

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

**WAVE LINX LLC,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**ZOOM VIDEO COMMUNICATIONS, INC.  
and ZOOM VOICE COMMUNICATIONS,  
INC.,**

Defendants.

Civil Action No.

**TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED**

**COMPLAINT FOR INFRINGEMENT OF PATENT**

Now comes, Plaintiff, Wave Linx LLC (“Plaintiff” or “Wave Linx”), by and through undersigned counsel, and respectfully alleges, states, and prays as follows:

**NATURE OF THE ACTION**

1. This is an action for patent infringement under the Patent Laws of the United States, Title 35 United States Code (“U.S.C.”) to prevent and enjoin the related Defendants Zoom Video Communications, Inc. and Zoom Voice Communications, Inc. (collectively hereinafter “Defendants”), from infringing and profiting, in an illegal and unauthorized manner, and without authorization and/or consent from Plaintiff from U.S. Patent No. 8,843,549 (“the ‘549 Patent” or the “Patent-in-Suit”), which is attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference, and pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §271, and to recover damages, attorney’s fees, and costs.

**THE PARTIES**

2. Plaintiff is a Texas limited liability company with its principal place of business at 2108 Dallas Parkway, Suite 214, #1010, Plano, Texas 75093.

3. Upon information and belief, Defendants are related organizations, wherein Defendant Zoom Video Communications, Inc. is a corporation organized under the laws of

Delaware, and Defendant Zoom Voice Communications, Inc. is a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware, each having a principal place of business at 55 Almaden Boulevard, 6th Floor, San Jose, CA 95113. Upon information and belief, Defendants may be served with process c/o The Corporation Trust Company, Corporation Trust Center, 1209 Orange Street, Wilmington, DE 19801.

4. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that either (i) Defendants jointly or (ii) Defendant Zoom Voice Communications, Inc. or Defendant Zoom Video Communications, Inc. operate the website [www.zoom.us](http://www.zoom.us), which is in the business of providing communication services, amongst other services. Defendants derive a portion of its revenue from sales and distribution via electronic transactions conducted on and using at least, but not limited to, an Internet website located at [www.zoom.us](http://www.zoom.us), and its incorporated and/or related systems (collectively the “Zoom Website”). Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that, at all times relevant hereto, Defendants have done and continues to do business in this judicial district, including, but not limited to, providing products/services to customers located in this judicial district by way of the Zoom Website.

#### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

5. This is an action for patent infringement in violation of the Patent Act of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§1 *et seq.*

6. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

7. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants by virtue of their systematic and continuous contacts with this jurisdiction and its residence in this District, as well as because of the injury to Plaintiff, and the cause of action Plaintiff has risen in this District, as alleged herein.

8. Defendants are subject to this Court's specific and general personal jurisdiction pursuant to their substantial business in this forum, including: (i) at least a portion of the infringements alleged herein; (ii) regularly doing or soliciting business, engaging in other persistent courses of conduct, and/or deriving substantial revenue from goods and services provided to individuals in Delaware and in this judicial District; and (iii) being incorporated in this District.

9. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b) because Defendants reside in this District under the Supreme Court's opinion in *TC Heartland v. Kraft Foods Group Brands LLC*, 137 S. Ct. 1514 (2017) through its incorporation, and regular and established place of business in this District.

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

10. On October 23, 2012, the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") duly and legally issued the '549 Patent, entitled "Streaming Method for Transmitting Telephone System Notifications to Internet Terminal Devices in Real Time" after a full and fair examination. The '549 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein as if fully rewritten.

11. Plaintiff is presently the owner of the '549 Patent, having received all right, title and interest in and to the '549 Patent from the previous assignee of record. Plaintiff possesses all rights of recovery under the '549 Patent, including the exclusive right to recover for past infringement.

12. The invention claimed in the '549 Patent comprises a method for an application involving real-time notification of a client by a telephone switching system.

13. The '549 Patent contains two independent claims and eight dependent claims.

14. Claim 1 of the '549 Patent states:

“1. A method for an application involving real-time notification of a client by a telephone switching system, comprising:

a) opening a connection between the client and a server;

b) transmitting notification messages from the telephone switching system to the server using a networking protocol;

c) transforming the notification messages at the server into a programming language code and using said networking protocol for sending the programming language code to the client, wherein the programming language code is executable by the client's browser;

d) using an HTTP streaming mechanism for transmission of the notification from the server to the browser through the open connection, whereby the connection between the client and the server remains open in the intervening period between the transmission of individual notification messages; and

e) executing the programming language codes by the browser whereby the respective notification messages are displayed or outputted at the client.” See Exhibit A.

15. Defendants commercialize, inter alia, methods that perform all the steps recited in at least one claim of the ‘549 Patent. More particularly, Defendants commercialize, inter alia, methods that perform all the steps recited in Claim 1 of the ‘549 Patent. Specifically, Defendants make, use, sell, offer for sale, or import a method that encompasses that which is covered by Claim 1 of the ‘549 Patent.

16. Dependent Claim 4 of the ‘549 patent states: “The method according to claim 1, further comprising: using the HTTP protocol for the client-server connection.” See Exhibit A.

### **DEFENDANT’S PRODUCTS**

17. Defendants offers solutions, such as the “Zoom Room” system (the “Accused Instrumentality”), that enables a method for an application involving real-time notification of a

client by a telephone switching system. For example, as shown in Defendants' user guide (the "User Guide"), which is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated herein as if fully rewritten, the Accused Instrumentality performs the method of an application involving real-time notification of a client by a telephone switching system. A non-limiting and exemplary claim chart comparing the Accused Instrumentality to Claim 1 of the '549 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit C and is incorporated herein as if fully rewritten.

