Case 2:19-cv-01994 Document 1 Filed 03/18/19 Page 1 of 8 Page ID #:1

For its Complaint against Defendant SecureData, Inc. ("SecureData" or "Defendant"), Plaintiff Soteria Encryption, LLC ("Soteria" or "Plaintiff") alleges as follows:

THE PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff Soteria Encryption, LLC ("Soteria") is a California limited liability company having a principal place of business at 1055 East Colorado Boulevard, Suite 500, Pasadena, CA 91106.
- 2. On information and belief, SecureData, Inc. is a California corporation with its principal place of business at 3255 Cahuenga Blvd. West, #111, Los Angeles, CA 90068, and has appointed Walter Weiss, 1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 390, Los Angeles, CA 90067, as its agent for service of process.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 3. This is a civil action for patent infringement arising under the Patent Act of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§ 1 *et seq*. This court has subject matter jurisdiction of such federal question claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).
- 4. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant in this action because Defendant has its principal place of business in this district, has committed acts within this district giving rise to this action and has established minimum contacts with this forum such that the exercise of jurisdiction would not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice. Defendant, directly and indirectly, has committed and continue to commit acts of infringement in this district by, among other things, offering to sell and selling products and/or services that infringe the asserted patent.
- 5. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b), 1391(c) and 1400(b) in that the acts and transactions complained of herein were conceived, carried out, made effective, and had effect within the State of California and within this district, among other places. Defendant resides in this district by virtue of its principal place

of business and business activities in this district, including its regular and established place of business, and acts of infringement and inducement of infringement within this district.

SOTERIA'S PATENT-IN-SUIT

- 6. On June 27, 2006, the United States Patent & Trademark Office duly and legally issued United States Letters Patent No. 7,069,447 ("the '447 Patent"), entitled "Apparatus and Method for Secure Data Storage."
- 7. The '447 Patent claims, among other things, a secure mass data storage device operable in conjunction with a host computer. This device allows for the safe and secure storage of sensitive and confidential information in portable memory storage devices.
 - 8. The '447 Patent is owned by Soteria.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Against Defendant for direct and inducing INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,069,447)

- 9. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1-8 of the Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 10. A true and correct copy of the '447 Patent is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference.
- 11. Defendant has been and now is infringing at least claim 1 of the '447 Patent in this district, and elsewhere in the United Stated by, among other things; making, using, importing, offering for sale, and/or selling mass data storage devices that contain mass storage media, a command/sector buffer, an encryption/decryption unit, a user authentication unit, a media controller and a host computer interface. Said mass data storage devices offer the benefits of encryption to Defendant's customers without the need for software installation or the risk of infected machines stealing login credentials by using the technology contained in the mass data storage devices themselves to authenticate users without going through software or through

9

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24 25

26

27

28

the host computer interface. Examples of such devices include, but are not limited to, Defendant's SecureDrive KP, SecureDrive BT, Secure USB KP, and Secure USB BT products.

- 12. The mass storage device of Claim 1 offers significant improvements for data security over those that existed in the art. Traditional data security relies on software solutions but offer little in the way of security measures to prevent physical data theft or security in the event of a compromised host computer. While the contents of a drive may be encrypted, any machine that already had the encryption key could readily decode them, whether or not the use of that machine was allowed. The invention of the '447 as embodied in Claim 1 for example, solves this problem by moving the security from the host computer or computer network to the physical mass storage device. By ensuring that the data is inaccessible and encrypted without an authorized use of the mass storage device, it become significantly more difficult for even well-positioned data thieves to access any of the data. By authenticating the user on the mass storage device directly, the security of the data can be ensured even if someone picks up and carries off the computer and mass storage device something traditional network or software security is ill-positioned to combat.
- 13. The '447 patent has been cited by at least 50 issued United States patents and published patent applications as relevant prior art.
- By making, using, selling, and offering for sale such devices, and all 14. like products and related services that are covered by one or more claims of the '447 Patent, including at least claim 1, Defendant has infringed and continues to infringe the '447 Patent, including infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271.
- On information and belief, Defendant has also indirectly infringed and 15. continues to indirectly infringe the '447 Patent by actively inducing direct infringement by other persons, such as its customers and end users, who operate methods and systems that embody or otherwise practice one or more of the claims of the '447 Patent, when Defendant had knowledge (or willful blindness thereto) of the

'447 Patent and that the activities they were inducing would result in direct infringement by others and intended that its actions would induce direct infringement by others. SecureData intended and was aware that the normal and customary use of the accused products would infringe the '447 patent.

