1	Thomas I. Rozsa, State Bar No. 080615		
1	Zsofia Nemeth, State Bar No. 298240		
2	ROZSA LAW GROUP LC		
3	18757 Burbank Boulevard, Suite 220		
4	Tarzana, California 91356-3346		
	Telephone (818) 783-0990		
5	Facsimile (818) 783-0992 Email: counsel@rozsalaw.com		
6	Email: counsel c rozsalaw.com		
7	Attorneys for Unique Garage Door Inc.		
8			
9			
	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
10	ONTED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
11	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA (WESTERN DIVISION		
12			
13	UNIQUE GARAGE DOOR INC., a	CASE NO.: 8:19-CV-0756	
	California corporation,	COMPLAINT FOR	
14	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT	
15	r iamum,	TATENT INTRINGENIENT	
16	VS.	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	
17	CLOPAY BUILDING PRODUCTS		
	COMPANY, INC., a corporation of		
18	Delaware; THE HOME DEPOT, INC.,		
19	a corporation of Delaware; HOME		
20	DEPOT U.S.A., INC., a corporation of Delaware; and DOES 1-10, Inclusive,		
21	Delaware, and DOES 1-10, inclusive,		
22	Defendants.		
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
	II		

ROZSA LAW GROUP LC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
18757 BURBANK BOLLEVARD, SUITE 220
TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91356-3346
TELEPHONE (818) 783-0990

COMES NOW Plaintiff UNIQUE GARAGE DOOR INC., a corporation of California (hereafter "Plaintiff" or "Unique"), and for its Complaint against CLOPAY BUILDING PRODUCTS COMPANY, INC., a corporation of Delaware (hereafter "Clopay"); THE HOME DEPOT, INC., a corporation of Delaware; HOME DEPOT U.S.A., INC., a corporation of Delaware (hereafter The Home Depot, Inc. and Home Depot U.S.A., Inc. are jointly referred to as "Home Depot"); (hereafter Clopay and Home Depot are jointly referred to as "Defendants") and DOES 1-10, complains and alleges as follows:

THE PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff UNIQUE GARAGE DOOR INC. is a corporation duly formed and existing under the laws of the State of California and has its principal place of business located at 6259 Descanso Ave., Buena Park, California 90620. Unique is the owner by assignment of all title, right and interest in and to the United States Patent 9,856,685 (hereafter "the '685 Patent"), with the right to enforce the '685 Patent. During the time period from January 2, 2018 through January 2, 2019, Unique was the exclusive licensee of the '685 Patent with the right to enforce the '685 Patent, which is the subject of this Complaint.
- 2. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendant CLOPAY BUILDING PRODUCTS COMPANY, INC. is a corporation formed and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware and has its principal place of business located at 8585 Duke Boulevard, Mason, Ohio 45040-3101.
- 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendant THE HOME DEPOT, INC. is a corporation formed and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware and has its principal place of business located at 2455 Paces Ferry Road, Atlanta, Georgia 30339.

- 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Clopay is doing continuous and substantial business within this judicial district in the State of California. In particular, Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Clopay has been and is advertising, offering for sale, selling and/or placing products in the stream of commerce in the United States knowing that they will be sold to consumers in this judicial district. In particular, as set forth in detail below, Clopay has been and is advertising, offering for sale and/or selling the infringing "QuietFlex Hinge" (hereafter "Infringing Hinge") in this judicial district.
- 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Home Depot is doing continuous and substantial business within this judicial district in the State of California and Home Depot is an authorized dealer of Clopay. In particular, Home Depot operates dozens of multiple brick and mortar stores in the State of California and in this judicial district, where customers may obtain Clopay's products, including the Infringing Hinge.
- 7. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, and therefore sues such defendants by such fictitious names. At such time as the true names and capacities of these DOE Defendants are ascertained, Plaintiff will seek leave of the Court to amend its Complaint to allege their true names and capacities. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and upon such information and belief alleges, that at all times mentioned herein, each of the DOE defendants was responsible, along with the named Defendants. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and based thereon alleges

