

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION**

<p><b>Cedar Lane Technologies Inc.,</b></p> <p>Plaintiff,</p> <p>v.</p> <p><b>Panasonic Corporation of North America,</b></p> <p>Defendant.</p>	<p>Case No. _____</p> <p>Patent Case</p> <p>Jury Trial Demanded</p>
---	---

**COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

Plaintiff Cedar Lane Technologies Inc. ("Cedar Lane"), through its attorneys, complains of Panasonic Corporation of North America ("Panasonic"), and alleges the following:

**PARTIES**

1. Plaintiff Cedar Lane Technologies Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Canada that maintains its principal place of business at 560 Baker Street, Suite 1, Nelson, BC V1L 4H9.

2. Defendant Panasonic Corporation of North America is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Delaware that maintains its principal place of business at 3461 Plano Parkway, The Colony, Texas 75056.

**JURISDICTION**

3. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code.

4. This Court has exclusive subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

5. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because it has engaged in systematic and continuous business activities in this District. As described below, Defendant has committed acts of patent infringement giving rise to this action within this District.

#### **VENUE**

6. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b) because Defendant has committed acts of patent infringement in this District, and has an established place of business in this District. In addition, Cedar Lane has suffered harm in this district.

#### **PATENTS-IN-SUIT**

7. Cedar Lane is the assignee of all right, title and interest in United States Patent Nos. 6,516,147 (the "'147 Patent"); 7,733,368 (the "'368 Patent"); 8,073,250 (the "'250 Patent"); (collectively the "Patents-in-Suit"); including all rights to enforce and prosecute actions for infringement and to collect damages for all relevant times against infringers of the Patents-in-Suit. Accordingly, Cedar Lane possesses the exclusive right and standing to prosecute the present action for infringement of the Patents-in-Suit by Defendant.

#### **The '147 Patent**

8. The '147 Patent is entitled "Scene recognition method and system using brightness and ranging mapping," and issued 2/4/2003. The application leading to the '147 Patent was filed on 12/19/2000, which ultimately claims priority from provisional application number 60/172,883, filed on 12/20/1999. A true and correct copy of the '147 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated herein by reference.

9. The '147 Patent is valid and enforceable.

**The '368 Patent**

10. The '368 Patent is entitled "Virtual reality camera," and issued 6/8/2010. The application leading to the '368 Patent was filed on 11/5/2007. A true and correct copy of the '368 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 2 and incorporated herein by reference.

11. The '368 Patent is valid and enforceable.

**The '250 Patent**

12. The '250 Patent is entitled "Method and system for removal of red eye effects," and issued 12/6/2011. The application leading to the '250 Patent was filed on 12/4/2007. A true and correct copy of the '250 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 3 and incorporated herein by reference.

13. The '250 Patent is valid and enforceable.

**COUNT 1: INFRINGEMENT OF THE '147 PATENT**

14. Cedar Lane incorporates the above paragraphs herein by reference.

15. **Direct Infringement.** Defendant has been and continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the '147 Patent in at least this District by making, using, offering to sell, selling and/or importing, without limitation, at least Panasonic's Lumix GX880 and DMC-GH2 (among the "Exemplary Panasonic Products") that infringe at least exemplary claims 1 of the '147 Patent (the "Exemplary '147 Patent Claims") literally or by the doctrine of equivalence. On information and belief, numerous other devices that infringe the claims of the '147 Patent have been made, used, sold, imported, and offered for sale by Defendant and/or its customers.

16. The filing of this Complaint constitutes notice and actual knowledge in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 287.

17. Despite such actual knowledge, Defendant continues to make, use, test, sell, offer for sale, market, and/or import into the United States, products that infringe the '147 Patent. On information and belief, Defendant has also continued to sell the Exemplary Panasonic Products and distribute product literature and website materials inducing end users and others to use its products in the customary and intended manner that infringes the '147 Patent. Thus, on information and belief, Defendant is contributing to and/or inducing the infringement of the '147 Patent.

18. **Induced Infringement.** Defendant actively, knowingly, and intentionally has been and continues to induce infringement of the '147 Patent, literally or by the doctrine of equivalence, by selling Exemplary Panasonic Products to their customers for use in end-user products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '147 Patent.

19. **Contributory Infringement.** Defendant actively, knowingly, and intentionally has been and continues materially contribute to their own customers' infringement of the '147 Patent, literally or by the doctrine of equivalence, by selling Exemplary Panasonic Products to their customers for use in end-user products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '147 Patent.

20. Exhibit 4 includes charts comparing the Exemplary '147 Patent Claims to the Exemplary Panasonic Products. As set forth in these charts, the Exemplary Panasonic Products practice the technology claimed by the '147 Patent. Accordingly, the Exemplary Panasonic Products incorporated in these charts satisfy all elements of the Exemplary '147 Patent Claims.

21. Cedar Lane therefore incorporates by reference in its allegations herein the claim charts of Exhibit 4.

22. Cedar Lane is entitled to recover damages adequate to compensate for Defendant's infringement.

**COUNT 2: INFRINGEMENT OF THE '368 PATENT**

23. Cedar Lane incorporates the above paragraphs herein by reference.

24. **Direct Infringement.** Defendant has been and continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the '368 Patent in at least this District by making, using, offering to sell, selling and/or importing, without limitation, at least Panasonic's DMC-FZ100 (among the "Exemplary Panasonic Products") that infringe at least exemplary claims 21 of the '368 Patent (the "Exemplary '368 Patent Claims") literally or by the doctrine of equivalence. On information and belief, numerous other devices that infringe the claims of the '368 Patent have been made, used, sold, imported, and offered for sale by Defendant and/or its customers.

