

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

IRON OAK TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,
INC. and SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO.
LTD.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:17-CV-01259

JURY DEMANDED

AMENDED COMPLAINT

For its amended complaint against defendant Samsung Electronics America, Inc. and defendant Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd., (“Defendants”) Plaintiff Iron Oak Technologies, LLC (“Iron Oak”) alleges:

PARTIES

1. Plaintiff Iron Oak is a limited liability company organized under the laws of the State of Texas and has its principal place of business at 3605 Scranton Drive, Richland Hills, Texas, 76118. Iron Oak is a technology development company wholly-owned by prolific inventors William (Bill) C. Kennedy III of Dallas and Kenneth R. Westerlage of Ft. Worth. Mr. Kennedy and/or Mr. Westerlage are named inventors on each of the 22 patents owned by Iron Oak.

2. Samsung Electronics America, Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the state of New York with its principal place of business in 85 Challenger Road, Ridgely Park, New Jersey 07660. Samsung Electronics America, Inc. has designated CT Corporation System, 350 N. Saint Paul Street, Suite 2900, Dallas, TX 75201, as its representative

to accept service of process within the State of Texas. The contentions in this paragraph will likely have additional evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery.

3. Samsung Electronics Company, Ltd. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Korea with its principal place of business located at 416 Maetan-3dong, Yeongtong-gu, Suwon-City, Gyeonggi-do, Korea 443-742. Samsung Electronics America, Inc. is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Samsung Electronics Company, Ltd. The contentions in this paragraph will likely have additional evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery.

NATURE OF ACTION, JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This is an action for patent infringement under the Patent Act, 35 U.S.C. § 1 et seq.

5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (Federal Question) and § 1338 (Patent, Trademark and Unfair Competition).

6. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b), (c), & (d) and § 1400(b).

FACTS COMMON TO ALL COUNTS

7. Iron Oak is the owner through assignment of U.S. Patent No. 5,699,275 issued December 16, 1997 (“the ‘275 Patent”), which is valid and enforceable. The ‘275 Patent is directed to a system and method for remote patching of operating code located in a mobile unit. A true and correct copy of the ‘275 patent is attached as Exhibit A.

8. Iron Oak is the owner through assignment of U.S. Patent No. 5,966,658 issued October 12, 1999 (the ‘658 Patent”), which is valid and enforceable. The ‘658 Patent is directed to

the automated selection of a communication path. A true and correct copy of the '658 patent is attached as Exhibit B.

COUNT I

Infringement of the '275 Patent

9. The allegations in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint are hereby restated and incorporated by reference.

10. Defendants have committed acts of direct patent infringement of the '275 Patent by making, using, selling, offering to sell, and importing products, including but not limited to the accused products described in the Original Complaint, and in Exhibits C and G (“accused products”), for at least the reasons described therein.

11. In addition to, or as an alternative to, directly infringing the '275 Patent by making, using, selling, offering to sell, and importing the accused products, Defendant has induced direct infringement of the '275 Patent by others. Defendant had knowledge of the '275 Patent and Plaintiff's allegations of direct infringement of the '275 Patent at least as early as October 6, 2008, as shown by Exhibit C. After that date, Defendant continued to make, use, offer to sell, sell and/or import accused products, including the mobile units and manager hosts identified in the Original Complaint, and in Exhibits C and G, each configured for remote patching of operating code on a mobile unit, and/or configured to transmit a discrete patch message to a mobile unit, and/or configured to receive a discrete patch message on a mobile unit. Defendant provided assistance to end users of the accused products concerning how to update or patch operating code on a mobile unit, knowing that those instructions and/or assistance would be followed by the end users of the accused products, and would result in infringement of the '275 Patent. End users of

the accused products directly infringe the '275 Patent when the accused products are used in the ordinary, customary, and intended way. By continuing to make and sell accused products and by continuing to provide such instructions and assistance, Defendant knew, or was willfully blind to, the probability that its actions would actively induce infringement. These actions have induced the direct infringement of the '275 patent by end-users. The allegations in this paragraph are believed to have evidentiary support as set forth herein, and likely will have additional evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery.

