

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

_____		)	
KRAKEN SPORTS, Inc.		)	
67 Wharncliffe Road North		)	
London, Ontario N6H 2A5		)	
Canada		)	
	Plaintiff,	)	
		)	
v.		)	Civil Action No.: 1:19-cv-3233
		)	
EASYDIVE DI FABIO BENVENUTI,		)	
Montaletto di Cervia		)	
Italy 48015		)	
		)	
and		)	
		)	
FABIO BENVENUTI (an individual)		)	
Montaletto di Cervia		)	
Italy 48015		)	
	Defendants	)	
_____		)	

**COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT UNDER 28 USC 2201 and 2202  
AND FOR FALSE MARKING UNDER 35 USC 292**

Plaintiff Kraken Sports, Inc. (“Kraken”) files this Complaint for False Marking and for Declaratory Judgment of invalidity against Defendants Easydive di Fabio Benvenuti (“EasyDive”) and Fabio Benvenuti (“Benvenuti”). Kraken seeks declaratory relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, declaring that United States Patent No. 10,261,395 is not infringed by any product sold by Kraken and is invalid and is unenforceable.

**PARTIES**

1. Plaintiff Kraken is a Canadian corporation with its principal place of business at 67 Wharncliffe Rod North, London Ontario N6H 2A5, Canada.

2. Upon information and belief, Defendant EasyDive is an unincorporated entity with its sole place of business in Montaletto di Cervia Italy.

3. Upon information and belief, Defendant Benvenuti is an individual residing in Montaletto di Cervia Italy. Defendant Benvenuti is believed to be the sole owner of Defendant EasyDive.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

4. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over Kraken's assertion of false marking under 35 USC 292 and for Kraken's request for a declaratory judgment under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202. This action arises under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§ 100 et seq., which are within the subject matter jurisdiction of this Court under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

5. Defendants have sent numerous letters and other communications to Plaintiff, to Plaintiff's customers and to Plaintiff's supplier, asserting ownership of U.S. Patent 10,262,395, falsely claiming that certain of Defendants' products were covered by the '395 patent and accusing one of Plaintiff's products, the "Kraken Smart Housing" of infringement of U.S. Patent 10,262,395. Defendants included copies of Complaints prepared for various judicial districts within the United States and have asserted that suits would be filed if Plaintiff, Plaintiff's customers and Plaintiff's supplier did not cease sales. Due to the threats of Defendants, certain customers have returned product to Plaintiff and others have questioned the issue of continued sales. The allegations made by Defendant give rise to an actual and justiciable controversy over the noninfringement and invalidity of the '395 patent.

6. Defendants' false marking, draft lawsuits and infringement allegations have

caused damage and continue to threaten real and imminent injury to Plaintiff that can be redressed by judicial relief and that injury is of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment. Absent a declaration of noninfringement, invalidity and/or unenforceability, Defendants' continued wrongful assertions of infringement against Plaintiff's product will cause Plaintiff continued harm.

7. Defendants are foreign nationals and thus subject to general and specific personal jurisdiction in this judicial district.

8. Venue is proper in this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because Plaintiff has made sales in this judicial district and both parties are subject to personal jurisdiction within this judicial district.

#### **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

9. Plaintiff Kraken is a developer, manufacturer, and seller of photography and videography accessories for divers, including diving lights and diving cases for still cameras, video cameras and smart phones. Kraken's products are distributed world wide through direct sales and resellers, on-line and through retail stores and dive shops.

10. Defendant Benvenuti is believed to be the owner of Defendant EasyDive. EasyDive is also a manufacturer and seller of photography and videography equipment for divers. It is understood that EasyDive's products are also distributed in numerous countries.

11. Kraken and EasyDive are direct competitors.

12. Defendant Benvenuti is the named inventor on United States Patent No. 10,262,395. Defendant EasyDive has asserted ownership of the '395 patent.

13. The '395 Patent is entitled "Underwater Case for Digital Cameras and Video Cameras." The '395 patent issued on April 16, 2019. The '395 patent discloses a case for housing a standard configuration digital camera. Standard digital cameras include a threaded hole to accommodate tripod mount on the bottom of the camera body and also have a lens extending from the front of the camera body. The '395 patent does not disclose a housing designed to fit a smartphone. The single embodiment disclosed in the '395 patent would not support a smartphone. The '395 patent includes a typical tripod head plate and screw for mounting a digital camera into the housing using the standard threaded hole in the bottom of the digital camera body.

14. EasyDive sells two smartphone cases referred to as the "Leo3Smart" and the "DiveShot." EasyDive also sells a tablet case referred to as the "DivePad." Both of these cases are flat with interiors designed to accommodate smartphone and tablets which are also flat. Neither the Leo3Smart, the DiveShot nor the DivePad can accommodate a standard configuration digital camera.

15. EasyDive also sells a line of digital camera cases including the "Leo3," the "Leo3Wi" and the "Leo3 Plus." These camera cases are designed to accommodate digital cameras, are shaped to accommodate the thickness of a digital camera body and to accommodate the extending lens, and include a typical tripod head plate and screw for mounting a digital camera into the housing using the standard threaded hole in the bottom of the digital camera body.

16. Plaintiff Kraken sells a smartphone case referred to as the "Kraken Smart Housing." The Kraken Smart Housing cannot accommodate a standard configuration digital

camera. The Kraken Smart Housing which competes directly with the "Leo3Smart" and the "DiveShot" housings. All three products are designed to enclose a smart phone so that it can be used to capture photographs and videos while diving.

17. Neither the Leo3Smart, the DiveShot, the DivePad nor the Kraken Smart Housing embody the claimed invention of the '395 Patent. However, Defendants have mismarked their Leo3Smart, DivePad and DiveShot products as "patented" and have incorrectly accused the Kraken Smart Housing of infringement of the '395 Patent.

