

**United States District Court
Eastern District of Texas
Sherman Division**

ANDRA GROUP, LP,	§	
	§	
<i>Plaintiff</i>	§	
	§	
v.	§	
	§	Case No. 4:19-cv-00288
VICTORIA’S SECRET STORES,	§	
LLC, VICTORIA’S SECRET	§	
STORES BRAND MANAGEMENT,	§	Jury Trial Demanded
INC., VICTORIA’S SECRET	§	
DIRECT BRAND MANAGEMENT,	§	
LLC, AND L BRANDS, INC.,	§	
	§	
<i>Defendants</i>	§	

Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint for Patent Infringement

Plaintiff Andra Group, LP (“Andra Group”) files this First Amended Complaint for patent infringement against Defendant Victoria’s Secret Stores, LLC, Victoria’s Secret Stores Brand Management, Inc., Victoria’s Secret Direct Brand Management, LLC, and L Brands, Inc. (collectively “Victoria’s Secret” or “Defendants”).

PARTIES

1. Andra Group is a Texas limited partnership with a principal place of business in Texas. Among other things, Andra Group operates an online retail business known as HerRoom at herroom.com. A large assortment of lingerie is marketed at herroom.com.

2. Victoria’s Secret Stores, LLC (“Stores”) is a Delaware limited liability company doing business in Texas. Stores may be served through its registered agent CT Corporation System, 1999 Bryan St., Ste. 900, Dallas, TX 75201.

3. Victoria’s Secret Stores Brand Management, Inc. (“Stores Brand Management”) is a Delaware corporation doing business in Texas. Because Stores Brand Management has failed to maintain a registered agent in Texas, it may be served through the Texas Secretary of State.

4. Victoria's Secret Direct Brand Management, LLC ("Direct") is a Delaware limited liability company doing business in Texas. Because Direct has failed to maintain a registered agent in Texas, it may be served through the Texas Secretary of State.

5. L Brands, Inc. ("LBI") is a Delaware corporation doing business in Texas. Because LBI has failed to maintain a registered agent in Texas, it may be served through the Texas Secretary of State.

6. Stores is a wholly-owned subsidiary of LBI. Stores Brand Management is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Intimate Brands, Inc., which is a wholly-owned subsidiary of LBI. Direct is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Stores Brand Management. LBI, Stores, Stores Brand Management, and Direct are engaged in a joint enterprise to market lingerie, and direct and control each other in marketing lingerie, through their victoriasssecret.com website, apps, and in their retail stores, including their stores located in this District.

7. Defendants share overlapping directors and officers. Stores, Direct, and Stores Brand Management are each managed by the same executive team. Additionally, the CEO and CFO of LBI (Leslie Wexner and Stuart Burgdoerfer) are also the Chief Officer and Executive VP of Stores. Stores Brand Management and Stores share physical headquarters and a principal place of business located at Four Limited Parkway, Reynoldsburg, OH 43068.

8. Defendants own and operate (and/or hold themselves out as owning and operating) Victoria's Secret domestic retail stores. In this regard, each of Defendants has adopted and ratified the retail stores within this District as its places of business. For example, LBI "operates" its "company-owned specialty retail stores."¹ LBI has decision-making power to open, remodel, and close retail stores.² LBI supplies improvements and pays remodeling costs for Defendants' stores, including to interior walls, floors, ceilings, fixtures, and decorations, as well as paying certain

¹ L Brands, Inc., Annual Report (Form 10-K) at 1 (Mar. 22, 2019); *see also* L Brands Board of Directors, *Modern Slavery Transparency Statement* (Aug. 10, 2018), <https://www.lb.com/responsibility/supply-chain/modern-slavery-transparency-statement>.

² L Brands Inc., *LB First Quarter 2019 Earnings Commentary May 23, 2019*, at 6, 10, and 12 (Mar. 23, 2019), <http://investors.lb.com/phoenix.zhtml?c=94854&p=irol-salesearnings>.

operating costs such as maintenance, utilities, insurance, and taxes.³ LBI invests in technology used in Defendants' stores.⁴ The Victoria Secret website directs all correspondence and inquiries be sent directly to LBI.⁵

9. Direct operates the website located at victoriasecret.com, the registrar of which is Stores Brand Management, as well as the Victoria's Secret apps. Defendants and their agents use the website located at victoriasecret.com while in Defendants' stores, including their stores in this District. Defendants' employees perform all of the limitations of at least one claim of the '498 Patent while physically present in Defendants' stores, including in this District.