12. Defendant had knowledge of the '275 patent prior to the filing of the Original Complaint in this action, as shown at least by Exhibit C.

13. In compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 287, Plaintiff provided to Defendant notice of infringement of the '275 Patent at least as early as October 6, 2008. See Exhibit C.

14. Defendant's infringement of the '275 patent was willful. Despite knowing of the '275 Patent, Defendant engaged in acts that infringe the '275 Patent.

15. Iron Oak has been damaged as a result of Defendant's infringing conduct. Defendant is, thus, liable to Iron Oak in an amount that adequately compensates it for which, by law, cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs, including lost profits, as affixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

COUNT II

Infringement of the '658 Patent

16. The allegations in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint are hereby restated and incorporated by reference.

17. Defendant has committed acts of direct and indirect patent infringement of the '658 Patent by making, using, selling, offering to sell, and importing products, including but not limited to the products described in the Original Complaint, and in Exhibits E, F and G (“accused products”), for at least the reasons described therein.

18. In addition to, or as an alternative to, directly infringing the '658 Patent by making, using, selling, offering to sell, and importing the accused products, Defendant has induced direct infringement of the '658 Patent by others. Defendant had knowledge of the '658 Patent and Plaintiff's allegations of direct infringement of the '658 Patent at least as early as May 23, 2008, as shown by Exhibit E. After that date, Defendant continued to make, use, offer to sell, sell and/or import accused products identified in the Original Complaint and in Exhibits E, F and G, each configured to select among an ordered list of communications paths. Defendant provided assistance to end users of the accused products concerning how to operate the accused products, concerning selection among an ordered list of communication paths, knowing that those instructions and/or assistance would be followed by the end users of the accused products, and would result in infringement of the '658 Patent. End users of the accused products directly infringe the '658 Patent when the accused products are used in the ordinary, customary, and intended way. By continuing to make and sell accused products, and continuing to provide such instructions and assistance, Defendant knew, or was willfully blind to, the probability that its actions would actively induce infringement. These actions have induced the direct infringement of the '658

patent by end-users. The allegations in this paragraph are believed to have evidentiary support as set forth herein, and likely will have additional evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery.

19. Defendant had knowledge of the '658 patent prior to the filing of the Original Complaint in this action, as shown at least by Exhibit D.

20. In compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 287, Plaintiff provided to Defendant notice of infringement of the '275 Patent at least as early as May 9, 2014. See Exhibit E.

21. Defendant's infringement of the '658 patent was willful. Despite knowing of the '658 Patent, Defendant engaged in acts that infringe the '658 Patent.

22. Iron Oak has been damaged as a result of Defendant's infringing conduct. Defendant is, thus, liable to Iron Oak in an amount that adequately compensates it for, which, by law, cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs, including lost profits, as affixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Iron Oak requests judgment against Defendant as follows:

1. An award of damages, increased as deemed appropriate by the court, under 35 U.S.C. § 284;
2. An award of attorneys' fees under 35 U.S.C. § 285;
3. An award of prejudgment interest and costs of the action; and
4. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

July 26, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Al Deaver
Robert J. McAughan, Jr.
TX State Bar No. 00786096
bmcaughan@smd-iplaw.com
YETTER COLEMAN LLP
909 Fannin St. Suite 3600
Houston, TX 77002
(713) 632-8000 (T)
(713) 632-8002 (F)

Albert B. Deaver, Jr.
TX Bar No. 05703800
adeaver@smd-iplaw.com
JONES WALKER LLP
811 Main St. Suite 2900
Houston, Texas 77002
(713) 437-1800
(713) 437-1810

Attorneys for Plaintiff Iron Oak Technologies, LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on July 26, 2018, a true and correct copy of this document was served on counsel of record via electronic mail in accordance with the Northern District of Texas Procedures for Electronic Filing.

/s/ Al Deaver