

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

<p>Honeyman Cipher Solutions LLC, Plaintiff, v. Snap Inc., Defendant.</p>	<p>Case No. _____ Patent Case Jury Trial Demanded</p>
---	---

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff Honeyman Cipher Solutions LLC ("Honeyman Cipher"), through its attorneys, complains of Snap Inc. ("Snap"), and alleges the following:

PARTIES

1. Plaintiff Honeyman Cipher Solutions LLC is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Delaware that maintains its principal place of business at 675 Town Square Blvd., Suite 200, Garland, TX 75040.

2. Defendant Snap Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Delaware that maintains its principal place of business at 2772 Donald Douglas, Loop North Santa Monica, CA 90405 United States.

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, Honeyman Cipher has suffered harm in this district.

PATENT-IN-SUIT

7. Honeyman Cipher is the assignee of all right, title and interest in United States Patent No. 5,991,399 (the "'399 Patent"); (the "Patent-in-Suit"); including all rights to enforce and prosecute actions for infringement and to collect damages for all relevant times against infringers of the Patent-in-Suit. Accordingly, Honeyman Cipher possesses the exclusive right and standing to prosecute the present action for infringement of the Patent-in-Suit by Defendant.

The '399 Patent

8. The '399 Patent is entitled "Method for securely distributing a conditional use private key to a trusted entity on a remote system," and issued 11/23/1999. The application leading to the '399 Patent was filed on 12/18/1997. A true and correct copy of the '399 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated herein by reference.

9. The '399 Patent is valid and enforceable.

COUNT 1: INFRINGEMENT OF THE '399 PATENT

10. Honeyman Cipher incorporates the above paragraphs herein by reference.

11. **Direct Infringement.** Defendant has been and continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the '399 Patent in at least this District by making, using, offering to sell, selling

and/or importing, without limitation, at least Snap's Android and iOS Mobile Apps (the "Exemplary Snap Products") that infringe at least exemplary claims 1-2, 9-11, 34 of the '399 Patent (the "Exemplary '399 Patent Claims") literally or by the doctrine of equivalence. On information and belief, numerous other devices that infringe the claims of the '399 Patent have been made, used, sold, imported, and offered for sale by Defendant and/or its customers.

12. Exhibit 2 includes charts comparing the Exemplary '399 Patent Claims to the Exemplary Snap Products. As set forth in these charts, the Exemplary Snap Products practice the technology claimed by the '399 Patent. Accordingly, the Exemplary Snap Products incorporated in these charts satisfy all elements of the Exemplary '399 Patent Claims.

13. Honeyman Ciper therefore incorporates by reference in its allegations herein the claim charts of Exhibit 2.

14. Honeyman Ciper is entitled to recover damages adequate to compensate for Defendant's infringement.

JURY DEMAND

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Honeyman Ciper respectfully requests the following relief:

- A. A judgment that the '399 Patent is valid and enforceable;
- B. A judgment that Defendant has infringed, contributorily infringed, and/or induced infringement of one or more claims of the '399 Patent;
- C. An accounting of all damages not presented at trial;

- D. A judgment that awards Honeyman Cipher all appropriate damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 for Defendant's past infringement of the Patent-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 Honeyman Cipher for Defendant's infringement, an accounting:
- i. that this case be declared exceptional within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 285 and that Honeyman Cipher be awarded its reasonable attorneys' fees against Defendant that it incurs in prosecuting this action;
 - ii. that Honeyman Cipher be awarded costs, and expenses that it incurs in prosecuting this action; and
 - iii. that Honeyman Cipher be awarded such further relief at law or in equity as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: August 19, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Stamatios Stamoulis
Stamatios Stamoulis (No. 4606)
800 N. West Street, Third Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801
Telephone: (302) 999-1540
Facsimile: (302) 762-1688
stamoulis@swdelaw.com

Isaac Rabicoff
(Pro Hac Vice admission pending)
Rabicoff Law LLC
73 W Monroe St
Chicago, IL 60603
(773) 669-4590
isaac@rabilaw.com

Counsel for Plaintiff
Honeyman Cipher Solutions LLC