

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

Theta Chip LLC, Plaintiff, v. Bushnell Holdings, Inc., Defendant.	Case No. _____ Patent Case Jury Trial Demanded
---	--

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff Theta Chip LLC ("Theta Chip"), through its attorneys, complains of Bushnell Holdings, Inc. ("Bushnell"), and alleges the following:

PARTIES

1. Plaintiff Theta Chip LLC is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Texas that maintains its principal place of business at 6009 W. Parker Rd, Ste 149-1004, Plano, TX 75093-8121.

2. Defendant Bushnell Holdings, Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Delaware that maintains its principal place of business at 9200 Cody, Overland Park, Kansas 66214.

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, Theta Chip has suffered harm in this district.

PATENT-IN-SUIT

7. Theta Chip is the assignee of all right, title and interest in United States Patent No. 6,937,356 (the "'356 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, Theta Chip possesses the exclusive right and standing to prosecute the present action for infringement of the Patent-in-Suit by Defendant.

The '356 Patent

8. The '356 Patent is entitled "Digital imaging system," and issued 8/30/2005. The application leading to the '356 Patent was filed on 9/3/1998. A true and correct copy of the '356 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated herein by reference.

9. The '356 Patent is valid and enforceable.

COUNT 1: INFRINGEMENT OF THE '356 PATENT

10. Theta Chip incorporates the above paragraphs herein by reference.

11. **Direct Infringement.** Defendant has been and continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the '356 Patent in at least this District by making, using, offering to sell, selling and/or importing, without limitation, at least Bushnell's Imageview 15-45x 70mm Spotting Scope (among the "Exemplary Bushnell Products") that infringe at least exemplary claims 10-11, 13, 17-18 of the '356 Patent (the "Exemplary '356 Patent Claims") literally or by the doctrine of equivalence. On information and belief, numerous other devices that infringe the claims of the '356 Patent have been made, used, sold, imported, and offered for sale by Defendant and/or its customers.

12. Defendant also has and continues to directly infringe, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, the Exemplary '356 Patent Claims, by having its employees internally test and use these Exemplary Products.

13. The service of this Complaint upon Defendant constitutes actual knowledge of infringement as alleged here.

14. 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 '356 Patent. On information and belief, Defendant has also continued to sell the Exemplary Bushnell 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 '356 Patent. Thus, on information and belief, Defendant is contributing to and/or inducing the infringement of the '356 Patent.

15. **Induced Infringement.** Defendant actively, knowingly, and intentionally has been and continues to induce infringement of the '356 Patent, literally or by the doctrine of

equivalence, by selling Exemplary Bushnell Products to their customers for use in end-user products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '356 Patent.

16. **Contributory Infringement.** Defendant actively, knowingly, and intentionally has been and continues materially contribute to their own customers' infringement of the '356 Patent, literally or by the doctrine of equivalence, by selling Exemplary Bushnell Products to their customers for use in end-user products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '356 Patent.

17. Exhibit 2 includes charts comparing the Exemplary '356 Patent Claims to the Exemplary Bushnell Products. As set forth in these charts, the Exemplary Bushnell Products practice the technology claimed by the '356 Patent. Accordingly, the Exemplary Bushnell Products incorporated in these charts satisfy all elements of the Exemplary '356 Patent Claims.

18. Theta Chip therefore incorporates by reference in its allegations herein the claim charts of Exhibit 2.

19. Theta Chip is entitled to recover damages adequate to compensate for Defendant's infringement.

JURY DEMAND

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Theta Chip respectfully requests the following relief:

- A. A judgment that the '356 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 '356 Patent;

- C. An accounting of all damages not presented at trial;
- D. A judgment that awards Theta Chip all appropriate damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 for Defendant's past infringement, and any continuing or future 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 Theta Chip for Defendant's infringement, an accounting:
 - i. that this case be declared exceptional within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 285 and that Theta Chip be awarded its reasonable attorneys' fees against Defendant that it incurs in prosecuting this action;
 - ii. that Theta Chip be awarded costs, and expenses that it incurs in prosecuting this action; and
 - iii. that Theta Chip be awarded such further relief at law or in equity as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: September 27, 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
Theta Chip LLC