

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
ALEXANDRIA DIVISION**

<p><b>Cedar Lane Technologies Inc.,</b></p> <p>Plaintiff,</p> <p>v.</p> <p><b>iPiccy Inc.,</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 iPiccy Inc. ("iPiccy"), 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 iPiccy Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Virginia that maintains its principal place of business at 901 N PITT, ST 170, ALEXANDRIA VA22314.

**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, and is incorporated in this District's state. 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, has an established place of business in this District, and is incorporated in this District's state. 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. 6,972,774 (the "'774 Patent"); 7,324,689 (the "'689 Patent"); 8,073,250 (the "'250 Patent"); 7,088,855 (the "'855 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 '774 Patent**

8. The '774 Patent is entitled "Image processing system for inserting plurality of images into composite area, and medium," and issued 12/6/2005. The application leading to the '774 Patent was filed on 12/18/2000. A true and correct copy of the '774 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated herein by reference.

9. The '774 Patent is valid and enforceable.

#### **The '689 Patent**

10. The '689 Patent is entitled "Method and system for removal of red eye effects," and issued 1/29/2008. The application leading to the '689 Patent was filed on 7/5/2005. A true and correct copy of the '689 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 2 and incorporated herein by reference.

11. The '689 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.

**The '855 Patent**

14. The '855 Patent is entitled "Method and system for removal of red eye effects," and issued 8/8/2006. The application leading to the '855 Patent was filed on 1/22/2001. A true and correct copy of the '855 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 4 and incorporated herein by reference.

15. The '855 Patent is valid and enforceable.

**COUNT 1: INFRINGEMENT OF THE '774 PATENT**

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

17. **Direct Infringement.** Defendant has been and continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the '774 Patent in at least this District by making, using, offering to sell, selling and/or importing, without limitation, at least iPicky's Collage Tool (the "Exemplary iPicky Products") that infringe at least exemplary claims 1, 3-5 of the '774 Patent (the "Exemplary '774

Patent Claims") literally or by the doctrine of equivalence. On information and belief, numerous other devices that infringe the claims of the '774 Patent have been made, used, sold, imported, and offered for sale by Defendant and/or its customers.

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

19. 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 '774 Patent. On information and belief, Defendant has also continued to sell the Exemplary iPicky 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 '774 Patent. Thus, on information and belief, Defendant is contributing to and/or inducing the infringement of the '774 Patent.

20. **Induced Infringement.** Defendant actively, knowingly, and intentionally has been and continues to induce infringement of the '774 Patent, literally or by the doctrine of equivalence, by selling Exemplary iPicky Products to their customers for use in end-user products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '774 Patent.

21. **Contributory Infringement.** Defendant actively, knowingly, and intentionally has been and continues materially contribute to their own customers' infringement of the '774 Patent, literally or by the doctrine of equivalence, by selling Exemplary iPicky Products to their customers for use in end-user products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '774 Patent.

22. Exhibit 5 includes charts comparing the Exemplary '774 Patent Claims to the Exemplary iPicky Products. As set forth in these charts, the Exemplary iPicky Products practice

the technology claimed by the '774 Patent. Accordingly, the Exemplary iPicky Products incorporated in these charts satisfy all elements of the Exemplary '774 Patent Claims.

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

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

### **COUNT 2: INFRINGEMENT OF THE '689 PATENT**

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

26. **Direct Infringement.** Defendant has been and continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the '689 Patent in at least this District by making, using, offering to sell, selling and/or importing, without limitation, at least iPicky's Red-eye Fix tool (also among the "Exemplary iPicky Products") that infringe at least exemplary claims 11 of the '689 Patent (the "Exemplary '689 Patent Claims") literally or by the doctrine of equivalence. On information and belief, numerous other devices that infringe the claims of the '689 Patent have been made, used, sold, imported, and offered for sale by Defendant and/or its customers.

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

28. 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 '689 Patent. On information and belief, Defendant has also continued to sell the Exemplary iPicky 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 '689 Patent. Thus, on

information and belief, Defendant is contributing to and/or inducing the infringement of the '689 Patent.

29. **Induced Infringement.** Defendant actively, knowingly, and intentionally has been and continues to induce infringement of the '689 Patent, literally or by the doctrine of equivalence, by selling Exemplary iPicky Products to their customers for use in end-user products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '689 Patent.