10. The website, the apps, and the brick-and-mortar stores are inextricably linked. Rather than operating as separate and independent corporate entities, Defendants collaborate to produce a unified consumer experience across platforms and retail stores. For example, the website and apps direct consumers to the retail stores, and the sales associates at the retail stores direct customers to the website and apps while in the stores. Promotions, sales, offers, collections, styles, and products offered via the website and apps are coordinated with what is available in stores. The Victoria's Secret Angel Credit Card, a store-branded credit card that offers cardholders exclusive rewards for shopping, is accepted at stores and online; there is a "Find a Store" function on the website and apps; consumers can subscribe to newsletters about the online and in-store offers from the website and apps; any items purchased online may be returned in retail stores; and receipts for in-store purchases direct consumers to visit the website and to sign up for e-mails with special offers. Upon information and belief, Stores Brand Management and LBI orchestrate this synchrony.⁶

³ L Brands, Inc., Annual Report (Form 10-K) at 15 (Mar. 22, 2019).

⁴ *Id.* at 21, 44.

⁵ *Site Terms, Conditions, and Notices* (2019), <https://www.victoriasecret.com/site-terms-and-notice>; *see also Online Privacy Policy* (May 31, 2018), <https://www.victoriasecret.com/privacy-and-security>.

⁶ With respect to the retail stores, the website, and the Victoria's Secret apps, LBI acknowledges the following: "In addition to our in-store experience, we strive to create a customer-centric digital platform that integrates the digital and physical brand experience. Our digital presence,

11. As part of Defendants' joint enterprise to market lingerie, Stores Brand Management distributes a catalogue under the "Victoria's Secret" trademark and produces the so-called "Victoria's Secret Fashion Show," which are utilized by Defendants to induce consumers in this District and elsewhere to use their victoriasecret.com website.

12. Andra Group and Defendants are direct competitors in the lingerie retail services market.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

13. This action arises under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

14. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants. Defendants have purposefully directed their activities at residents of Texas. Defendants' agents, for example, have used the victoriasecret.com website while present in Defendants' stores in Texas, and while doing so have caused infringement of the patent-in-suit, which has resulted in injury to Andra Group in Texas. In addition, Defendants' victoriasecret.com website is marketed, directed, and made available to Texas residents, and Texas residents' use of the victoriasecret.com website causes the patent-in-suit to be infringed. Andra Group's infringement claims arise out of or relate to Defendants' activities directed at residents of Texas.

15. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(c) and 1400(b). Defendants have a regular and established place of business in this District. This includes, without limitation, physical stores located in the District at: 895 Market St., Allen, TX 75013; 811 Central Expressway, Plano, TX 75075; 2601 Preston Road, Frisco, TX 75034; 6121 W. Park Blvd., Plano, TX 75093; 2201 S. Interstate 35 E, Denton, TX 76205; 4081 Waller Creek Road, Highland Village, TX 75077; 4800 N. Texoma Parkway, Sherman, TX 75090; 4601 S. Broadway, Tyler, TX 75703; 3500 McCann Road, Longview, TX 75605; 2400 Richmond Road, Texarkana, TX 75503; 4600 S.

including social media, our websites and our mobile applications, allows us to get to know our customers better and communicate with them." L Brands, Inc., Annual Report (Form 10-K) at 3 (Mar. 22, 2019).

Medford Dr., Lufkin, TX 75901; and 6155 Eastex Freeway, Beaumont, TX 77706. Further, as alleged in greater detail in this Complaint, Defendants have committed and continue to commit acts of infringement in this District.

THE PATENT-IN-SUIT

16. Tomima Edmark is the sole inventor of United States Patent No. 8,078,498 (“the ’498 Patent”) entitled “Virtual Showroom System and Method.” The ’498 Patent was issued on December 13, 2011. A true and correct copy of the ’498 Patent is attached as **Exhibit A**.

17. The ’498 Patent is valid, enforceable, and was duly issued in full compliance with Title 35 of the United States Code.

