

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION

APERTURE NET LLC,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

ZTE (USA), INC.,

*Defendants.*

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

C.A. No. \_\_\_\_\_

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL



*Figure 1 – Defendant’s Blade X Max*

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

1. Aperture Net LLC (“Aperture” or “Plaintiff”), by and through its counsel, hereby brings this action for patent infringement against ZTE (USA), Inc., (the “Defendant”) alleging infringement of the following validly issued patent (the “Patent-in-Suit”): U.S. Patent No. 6,711,204, titled “Channel Sounding for a Spread-Spectrum Signal” (the ’204 Patent), attached hereto as Exhibit A.

NATURE OF THE ACTION

2. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the United States Patent Act 35 U.S.C. §§ 1 et seq., including 35 U.S.C. § 271.

PARTIES

3. Plaintiff Aperture Net LLC is a company established in Texas with its principal place of business at 6205 Coit Rd., Ste 300 – 1016, Plano, TX 75024-5474.

4. On information and belief, Defendant ZTE (USA), Inc. is a company incorporated in Texas with a principle place of business in Texas and may be served by its registered agent Incorp Services Inc., 815 Brazos Street Suite 500, Richardson, Texas, 78701.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. This lawsuit is a civil action for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 101 et seq. The Court has subject-matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332, 1338(a), and 1367.

6. The Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant for the following reasons: (1) Defendant is present within or has minimum contacts within the State of Texas and the Northern District of Texas; (2) Defendant has purposefully availed itself of the privileges of conducting business in the State of Texas and in this district; (3) Defendant has sought protection and benefit

from the laws of the State of Texas; (4) Defendant regularly conducts business within the State of Texas and within this district, and Plaintiff's cause of action arises directly from Defendant's business contacts and other activities in the State of Texas and in this district; and (5) Defendant has a regular and established business in Texas and has purposely availed itself of the privileges and benefits of the laws of the State of Texas.

7. Defendant, directly and/or through intermediaries, ships, distributes, uses, offers for sale, sells, and/or advertises products and services in the United States, the State of Texas, and the Northern District of Texas including but not limited to the products which contain the infringing '204 Patent systems and methods as detailed below. Upon information and belief, Defendant has committed patent infringement in the State of Texas and in this district; Defendant solicits and has solicited customers in the State of Texas and in this district; and Defendant has paying customers who are residents of the State of Texas and this district and who each use and have used the Defendant's products and services in the State of Texas and in this district.

8. Venue is proper in the Northern District of Texas pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1400(b). Defendant has a regular and established place of business in this district, has transacted business in this district, and has directly and/or indirectly committed acts of patent infringement in this district.

#### PATENT-IN-SUIT

9. The Patent-in-Suit teaches systems and methods for improving a spread-spectrum code-division-multiple-access ("CDMA") system, using a channel sounding signal from a base station to provide initial transmitter power levels for remote stations.

10. The invention disclosed in the Patent-in-Suit discloses inventive concepts that represent significant improvements in the art and are not mere routine or conventional uses of

computer components. For instance, at the time of filing, CDMA systems suffered from poor power control. *See* Ex. A, '204 Patent, 1:21-2:5. Although various approaches existed to address power control issues, those approaches suffered from inconsistency, inefficiency, and excessive delays. *See* Ex. A, '204 Patent, 1:21-2:5. The patent-in-suit addressed these concerns by “permit[ting] a remote power station to have knowledge, a priori to transmitting, of a proper power level to initiate transmission.” *See* Ex. A, '204 Patent, 2:7-10. Further, the patent-in-suit teaches “to measure and initially correct or compensate for Doppler shift in carrier frequency caused by the motion of the remote station.” *See* Ex. A, '204 Patent, 2:11-13.

### ACCUSED PRODUCTS

11. Defendant makes, uses, offers for sale and sells in the U.S. products, systems, and/or services that infringe the Patent-in-Suit, including, but not limited to its Blade X Max product (the “Accused Products” or “Accused Instrumentality”).

### COUNT I (Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,711,204)

12. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations of paragraphs 1-11, the same as if set forth herein.

13. The '204 Patent is valid, enforceable, and was duly and legally issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) on March 23, 2004. The '204 Patent is presumed valid and enforceable. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 282.