18. As recited in Claim 1, the Accused Instrumentality practices a method for an application (e.g., Zoom Meetings client application) involving real-time notification (e.g., notification of a participant in waiting room of a meeting or entry/exit notification) of a client (e.g., a user who is utilizing web browser interface/app interface of Zoom Meetings) by a telephone switching system (e.g., PSTN, dial-in telephone). See Exhibit C.

19. As recited in one step of Claim 1, the Accused Instrumentality opening a connection (e.g., joining/starting a meeting) between the client (e.g., a user who is utilizing web browser interface/app interface of Zoom meetings) and a server (e.g., Zoom Meetings server). See Exhibit C.

20. As recited in another step of Claim 1, the Accused Instrumentality transmitting notification messages (e.g., notification of a participant in waiting room of a meeting or entry/exit notification) from the telephone switching system (e.g., a participant who joined the meeting using dial-in telephone or PSTN phone) to the server (e.g., Zoom meetings server) using a networking protocol (e.g., IP). See Exhibit C.

21. As recited in another step of Claim 1, the Accused Instrumentality practices transforming the notification messages (e.g., notification of a participant in waiting room of a meeting or entry/exit notification) at the server (e.g., Zoom meetings server) into a programming

language code (e.g., markup language code such as HTML code) and using said networking protocol (e.g., IP) for sending the programming language code (e.g., markup language code such as HTML code) to the client (e.g., a user who is utilizing web browser interface/app interface of Zoom meetings), wherein the programming language code is executable by the client's browser (e.g., web browser of the user such as Google Chrome). See Exhibit C.

22. As recited in another step of Claim 1, the Accused Instrumentality practices using an HTTP streaming (e.g., meeting session streaming to a user's web browser) mechanism for transmission of the notification (e.g., notification of a participant in waiting room of a meeting or entry/exit notification) from the server (e.g., Zoom meetings server) to the browser (e.g., web browser of the user such as Google Chrome) through the open connection (e.g., ongoing meeting session), whereby the connection between the client (e.g., a user who is utilizing web browser interface/app interface of Zoom meetings) and the server (e.g., Zoom meetings server) remains open in the intervening period between the transmission of individual notification messages. See Exhibit C.

23. As recited in another step of Claim 1, the Accused Instrumentality practices executing the programming language codes (e.g., markup language code such as HTML code) by the browser (e.g., web browser of the user such as Google Chrome) whereby the respective notification messages are displayed or outputted (e.g., display notification or play sound) at the client (e.g., a user who is utilizing web browser interface/app interface of Zoom meetings). See Exhibit C.

24. The elements described in paragraphs 18-23 are covered by at least Claim 1 of the '549 Patent. Thus, Defendant's use of the Accused Instrumentality is enabled by the method described in the '549 Patent.

25. As to Claim 4, the Accused Instrumentality practices the method using the HTTP protocol for the client-server connection. See Exhibit C.

26. The elements described in paragraphs 18-23, and 25 are covered by at least Claim 4 of the '549 Patent. Thus, Defendant's use of the Accused Instrumentality is enabled by the method described in the '549 Patent.

### **INFRINGEMENT OF THE '549 PATENT**

27. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 to 26.

28. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271, Defendant is now, and has been directly infringing the '549 Patent.

29. Defendants have had knowledge of infringement of the '549 Patent at least as of the service of the present Complaint.

30. Defendants have directly infringed and continues to directly infringe at least one claim of the '549 Patent by using, at least through internal testing or otherwise, the Accused Instrumentality without authority in the United States, and will continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' direct infringement of the '549 Patent, Plaintiff has been and continues to be damaged.

31. By engaging in the conduct described herein, Defendants have injured Plaintiff and are thus liable for infringement of the '549 Patent, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.

32. Defendants have committed these acts of infringement without license or authorization.

33. As a result of Defendants' infringement of the '549 Patent, Plaintiff has suffered monetary damages and is entitled to a monetary judgment in an amount adequate to compensate for Defendants' past infringement, together with interests and costs.

34. Plaintiff will continue to suffer damages in the future unless Defendants' infringing activities are enjoined by this Court. As such, Plaintiff is entitled to compensation for any continuing and/or future infringement up until the date that Defendant is finally and permanently enjoined from further infringement.

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

35. Plaintiff demands a trial by jury of any and all causes of action.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for the following relief:

a. That Defendants be adjudged to have directly infringed the '549 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents;

b. An accounting of all infringing sales and damages including, but not limited to, those sales and damages not presented at trial;

c. That Defendants, their officers, directors, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, affiliates, divisions, branches, parents, and those persons in active concert or participation with any of them, be permanently restrained and enjoined from directly infringing the '549 Patent;

d. An award of damages pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §284 sufficient to compensate Plaintiff for the Defendants' past infringement and any continuing or future infringement up until the date that Defendants are finally and permanently enjoined from further infringement, including compensatory damages;



e. An assessment of pre-judgment and post-judgment interest and costs against Defendants, together with an award of such interest and costs, in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 284;

f. That Defendants be directed to pay enhanced damages, including Plaintiff's attorneys' fees incurred in connection with this lawsuit pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285; and

g. That Plaintiff be granted such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: February 28, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

DEVLIN LAW FIRM, LLC

/s/ Timothy Devlin

Timothy Devlin (No. 4241)  
1306 N. Broom Street, 1st Floor  
Wilmington, DE 19806  
Phone: (302) 449-9010  
Fax: (302) 353-4251  
tdevlin@devlinlawfirm.com

Together with:

SAND, SEBOLT & WERNOW CO., LPA

Howard L. Wernow  
(*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
Aegis Tower - Suite 1100  
4940 Munson Street, N. W.  
Canton, OH 44718  
Phone: (330) 244-1174  
Fax: (330) 244-1173  
Howard.Wernow@sswip.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF  
WAVE LINX LLC