo Welcome Indoor Security Camera.

46. A claim chart comparing Claim 1 of the '819 Patent to the Accused Product(s) is attached as Exhibit G.

47. The Accused Product(s) is an outdoor security camera with people, car, and animal detection. See Exhibit G, p. 1.

48. Upon information and belief, the Accused Product(s) includes a processor that is configured to capture images of moving objects and categorize the captured images as a person, a car, or an animal. See Exhibit G, p. 2.

49. The Accused Product(s) includes local storage for storing captured images and tags. See Exhibit G, p. 3.

50. Each one of the elements included in the Infringing System, itemized in paragraphs 47 – 49 above, is an element in Claim 1 of the ‘819 Patent.

51. Plaintiff has been, and will continue to be, irreparably harmed by Defendant’s ongoing infringement of the ‘819 Patent.

52. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant’s infringement of the ‘819 Patent, Plaintiff has been and will continue to be damaged in an amount yet to be determined.

COUNT IV: CLAIM FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) (‘408 PATENT)

53. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 18 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

54. Claim 1 of the ‘408 Patent covers “a method comprising automatically generating, using a first processing device, at least one image category tag based at least in part on the first processing device analyzing image data associated with an image at a time of image capture, storing, in a memory device, the at least one image category tag as part of an image file storing the image; and automatically determining, using the first processing device or a second processing device, a category for the image based at least in part on the at least one image category tag.”

55. Defendant manufactures, imports into the United States, offers for sale, and/or sells security cameras, which infringe at least Claim 1 of the '408 Patent (hereafter "Accused Product(s)").

56. Defendant's Accused Product(s) include, without limitation Netatmo Presence Outdoor Security Camera and Netatmo Welcome Indoor Security Camera.

57. A claim chart comparing Claim 1 of the '408 Patent to the Accused Product(s) is attached as Exhibit H.

58. The Accused Product(s) is an outdoor security camera with people, car, and animal detection. See Exhibit H, p. 1.

59. Upon information and belief, the Accused Product(s) includes a processor that is configured to capture images of moving objects and categorize the captured images as a person, a car, or an animal. See Exhibit H, p. 2.

60. The Accused Product(s) includes local storage for storing captured images and tags. See Exhibit H, p. 3.

61. Upon information and belief, the Accused Product(s) includes a processor that is configured to capture images of moving objects and categorize the captured images as a person, a car, or an animal. See Exhibit H, p. 4.

62. The Accused Product(s) includes face recognition technology for capturing the face of the person standing in front of the camera and comparing it to stored faces to identify the person instantly. See Exhibit, p. 4.

63. Each one of the elements included in the Infringing System, itemized in paragraphs 58 – 62 above, is an element in Claim 1 of the '408 Patent.

64. Plaintiff has been, and will continue to be, irreparably harmed by Defendant's ongoing infringement of the '408 Patent.

65. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's infringement of the '408 Patent, Plaintiff has been and will continue to be damaged in an amount yet to be determined.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief against Defendant as follows:

A. In favor of Plaintiff that Defendant has infringed one or more claims of the '555 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents;

B. Requiring Defendant to pay Plaintiff its damages, costs, expenses, and prejudgment and post-judgment interest for Defendant's infringement of the '555 Patent as provided under 35 U.S.C. § 284, but not less than a reasonable royalty; and

C. For such other and further relief, as may be just and equitable.

D. Requiring Defendant to pay Plaintiff its damages, costs, expenses, and prejudgment and post-judgment interest for Defendant's infringement of the '928 Patent as provided under 35 U.S.C. § 284, but not less than a reasonable royalty; and

E. For such other and further relief, as may be just and equitable.

F. Requiring Defendant to pay Plaintiff its damages, costs, expenses, and prejudgment and post-judgment interest for Defendant's infringement of the '819 Patent as provided under 35 U.S.C. § 284, but not less than a reasonable royalty; and

G. For such other and further relief, as may be just and equitable.

H. Requiring Defendant to pay Plaintiff its damages, costs, expenses, and prejudgment and post-judgment interest for Defendant's infringement of the '408 Patent as provided under 35 U.S.C. § 284, but not less than a reasonable royalty; and

I. For such other and further relief, as may be just and equitable.

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

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

Dated: May 14, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

Of Counsel:

Todd Y. Brandt (Pro Hac Vice pending)
State Bar No. 24027051
BRANDT LAW FIRM
222 N. Fredonia Street
Longview, Texas 75606
Telephone: (903) 212-3130
Facsimile: (903) 753-6761
tbrandt@thebrandtlawfirm.com

/s/ George Pazuniak
George Pazuniak (DE Bar 478)
O'Kelly Ernst & Joyce, LLC
901 N. Market St.
Suite 1000
Wilmington, DE 19801
Tel: 302-478-4230
Email: GP@del-iplaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Secure Cam, LLC