that the Defendants and the DOE defendants, and each and every one of them, knowingly and willfully conspired and agreed among themselves or induced each other to commit the wrongful acts as set forth herein. These wrongful acts were done pursuant to and in furtherance of this conspiracy, agreement and/or inducement. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and based thereon alleges that certain individuals named at this time as DOE Defendants and each of them, are responsible in some manner, by their acts and/or omissions, for the matters alleged herein. The wrongful acts alleged herein were done through their acts and/or omissions.

8. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that at all times mentioned herein, Defendants, and each of them, were and are the agents, servants, employees, parents, subsidiaries, and/or co-conspirators of each other, and were and are acting within the scope of such agency or employment, parent ownership, or subsidiary ownership, or otherwise participated in the improper conduct alleged herein. Each of the Defendants is in some form or manner responsible for the conduct herein complained of, and Plaintiff's harm and damages are proximately caused by the conduct of each.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 9. This Complaint is for patent infringement, which arises under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 et seq., particularly in violation of § 271 and under §§ 282-285. This Court has original jurisdiction over the subject matter of this cause of action pursuant to Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, and pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).
- 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that this Court has personal jurisdiction over the Defendants in that each have an

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

established place of business in this judicial district. Further, Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the Defendants have been and are transacting substantial and continuous business within this judicial district and committed acts of patent infringement within this judicial district.

- Namely, Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges 11. that Clopay has 50 distribution centers throughout the United States and Canada, one of which is located in this judicial district, at 16731 Knott Ave, La Mirada, California 90638. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that Clopay has a showroom and a sales office at its distribution center located in La Mirada, and it employs full time employees there. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** and incorporated by reference is a true and correct copy of a printout from the website of Clopay, www.clopaydoor.com, stating that Clopay has 50 distribution centers throughout the United States and Canada, and operates a nationwide professional dealer network. Also attached hereto as Exhibit 2 and incorporated by reference is a true and correct copy of a printout from the website of Clopay that shows that Clopay is seeking applications for a full-time employee position of a regional sales representative, at its location at La Mirada, California. Further, attached hereto as Exhibit 3 and incorporated by reference is a true and correct copy of a printout from the website www.glassdoor.com, listing the job offer for a distribution center coordinator in Clopay's La Mirada Distribution Center.
- 12. In addition, Clopay offers for sale and sells the Infringing Hinge at its distribution center located in La Mirada. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 4** and incorporated by reference is a true and correct copy of an invoice showing that on or about March 1, 2019, Clopay sold an Infringing Hinge at the Clopay distribution center and sales office located in La Mirada, California. Therefore, Plaintiff alleges that Clopay has an established and regular place of business in this judicial district.

- alleges that retailer customers in the State of California may purchase Clopay merchandise, including the Infringing Hinge, directly from Clopay in this judicial district through Clopay's authorized dealers. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 5** and incorporated by reference is a true and correct copy of a printout from the website of Clopay, www.clopaydoor.com, listing Clopay's authorized dealers located in the greater Los Angeles area. Therefore, a substantial part of Defendant's acts complained of herein, and the events giving rise to the claims in this case occurred in this judicial district.
- 14. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Home Depot is an authorized dealer of Clopay, and as such, it offers for sale and sells hundreds of different Clopay products. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Clopay's customers may place an order for an upgrade to their Clopay garage door at the various Home Depot locations in this judicial district. Plaintiff is also informed and believes and based thereon alleges that customers of Home Depot in this judicial district may place an order for a Medallion Hardware Upgrade for their Clopay garage door, which includes the Infringing Hinge, listed in the upgrade package as Heavy-Duty QuietFlex Hinges.
- 15. Each and every one of the Defendants is subject to the personal jurisdiction of this Court because Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendants, and each and every one of them, has an established and regular place of business in this judicial district, and Defendants, and each and every one of them, have committed and/or actively induced the infringing and improper acts complained of herein, and continues to do so, in this judicial district.
- 16. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that venue is proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391and 1400, in that,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

inter alia, the matters in controversy arise out of the activities undertaken in this judicial district and the Defendants are subject to the personal jurisdiction of this Court.

THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS OF UNIQUE

- On January 2, 2018, the '685 Patent issued for "GARAGE DOOR 17. HINGE WITH NOISE REDUCTION INSERT", a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as **Exhibit 6** and incorporated herein by reference.
- 18. Plaintiff has acquired and duly owns all right, title and interest in the '685 Patent by virtue of proper assignment, including the right to sue and recover for infringement thereof. During the period of January 2, 2018 through January 2, 2019, Plaintiff was the exclusive licensee of the '685 Patent with the right to sue and recover for the infringement of the '685 Patent.
 - 19. The '685 Patent is in full force and effect.
- 20. Plaintiff has been importing, advertising, promoting, distributing, producing, offering for sale and selling products which practice the art disclosed in the '685 Patent, since at least as early as 2017. The products of Plaintiff that practice the invention disclosed in the '685 Patent are hereafter referred to collectively as "Unique Hinge".
- 21. Plaintiff has properly marked the Unique Hinge with the Patent Number 9,856,685 since the '685 Patent issued. Plaintiff had been properly marking its products with the designation "Patent Pending" while the application that matured into the '685 Patent was pending.
- Since at least as early as 2017, and prior to the acts of Defendants 22. complained of herein, Plaintiff has continuously imported, produced, advertised, marketed, distributed, offered for sale and sold in interstate commerce the garage door hinges that practice the invention disclosed in the '685 Patent.

INFRINGING AND UNLAWFUL ACTS OF THE DEFENDANTS

- 23. In or about February, 2019, Plaintiff has become aware of the fact that Clopay has started advertising, offering for sale and selling the Infringing Hinge, which infringe upon Plaintiff's patent rights in and to the '685 Patent. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 7** and incorporated herein by reference are true and correct copies of a printout from the website of Clopay advertising the Infringing Hinge. Also attached hereto as **Exhibit 8** and incorporated herein by reference are true and correct copies of photographs showing the Infringing Hinge.
- 24. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the Defendants, and each and every one of them, have been manufacturing, importing, marketing, distributing, offering for sale and selling the Infringing Hinge in spite of Defendants' full knowledge of Plaintiff's patent rights in and to the '685 Patent.
- 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that with full knowledge of the proprietary rights of Plaintiff in and to the '685 Patent, Defendants have been, and are currently manufacturing, producing, importing, distributing, offering for sale and selling the Infringing Hinge, or the Defendants are contributing to, or having the Infringing Hinges manufactured, produced, imported, distributed, offered for sale or sold.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Patent Infringement, 35 U.S.C. § 271)

- 26. Plaintiff repeats, realleges and incorporates by reference, as though fully set forth herein, the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1-25, above.
- 27. On January 2, 2018, the '685 Patent issued for "GARAGE DOOR HINGE WITH NOISE REDUCTION INSERT".

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 28. Plaintiff has acquired and duly owns all right, title and interest in the '685 Patent by virtue of a proper assignment, including the right to sue and recover for infringement thereof. During the period of January 2, 2018 through January 2, 2019, Plaintiff was the exclusive licensee of the '685 Patent with the right to sue and recover for the infringement of the '685 Patent.
 - The '685 Patent is in full force and effect. 29.
- Plaintiff has been advertising, promoting, distributing, producing, 30. importing, offering for sale and selling products which practice the art disclosed in the '685 Patent.
- 31. Plaintiff has properly marked its products with the Patent Number 9,856,685 after the date the '685 Patent issued. Plaintiff had been properly marking its products with the designation "Patent Pending" while its application that matured into the '685 Patent was pending.
- Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that 32. Defendants have notice of Plaintiff's rights in the '685 Patent.
- Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the 33. "Infringing Hinge" infringes at least one valid claim of the '685 Patent, either literally or under the Doctrine of Equivalents.
- 34. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendants, and each and every one of them, have infringed the '685 Patent either literally or under the Doctrine of Equivalents, by manufacturing, using, importing, distributing, advertising, offering to sell and/or selling the Infringing Hinge embodying the invention claimed in the '685 Patent in the United States, or by supplying infringing products to others to use, thereby inducing and/or contributing to the infringement of the '685 Patent.
- 35. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the individuals who are the controlling parties of Clopay and Home Depot, and each of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