18. The ’498 Patent is a continuation of Application No. 09/564,372, filed on May 2, 2000, now Patent No. 7,346,543 (“the ’543 Patent”). In turn, the ’543 Patent claims priority to U.S. Ser. No. 60/184,789, filed February 24, 2000, also entitled “Virtual Showroom System and Method.”

19. Andra Group is the assignee of all rights, title, and interest in and to the ’498 Patent. Prior to Edmark’s assignment to Andra Group, she was the only owner of the ’498 Patent, and she exclusively licensed it to Andra Group.

20. The ’498 Patent discloses and claims, among other things, a method of displaying an article within a virtual showroom associated with a network server, comprising:

- a. providing, by a processor, a plurality of thumbnail images of said article, each image comprising an icon and representing a respective perspective view of said article, allowing a user of said network server to select one of said plurality of thumbnail images for display in a master display field wherein each respective perspective view represents a different perspective view of the same said article, each respective perspective view being selected from the group consisting of front, rear, side, and isometric views;
- b. providing a distinctive characteristic to said one of said plurality of thumbnail images selected by said user; and
- c. displaying said selected one of said plurality of thumbnail images in said master display field.

21. Edmark's teachings in the '498 Patent, when implemented, gave website users the opportunity to virtually inspect articles by clicking on thumbnail images that provided a different perspective of each article in a master frame.

22. The inventions disclosed in the '498 Patent provide technological solutions to the Internet-centric problem of displaying tangible objects in a two-dimensional forum, solutions that did not have a pre-Internet analogue.

23. The '498 Patent addresses these problems and provides multiple improvements over prior systems and methods. The methods also improve the performance of webpages. By providing a master display field in conjunction with thumbnail images, bandwidth is preserved and pages load faster. *See generally* Expert Report of Ryan M. Garlick, Ph.D. ("Garlick Report") (attached as **Exhibit B** and incorporated by reference).

24. As of late 2000, most website users connected to the Internet using slow dial-up connections that transmitted data at a maximum of 56 kilobits per second. *Id.* Images in a web page are likely to be orders of magnitude larger than HTML text with the same content and will result in slower downloads. *Id.* Speeding up the delivery of a web page, particularly a page with multiple related images, is and was a critical factor to preventing a user from abandoning the site, and a notable improvement disclosed in the '498 Patent over prior systems implementing full size image galleries. *Id.* Speedy delivery of websites is critical—any delay may be the difference between successful and failed interactions with a website user. *Id.*

25. In analyzing the page load performance improvements of the '498 Patent's technology, relevant operations to consider are those that actually require transmission from server to client (thereby consuming slower network resources), and how those transmissions are reduced while actually improving the user experience when viewing the page. *Id.* It is the network-throughput bottleneck that is the most critical in speeding up web page loading times, and this is an area that is improved with the technology described in the '498 Patent. *Id.*

26. A web page at the time of the '498 Patent filing containing multiple images would often display those images in full-size within the text of the page or, in the case of an image gallery,

in a single column from top to bottom or an HTML table allowing display in columns and rows. *Id.* This would consume considerable space on the page and require transmitting many large images from server to client. *Id.*

27. Smaller versions of a page's images, or thumbnails, might also be presented to the user. Upon selection of a thumbnail image (e.g., by clicking), a larger version of the image would replace the previously viewed page in the browser window or be shown in a pop-up window. *Id.* But these methods required a user to either press the back button or close the pop-up window to return to the display of smaller images. *Id.* These additional steps interrupt the visual and navigational flow of the site and describe an inferior design strategy. *Id.*

28. Loading only a selected large version of a chosen thumbnail into the '498 Patent's "master display field" and within the same visual context is an important improvement in the graphical user interface (GUI) of a web page. *Id.* This integration allows the user of a website to clearly see which image was chosen and the enlarged or zoomed version of the image without going to a different page or opening additional windows, while only requiring full-sized images be transmitted at the option of the user. *Id.*

29. The '498 Patent's claimed methods are not well-understood, routine, or conventional. The '498 Patent discloses and claims multiple improvements over prior systems, including:

- a. Providing additional images to convey the desired message to a user, in most circumstances with the same amount of bandwidth as a page presenting fewer full-sized images.
- b. Presenting multiple images of a product to convey additional information to a potential purchaser while requiring little additional space on the page.
- c. Presenting a more intuitive interface, allowing the user to easily determine which image is selected and view all the images full-size (if desired) in the space normally occupied by a single image (plus a row of thumbnails).
- d. Improving the user experience over full-size image galleries through increasing the number of displayed images and subsequent page load time only at the discretion of the user, rather than requiring large page load times for all users (who may or may not want to view all the images full-size).