14. Plaintiff is the owner by assignment of the '204 patent and possesses all rights of recovery under the '204 patent, including the exclusive right enforce the '204 patent and pursue lawsuits against infringers.

15. Without a license or permission from Plaintiff, Defendant has infringed and

continues to infringe on one or more claims of the '204 Patent—directly, contributorily, and/or by inducement—by importing, making, using, offering for sale, or selling products and devices that embody the patented invention, including, without limitation, one or more of the patented '204 systems and methods, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271.

**Direct Infringement**

16. Defendant has been and now is directly infringing by, among other things, practicing all of the steps of the '204 Patent, for example, through internal testing, quality assurance, research and development, and troubleshooting. *See Joy Techs., Inc. v. Flakt, Inc.*, 6 F.3d 770, 775 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *see also* 35 U.S.C. § 271 (2006). For instance, Defendant has directly infringed the Patent-in-Suit by testing, configuring, and troubleshooting the functionality of its location technology.

17. By way of example, Defendant has infringed and continues to infringe at least one or more claims of the '204 Patent, including at least Claim 1. Attached hereto as Exhibit B is an exemplary claim chart detailing representative infringement of claim 1 of the Patent-in-Suit.

**Contributory Infringement**

18. On information and belief, Defendant contributorily infringes on Plaintiff's '204 Patent. Defendant knew or should have known, at the very least as a result of its freedom to operate analyses and the filing of this complaint, that third parties, such as its customers, would infringe the '204 Patent.

19. On information and belief, Defendant's implementation of the accused functionality has no substantial non-infringing uses. *See, e.g., Lucent Techs., Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.*, 580 F.3d 1301, 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2009) (holding that the “substantial non-infringing use” element of a contributory infringement claim applies to an infringing feature or component, and that an

“infringing feature” of a product does not escape liability simply because the product as a whole has other non-infringing uses).

**Willful Infringement**

20. On information and belief, the infringement of the '204 Patent by Defendant has been and continues to be willful. Defendant has had actual knowledge of Plaintiff's rights in the '204 Patent and details of Defendant's infringement based on at least the filing and service of this complaint. Additionally, Defendant had knowledge of the '204 Patent and its infringement in the course of Defendant's due diligence and freedom to operate analyses.

**Plaintiff Suffered Damages**

21. Defendant's acts of infringement of the '204 Patent have caused damage to Plaintiff, and Plaintiff is entitled to recover from Defendant the damages sustained as a result of Defendant's wrongful acts in an amount subject to proof at trial pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. Defendant's infringement of Plaintiff's exclusive rights under the '204 Patent will continue to damage Plaintiff causing it irreparable harm for which there is no adequate remedy at law, warranting an injunction from the Court.

**REQUEST FOR RELIEF**

22. Plaintiff incorporates each of the allegations in the paragraphs above and respectfully asks the Court to:

- (a) enter a judgment that Defendant has directly infringed, contributorily infringed, and/or induced infringement of one or more claims of each of the '204 Patent;
- (b) enter a judgment awarding Plaintiff all damages adequate to compensate it for Defendant's infringement of, direct or contributory, or inducement to infringe, the including all pre-judgment and post-judgment interest at the maximum rate permitted by

law;

(c) enter a judgment awarding treble damages pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284 for Defendant's willful infringement of the '204 Patent;

(d) issue a preliminary injunction and thereafter a permanent injunction enjoining and restraining Defendant, its directors, officers, agents, servants, employees, and those acting in privity or in concert with them, and their subsidiaries, divisions, successors, and assigns, from further acts of infringement, contributory infringement, or inducement of infringement of the '204 Patent;

(e) enter a judgment requiring Defendant to pay the costs of this action, including all disbursements, and attorneys' fees as provided by 35 U.S.C. § 285, together with prejudgment interest; and

(f) award Plaintiff all other relief that the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: September 30, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jay Johnson

Jay Johnson (TX SBN 24067322)

Kizzia Johnson PLLC

1910 Pacific Ave., Suite 13000

Dallas, TX 75201

(214) 451-0164

jay@kjpllc.com

KIRK J. ANDERSON (CA SBN 289043)

kanderson@budolaw.com

BUDO LAW, LLP

5610 Ward Rd., Suite #300

Arvada, CO 80002

(720) 225-9440 (Phone)

(720) 225-9331 (Fax)

*Attorney(s) for Aperture Net LLC*