30. **Contributory Infringement.** Defendant actively, knowingly, and intentionally has been and continues materially contribute to their own customers' infringement of the '689 Patent, literally or by the doctrine of equivalence, by selling Exemplary iPicky Products to their customers for use in end-user products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '689 Patent.

31. Exhibit 6 includes charts comparing the Exemplary '689 Patent Claims to the Exemplary iPicky Products. As set forth in these charts, the Exemplary iPicky Products practice the technology claimed by the '689 Patent. Accordingly, the Exemplary iPicky Products incorporated in these charts satisfy all elements of the Exemplary '689 Patent Claims.

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

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

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

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

35. **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 the Exemplary iPicky Products that infringe at least exemplary claims 1 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.

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

37. 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 iPicky 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.

38. **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 iPicky Products to their customers for use in end-user products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '250 Patent.

39. **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 iPicky Products to their customers for use in end-user products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '250 Patent.

40. Exhibit 7 includes charts comparing the Exemplary '250 Patent Claims to the Exemplary iPicky Products. As set forth in these charts, the Exemplary iPicky Products practice the technology claimed by the '250 Patent. Accordingly, the Exemplary iPicky Products incorporated in these charts satisfy all elements of the Exemplary '250 Patent Claims.

41. Cedar Lane therefore incorporates by reference in its allegations herein the claim charts of Exhibit 7.

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

#### **COUNT 4: INFRINGEMENT OF THE '855 PATENT**

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

44. **Direct Infringement.** Defendant has been and continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the '855 Patent in at least this District by making, using, offering to sell, selling and/or importing, without limitation, at least the Exemplary iPicky Products that infringe at least exemplary claims 1 of the '855 Patent (the "Exemplary '855 Patent Claims") literally or by the doctrine of equivalence. On information and belief, numerous other devices that infringe the claims of the '855 Patent have been made, used, sold, imported, and offered for sale by Defendant and/or its customers.

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

46. 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 '855 Patent. On information and belief, Defendant has also continued to sell the Exemplary iPicky 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 '855 Patent. Thus, on information and belief, Defendant is contributing to and/or inducing the infringement of the '855 Patent.

47. **Induced Infringement.** Defendant actively, knowingly, and intentionally has been and continues to induce infringement of the '855 Patent, literally or by the doctrine of equivalence, by selling Exemplary iPicky Products to their customers for use in end-user products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '855 Patent.

48. **Contributory Infringement.** Defendant actively, knowingly, and intentionally has been and continues materially contribute to their own customers' infringement of the '855 Patent, literally or by the doctrine of equivalence, by selling Exemplary iPicky Products to their customers for use in end-user products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '855 Patent.

49. Exhibit 8 includes charts comparing the Exemplary '855 Patent Claims to the Exemplary iPicky Products. As set forth in these charts, the Exemplary iPicky Products practice the technology claimed by the '855 Patent. Accordingly, the Exemplary iPicky Products incorporated in these charts satisfy all elements of the Exemplary '855 Patent Claims.

50. Cedar Lane therefore incorporates by reference in its allegations herein the claim charts of Exhibit 8.

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

#### **JURY DEMAND**

52. 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 '774 Patent is valid and enforceable;
- B. A judgment that the '689 Patent is valid and enforceable;
- C. A judgment that the '250 Patent is valid and enforceable;
- D. A judgment that the '855 Patent is valid and enforceable;
- E. A judgment that Defendant has infringed, contributorily infringed, and/or induced infringement of one or more claims of the '774 Patent;
- F. A judgment that Defendant has infringed, contributorily infringed, and/or induced infringement of one or more claims of the '689 Patent;
- G. A judgment that Defendant has infringed, contributorily infringed, and/or induced infringement of one or more claims of the '250 Patent;
- H. A judgment that Defendant has infringed, contributorily infringed, and/or induced infringement of one or more claims of the '855 Patent;
- I. An accounting of all damages not presented at trial;
- J. 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 12, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Peter Schurig  
Peter E. Schurig - VSB 76106  
Dov M. Szego – VSB 44586  
4940 Dominion Boulevard  
Glen Allen, Virginia 23060  
Telephone: (804) 377-1260  
Facsimile: (804) 377-1280  
*Local Counsel*

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.**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the foregoing document was served on all parties who have appeared in this case on July 12, 2019, via the Court's CM/ECF system.

/s/ Peter Schurig  
Peter Schurig