- e. Reducing the amount of vertical scrolling required on a page and the subsequent ability to present more information “above the fold.”
- f. Keeping related images in the same context, without requiring the user to press a back button or close an auxiliary window after viewing a full-sized image.
- g. Reducing image load time by 42% over a gallery of 10 full-sized images (25kB each, 2kB thumbnails), given the assumption that a user of the ’498 Patent’s web control chooses to view half of the images full-size.
- h. Saving users a collective 4 hours and 22 minutes per day in waiting for images to load and reducing network traffic by 63 Megabytes per day for a site with 1,000 daily modem visitors (page loads) with six gallery images (with the user choosing to view 3 of the thumbnails full-sized using the ’498 Patent’s claimed methods and system) over a site displaying six full-sized images (25kB images, 2kB thumbnails).

30. Further showing that the ’498 Patent’s claimed methods are not well-understood, routine, or conventional, the family of “Virtual Showroom System and Method” applications and patents, which includes the ’498 Patent, has been cited as prior art in connection with many patent applications prosecuted at the United States Patent and Trademark Office, including patent applications owned by: Amazon Technologies, Inc.; Apple Inc.; AT&T Intellectual Property I, L.P.; eBay Inc.; Fuji Xerox Co., Ltd.; PayPal, Inc.; and Sony Corporation.

CAUSES OF ACTION

Count 1: Infringement of the ’498 Patent

31. Andra Group incorporates and re-alleges, as though fully set forth herein, the allegations contained in the paragraphs above.

32. Defendants, directly and/or through intermediaries, own, use, operate, advertise, control, put into service, and otherwise provide a virtual showroom that infringes one or more claims of the ’498 Patent, including at least Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11, in this District and elsewhere in the United States.

33. The website located at <https://www.victoriassecret.com/> (the “Website”) and the Victoria’s Secret Apps (the “Apps”)⁷ utilize a method for displaying one or more articles within a virtual showroom associated with a network server.

34. Through the Website and the Apps, Defendants provide, by a processor, several thumbnail images of articles, each image comprising an icon and representing a respective perspective view of the article, allowing the user to select one of the thumbnail images for display in a master display field wherein each respective perspective view represents a different perspective view of the same article, each respective perspective view being selected from the group consisting of front, rear and side, and isometric views.

35. Through the Website and the Apps, Defendants provide a distinctive characteristic to the thumbnail images selected by the user.

36. Through the Website and the Apps, Defendants display the thumbnail image selected by the user in the master display field.

37. In the alternative, because the manner of use by Defendants differs in no substantial way from language of the claims, to the extent Defendants do not literally infringe the ’498 Patent, Defendants infringe it under the doctrine of equivalents.

38. Defendants’ activities have been without authority and license from Andra Group.

39. On information and belief, Defendants have been aware of Andra Group’s “Virtual Showroom System and Method” applications and patents since at least 2012, when Edmark was most recently serving as an expert witness in connection with patent infringement litigation against Defendants.

40. Defendants’ infringement of the ’498 Patent is described in greater detail in the claim charts attached as **Exhibit C**, which are incorporated by reference.

⁷ Defendants make and offer for download “Apps” such as the Victoria’s Secret iOS and Android Apps, as well as the PINK Nation iOS and Android Apps, that contain equivalent functionality as the standard browser website.

41. Alternatively, users of the Website and the Apps perform certain of the limitations in the patented methods. Defendants instruct and encourage users to infringe the '498 Patent by encouraging them to utilize the Website and the Apps in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '498 Patent. Upon information and belief, Defendants advertise to and/or instruct users of the Website and the Apps to do so in an infringing manner. Defendants, for example, are responsible for providing marketing materials, such as catalogs, coupons, and email product alerts, that direct others to the Website and the Apps, knowing that others will use the Website and the Apps in a manner that infringes the '498 Patent. Defendants conditioned the use of the Website and the Apps upon their users' performance of certain of the limitations of the '498 Patent, and by instructing these users on how to use the Website and the Apps for this purpose, Defendants established the manner or timing of that performance.