them, have personally decided, directed, contributed to and induced the infringing activities of Clopay and Home Depot, infringing the '685 Patent either literally or under the Doctrine of Equivalents, with actual knowledge of the '685 Patent by manufacturing, producing, importing, promoting, distributing, using, offering for sale and selling the Infringing Hinge and/or causing or inducing the Infringing Hinge to be manufactured, produced, imported, promoted, distributed, used, offered for sale and/or sold.

- As a direct and proximate result of the foregoing acts of the 36. Defendants, and each and every one of them, Plaintiff has suffered, and is entitled to, monetary damages in an amount to be determined at trial, including, without limitation, all profits lost by Plaintiff as a result of Defendants' unlawful activities, all of Defendants' profits from their sale of the Infringing Hinge including any and all profits from convoyed sales, but at a minimum, Plaintiff is entitled to a reasonable royalty for all sales of the Infringing Hinge. Plaintiff is also entitled to its costs of suit and pre- and postjudgment interest.
- Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that 37. Defendants' acts were in conscious and willful disregard for Plaintiff's rights, and Defendants have been and presently are engaged in willful and deliberate infringement of the '685 Patent.
- Defendants' willful infringement of the '685 Patent and the resulting damage to Plaintiff is such as to warrant the trebling of damages in order to provide just compensation.
- 39. Defendants' continuing infringement has inflicted, and unless enjoined by this Court, will continue to inflict great and irreparable harm upon Plaintiff. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law. Plaintiff is entitled to preliminary and permanent injunctions enjoining the Defendants from engaging in further acts of infringement.

40. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that this case is exceptional under 35 U.S.C. § 285 and Plaintiff is entitled to a recovery of their reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully prays for judgment against the Defendants as follows:

- 1. That this Court adjudge that the '685 Patent is valid and enforceable and in full force and effect;
- 2. That this Court adjudge that the Defendants, and each and every one of them, literally infringed the '685 Patent, and for that infringement this Court award Plaintiff all of Plaintiff's lost profits as a result of such infringement, and all of the Defendants' profits as a result of the Defendants' sales of the Infringing Hinge including, without limitation, any and all profits from convoyed sales, and not less than a reasonable royalty on the sale of all of the Infringing Hinge resulting from such infringement;
- 3. That this Court adjudge that the Defendants have infringed the '685 Patent under the Doctrine of Equivalents, and for that infringement this Court award Plaintiff all of Plaintiff's lost profits as a result of such infringement, and all of the Defendants' profits as a result of the Defendants' sales of the Infringing Hinge including, without limitation, any and all profits from convoyed sales, and not less than a reasonable royalty on the sale of all of the Infringing Hinge resulting from such infringement;
- 4. That this Court adjudge that the Defendants, by virtue of the manufacture, production, importation, use, offering for sale and sale of the

Infringing Hinge has contributed to the infringement of the '685 Patent, and for that infringement this Court award Plaintiff all of Plaintiff's lost profits as a result of such infringement, and all of the Defendants' profits as a result of the Defendants' sales of the Infringing Hinge including, without limitation, any and all profits from convoyed sales, and not less than a reasonable royalty on the sale of all of the Infringing Hinge resulting from such infringement;