- 16. SecureData intended to induce other persons, such as its customers and end users, to directly infringe the '447 patent by (1) advising or directing them to make, use, sell, or import the infringing products or perform the infringing method, (2) advertising and promoting the use of the infringing products and performance of the infringing method, and (3) distributing instructions for using the infringing products and performing the infringing methods. On information and belief, SecureData engaged in such inducement to promote the sales of the accused products, e.g., through user manuals, product support, and marketing materials to actively induce the users of the accused products to infringe the '447 patent.
- 17. On information and belief, Defendant has had knowledge of the '447 Patent since, at least, the receipt date of a cease and desist letter sent by Soteria on or about January 31, 2019, wherein said letter included a detailed claim chart showing infringement.
- 18. On information and belief, Defendant will continue to infringe the '447 Patent unless enjoined by this Court.
- 19. On information and belief, Defendant's infringement is willful. Defendant has disregarded, and continues to disregard, an objectively high likelihood that its actions infringe at least claim 1 of the '447 patent, where such action constitutes egregious misconduct. For instance, counsel for Defendant sent a response letter dated February 5, 2019, stating that it was "investigating the matter" but has not substantively followed up since the filing date of this Complaint. Given that Soteria has previously litigated this patent, including the issuance of a *Markman* decision, upon information and belief, Defendant knew, or it was so obvious that

Defendant should have known, that its actions constituted infringement of a valid and enforceable patent.

- 20. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's infringement of the '447 Patent, Soteria has been and continues to be, damaged in an amount yet to be determined, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty for the use made of the invention by Defendant, together with interest and costs as fixed by the Court.
- 21. Unless a preliminary and permanent injunction are issued enjoining Defendant and its officers, agents, servants and employees, and all others acting on its behalf or in concert with Defendant, from infringing the '447 Patent, Soteria, will be greatly and irreparably harmed.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Soteria prays for judgment against Defendant as follows:

- (1) For a judicial decree that Defendant has infringed, and continue to infringe, the '447 patent;
- (2) For a judicial decree that Defendant, its respective subsidiaries, officers, agents, servants, employees, licensees, and all other persons or entities acting or attempting to act in active concert or participation with it or acting on its behalf, be preliminarily and permanently enjoined from further infringement of the '447 Patent;
- (3) For a judicial decree that orders Defendant to account for and pay to Soteria all damages caused to Soteria by reason of Defendant's infringement pursuant to 35 U.S.C. Section 284, including enhanced damages;
- (4) For a judicial decree finding that this is an exceptional case within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 285 and awarding to Plaintiff its reasonable attorneys' fees;
- (5) For a judicial decree that Defendant pays an ongoing royalty in an amount to be determined for continued infringement after the date of judgment;
- (6) For a judicial decree awarding to Soteria pre-judgment and postjudgment interest on the damages caused to it by Defendant's infringement; and

| | Case 2:19-cv-01994 Document 1 Filed 03/18/19 Page 7 of 8 Page ID #:7 |
|-----|--|
| 1 2 | (7) For any such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper under the circumstances. |
| 3 | proper under the encumbances. |
| 4 | Dated: March 18, 2019 ONE LLP |
| 5 | ONE DEI |
| 6 | By: /s/ John E. Lord |
| | John E. Lord |
| 7 | Joey K. Liu |
| 8 | A 44 C D1 : 4:CC |
| 9 | Attorneys for Plaintiff Soteria Encryption, LLC |
| 10 | Soteria Energytion, EEC |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| 28 | |
| - | 7 |

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL Plaintiff Soteria hereby demands trial by jury in this action. Dated: March 18, 2019 **ONE LLP** By: /s/ John E. Lord John E. Lord Joey K. Liu Attorneys for Plaintiff Soteria Encryption, LLC