42. By making and using the above-described virtual showroom, Defendants have injured Andra Group and are thus jointly and severally liable for direct infringement of the '498 Patent in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

43. In the alternative, each of the Defendants had knowledge of the '498 Patent since at least the filing of this Complaint. To the extent any of the Defendants are not directly infringing the '498 Patent, they are inducing their co-Defendants and others to infringe the '498 Patent by encouraging them to utilize the Website and the Apps in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '498 Patent. Upon information and belief, Defendants advertise to and/or instruct users of the Website and the Apps to do so in an infringing manner. Defendants, for example, are responsible for providing marketing materials, such as catalogs, coupons, and email product alerts, that direct others to the Website and the Apps, knowing that others will use the Website and the Apps in a manner that infringes the '498 Patent. Consequently, each such inducing Defendant is liable for induced infringement of the '498 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b).

44. In addition to what is required for pleadings in patent cases, and to the extent any marking was required by 35 U.S.C. § 287, Andra Group and all predecessors in interest to the '498 Patent complied with all marking requirements under 35 U.S.C. § 287.

45. Andra Group is entitled to recover from Defendants the damages sustained by Andra Group as a result of Defendants' wrongful acts in an amount subject to proof at trial, which, by law, cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by the Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284. Because Andra Group and Defendants are competitors, Andra Group also seeks lost profits from Defendants.

46. Defendants' infringement of Andra Group's exclusive rights under the '498 Patent has damaged and will continue to damage Andra Group, causing irreparable harm, for which there is no adequate remedy at law, unless permanently enjoined by the Court.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

47. Pursuant to Rule 38, Andra Group demands a trial by jury of any issues so triable by right.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

48. Plaintiff Andra Group, LP respectfully requests that the Court enter:

- a. A judgment in favor of Andra Group that Defendants have infringed and are infringing the '498 Patent;
- b. An Order permanently enjoining Defendants, their affiliates, their respective officers, agents, employees, and those acting in privity with them, from further infringement of the '498 Patent;
- c. A judgment and order finding Defendants jointly and severally liable and requiring Defendants to pay Andra Group its damages for Defendants' infringement of the '498 Patent, including supplemental damages for any continuing post-verdict infringement up until entry of the final judgment, with an accounting, as needed, and enhanced damages pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §284, together with pre-judgment and post-judgment interest, in an amount according to proof;
- d. An award to Andra Group of an ongoing royalty for Defendants' post-judgment infringement in an amount according to proof in the event that a permanent injunction preventing future acts of infringement is not granted; and
- e. Any and all other relief Andra Group is entitled to.

July 22, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

GRIFFITH BARBEE PLLC

/s/ Casey Griffith

Casey Griffith
Texas Bar No. 24036687
Casey.Griffith@griffithbarbee.com

Michael Barbee
Texas Bar No. 24082656
Michael.Barbee@griffithbarbee.com

Maeghan Whitehead
Texas Bar No. 24075270
Maeghan.Whitehead@griffithbarbee.com

Ryan Funderburg
Texas Bar No. 24101776
Ryan.Funderburg@griffithbarbee.com

One Arts Plaza
1722 Routh St., Ste. 710
Dallas, Texas 75201
(214) 446-6020 | main
(214) 446-6021 | fax

-and-

Derek Gilliland
Texas Bar No. 24007239
NIX PATTERSON, LLP
222 N. Fredonia
Longview, Texas 75606
(903) 215-8310
dgilliland@nixlaw.com

-and-

Joseph J. Mastrogiovanni, Jr.
MASTROGIOVANNI MERSKY & FLYNN, PC
2001 Bryan St., Ste. 1250
Dallas, Texas 75201
(214) 922-8800 | main
(214) 922-8801 | fax
jmastro@mastromersky.com

Counsel for Plaintiff Andra Group, LP

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies the foregoing document was filed electronically in compliance with Local Rule CV-5(a). As such, this document was served on all counsel of record on July 22, 2019.

/s/ Casey Griffith
Casey Griffith