18. Plaintiff's Kraken Smart Housing does not infringe the '395 patent because several of the elements of the claims of the '395 patent which are directed to digital cameras and are wholly inapplicable to smartphones, are not found in the Kraken Smart Housing.

19. The '395 patent does not teach or disclose anything which is not found in the prior art. The '395 patent discloses a common well known idea of communicating with a digital camera in a waterproof case over a wireless connection. Wireless communication with a digital camera was well known long before the filing of the '395 patent and including such communication in a waterproof case was also well known.

20. The '395 patent also discloses a common two part mounting bracket for a digital camera. Such mounting was well know for use in digital cameras with a body adapted for a tripod type mount. The disclosure of watertight O-ring seals and magnetic keys was also well known. There is nothing novel in the '395 patent.

21. The '395 patent is invalid under 35 USC 101 as anticipated by prior art, is invalid under 35 USC as obvious over prior art.

22. The '396 patent fails to disclose critical information regarding both the single

disclosed embodiment and the alluded to but undisclosed embodiments and is thus invalid under 35 USC 112 for failing to make a proper disclosure. In addition, the inventor was not in possession of sufficient knowledge at the time of the filing to accomplish the undisclosed embodiments and thus are not part of the scope of the '395 patent.

23. Defendants have sent numerous letters and other communications to Plaintiff, to Plaintiff's customers and to Plaintiff's supplier, asserting ownership of U.S. Patent 10,262,395. These letters also included the direct statement that Defendants products, the DiveShot and the Leo3Smart are "covered by US Patent 10,261,395." Defendants knew and/or should have known through reasonable diligence that the DiveShot and the Leo3Smart are not covered by any of the claims of the '395 patent. These knowingly false statements were made in conjunction with the accusations of infringement and were communicated to the industry for the specific purpose and intent to deceive the public and to profit off of the '395 patent. In addition, Defendants' advertising and packaging materials, including Defendants' web site includes the false and deceptive assertion that these products are patented. The actions of Defendants constitute patent misuse and render the '395 patent unenforceable. In addition, these actions of Defendants are false marking in violation of 35 USC 292 and Plaintiff is entitled to damages.

## COUNT I

### **Declaratory Judgment of NonInfringement of the '395 Patent**

24. All of the foregoing paragraphs are incorporated by reference as though set forth fully herein.

25. No claim of the '395 Patent has been or is infringed, either directly or indirectly,

by Kraken or by any of Kraken's products, including the Kraken Smart Housing.

26. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy between EasyDive, Benvenuti and Kraken to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment that Kraken has not infringed, and does not infringe, directly or indirectly, any valid claim of the '395 Patent.

## **COUNT II**

### **Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of the '395 Patent**

27. All of the foregoing paragraphs are incorporated by reference as though set forth fully herein.

28. The claims of the '395 Patent are invalid for failure to comply with the requirements of patentability as specified in 35 U.S.C. §§ 1 et seq., including, without limitation, 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103, and/or 112, and/or based on other judicially-created bases for invalidation.

29. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy between EasyDive, Benvenuti and Kraken to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment that the claims of the '395 Patent are invalid.

## **COUNT III**

### **Declaratory Judgment of Unenforcability of the '359 Patent**

30. All of the foregoing paragraphs are incorporated by reference as though set forth fully herein.

31. Defendants have misused the '395 by marking products which are not covered by the '395 patent as "patented", by holding out to the public that products not covered by the '395 patent are "patented" and by specifically and intentionally threatening competitors through letters and other communications which include the assertion that non-covered products are actually protected by the '395 patent.

32. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality between Defendants and Kraken to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment that the '395 Patent is unenforceable.

#### **COUNT IV**

##### **False Marking in Violation of 35 USC 292**

33. All of the foregoing paragraphs are incorporated by reference as though set forth fully herein.

34. Defendants have falsely marked products which are not covered by the '395 patent or any other patent as "patented", by holding out to the public that products not covered by the '395 patent or any other patent are "patented" and by specifically and intentionally threatening competitors through letters and other communications which include the assertion that non-covered products are actually protected by the '395 patent.

35. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, Defendants have falsely marked in violation of 35 USC 292, Plaintiff has been damaged by this false marking and Plaintiff is entitled to damages.



**PRAYERS FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Kraken prays for:

- (a) A declaration that the Kraken Smart Housing has not infringed and does not infringe, either directly or indirectly, any claim of the '395 Patent;
- (b) A declaration that each claim of the '395 Patent is invalid;
- (c) A declaration that the '395 Patent is unenforceable for patent misuse;
- (d) Judgement against Defendants for False Marking under 35 USC 292 and an award of damages to Plaintiff;
- (e) An Order that Defendants and each of their officers, employees, agents, attorneys, and any persons in active concert or participation with them are restrained and enjoined from further asserting or threatening assertion or communicating threats of assertion to others claiming that the Kraken Smart Housing infringes the '395 Patent;
- (f) An Order that Defendants and each of their officers, employees, agents, attorneys, and any persons in active concert or participation with them are restrained and enjoined from further false marking of its products.
- (g) A declaration that this is an exceptional case under 35 U.S.C. § 285;
- (h) An award to Kraken of its costs and attorneys' fees;
- (i) Such other relief as this Court or a jury may deem proper and just under the circumstances.

**JURY DEMAND**

Kraken demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Dated: October 28, 2019

/s/ Joseph J. Zito  
Joseph J. Zito  
Paul Grandinetti  
LEVY & GRANDINETTI  
Suite 304  
1120 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington DC 20036  
(202) 429-4560  
mail@levygrandinetti.com