25. The filing of this Complaint constitutes notice and actual knowledge in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 287.

26. Despite such actual knowledge, Defendant continues to make, use, test, sell, offer for sale, market, and/or import into the United States, products that infringe the '368 Patent. On information and belief, Defendant has also continued to sell the Exemplary Panasonic Products and distribute product literature and website materials inducing end users and others to use its products in the customary and intended manner that infringes the '368 Patent. Thus, on information and belief, Defendant is contributing to and/or inducing the infringement of the '368 Patent.

27. **Induced Infringement.** Defendant actively, knowingly, and intentionally has been and continues to induce infringement of the '368 Patent, literally or by the doctrine of

equivalence, by selling Exemplary Panasonic Products to their customers for use in end-user products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '368 Patent.

28. **Contributory Infringement.** Defendant actively, knowingly, and intentionally has been and continues materially contribute to their own customers' infringement of the '368 Patent, literally or by the doctrine of equivalence, by selling Exemplary Panasonic Products to their customers for use in end-user products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '368 Patent.

29. Exhibit 5 includes charts comparing the Exemplary '368 Patent Claims to the Exemplary Panasonic Products. As set forth in these charts, the Exemplary Panasonic Products practice the technology claimed by the '368 Patent. Accordingly, the Exemplary Panasonic Products incorporated in these charts satisfy all elements of the Exemplary '368 Patent Claims.

30. Cedar Lane therefore incorporates by reference in its allegations herein the claim charts of Exhibit 5.

31. Cedar Lane is entitled to recover damages adequate to compensate for Defendant's infringement.

### **COUNT 3: INFRINGEMENT OF THE '250 PATENT**

32. Cedar Lane incorporates the above paragraphs herein by reference.

33. **Direct Infringement.** Defendant has been and continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the '250 Patent in at least this District by making, using, offering to sell, selling and/or importing, without limitation, at least Panasonic's DMC-FZ100 (among the "Exemplary Panasonic Products") that infringe at least exemplary claims 24 of the '250 Patent (the "Exemplary '250 Patent Claims") literally or by the doctrine of equivalence. On information and

belief, numerous other devices that infringe the claims of the '250 Patent have been made, used, sold, imported, and offered for sale by Defendant and/or its customers.

34. The filing of this Complaint constitutes notice and actual knowledge in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 287.

35. Despite such actual knowledge, Defendant continues to make, use, test, sell, offer for sale, market, and/or import into the United States, products that infringe the '250 Patent. On information and belief, Defendant has also continued to sell the Exemplary Panasonic Products and distribute product literature and website materials inducing end users and others to use its products in the customary and intended manner that infringes the '250 Patent. Thus, on information and belief, Defendant is contributing to and/or inducing the infringement of the '250 Patent.

36. **Induced Infringement.** Defendant actively, knowingly, and intentionally has been and continues to induce infringement of the '250 Patent, literally or by the doctrine of equivalence, by selling Exemplary Panasonic Products to their customers for use in end-user products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '250 Patent.

37. **Contributory Infringement.** Defendant actively, knowingly, and intentionally has been and continues materially contribute to their own customers' infringement of the '250 Patent, literally or by the doctrine of equivalence, by selling Exemplary Panasonic Products to their customers for use in end-user products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '250 Patent.

38. Exhibit 6 includes charts comparing the Exemplary '250 Patent Claims to the Exemplary Panasonic Products. As set forth in these charts, the Exemplary Panasonic Products

practice the technology claimed by the '250 Patent. Accordingly, the Exemplary Panasonic Products incorporated in these charts satisfy all elements of the Exemplary '250 Patent Claims.

39. Cedar Lane therefore incorporates by reference in its allegations herein the claim charts of Exhibit 6.

40. Cedar Lane is entitled to recover damages adequate to compensate for Defendant's infringement.

#### **JURY DEMAND**

41. Under Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Cedar Lane respectfully requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

#### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Cedar Lane respectfully requests the following relief:

- A. A judgment that the '147 Patent is valid and enforceable;
- B. A judgment that the '368 Patent is valid and enforceable;
- C. A judgment that the '250 Patent is valid and enforceable;
- D. A judgment that Defendant has infringed, contributorily infringed, and/or induced infringement of one or more claims of the '147 Patent;
- E. A judgment that Defendant has infringed, contributorily infringed, and/or induced infringement of one or more claims of the '368 Patent;
- F. A judgment that Defendant has infringed, contributorily infringed, and/or induced infringement of one or more claims of the '250 Patent;
- G. An accounting of all damages not presented at trial;
- H. A judgment that awards Cedar Lane all appropriate damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 for Defendant's past infringement, and any continuing or future infringement



of the Patents-in-Suit, up until the date such judgment is entered, including pre- or post-judgment interest, costs, and disbursements as justified under 35 U.S.C. § 284 and, if necessary, to adequately compensate Cedar Lane for Defendant's infringement, an accounting:

- i. that this case be declared exceptional within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 285 and that Cedar Lane be awarded its reasonable attorneys' fees against Defendant that it incurs in prosecuting this action;
- ii. that Cedar Lane be awarded costs, and expenses that it incurs in prosecuting this action; and
- iii. that Cedar Lane be awarded such further relief at law or in equity as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: July 5, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

*/s/ Isaac Rabicoff*  
Isaac Rabicoff  
**Rabicoff Law LLC**  
73 W Monroe St  
Chicago, IL 60603  
(773) 669-4590  
[isaac@rabilaw.com](mailto:isaac@rabilaw.com)

**Counsel for Plaintiff  
Cedar Lane Technologies Inc.**