- 5. That this Court adjudge that the Defendants, by virtue of the manufacture, production, importation, use, offering for sale and sale of the Infringing Hinge has induced the infringement of the '685 Patent, and for that infringement this Court award Plaintiff all of Plaintiff's lost profits as a result of such infringement, and all of the Defendants' profits as a result of the Defendants' sales of the Infringing Hinge including, without limitation, any and all profits from convoyed sales, and not less than a reasonable royalty on the sale of all of the Infringing Hinge resulting from such infringement;
- 6. That this Court issue a preliminary and then a permanent injunction enjoining the Defendants, and each and every one of them, their officers, directors, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, confederates, parents, subsidiaries and divisions, and all persons and/or entitites acting for, with, by, through, or in concert or participation with them from:
 - (a) infringing the '685 Patent, either directly or indirectly;
 - (b) inducing others to infringe the '685 Patent;
- (c) manufacturing, producing, importing, advertising, promoting, marketing, distributing, offering for sale and/or selling the Infringing Hinge;
- 7. That this Court order that the Defendants, and each and every one of them, deliver up to the Court any and all Infringing Hinge in its possession,

- 8. That this Court order that the Defendants, and each and every one of them, deliver up to the Court any and all documents reflecting or relating to the manufacture, importation, production, purchase, distribution and/or sale of any Infringing Hinge that infringe the '685 Patent and to serve a copy of such list on Plaintiff's attorneys;
- 9. That this Court order that the Defendants, and each and every one of them, within thirty (30) days after service of judgment with notice of entry thereof upon them, be required to file with the Court and serve upon Plaintiff's attorneys a written report, under oath, setting forth in detail the manner in which the Defendants have complied with paragraphs 1-8, above;
- 10. That this Court order that the Defendants account for and pay over to Plaintiff their profits and cumulative damages sustained by Plaintiff by reason of the Defendants' unlawful acts of patent infringement herein alleged;
- 11. That this Court order disgorgement and/or restitution of the Defendants' profits to Plaintiff;
- 12. That the present case be found exceptional and that attorneys' fees be awarded to Plaintiff under 35 U.S.C. § 285;
- 13. That this Court award to Plaintiff enhanced damages up to three times their amount as provided by law, against the Defendants, and each and every one of them, to punish the Defendants for their malicious and oppressive actions of willful and deliberate violation of Plaintiff's patent rights;
 - 14. That this Court award Plaintiff punitive damages;

Case 8:19-cv-00756 Document 1 Filed 04/25/19 Page 14 of 15 Page ID #:14

1	15. That this Court award Plaintiff pre- and postjudgment interest on its	
2	damages; and	
3	16. That this Court award Plaintiff such other and further relief as the	
4	Court may deem just and proper.	
5	Court may acom just and proper.	
6		
7	Dated: <u>April 25, 2019</u>	ROZSA LAW GROUP L.C.
8		
9	By:	/s/ Thomas I. Rozsa
10		Thomas I. Rozsa
11		Zsofia Nemeth Attorneys for Plaintiff
12		Unique Garage Door Inc.
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27	li .	

ROZSA LAW GROUP LC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
18757 BURBANK BOLLEVARD, SUITE 220
TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91356-3346
TELEPHONE (818) 783-0990

ROZSA LAW GROUP LC

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff Unique Garage Door Inc. hereby demands that all claims or causes of action raised in this Complaint be tried by a jury to the fullest extent possible under the United States and California Constitutions, statutes and laws.

Respectfully submitted:

Dated: April 25, 2019 ROZSA LAW GROUP L.C.

By: /s/ Thomas I. Rozsa
Thomas I. Rozsa

Zsofia Nemeth

ROZSA LAW GROUP L.C.

18757 Burbank Boulevard, Suite 220

Tarzana, California 91356

Tel. (818) 783-0990 Fax (818) 783-0992

E-mail: counsel@rozsalaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Unique Garage Door Inc.