

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
5

6 VALYRIAN IP LLC,
7 Plaintiff,
8 v.
9 INFRATEL US, INC.,
10 Defendant.
11
12

CASE NO. 21-CV-1172

**COMPLAINT FOR PATENT
INFRINGEMENT**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

13 **COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

14 Plaintiff Valyrian IP LLC (“Plaintiff”), through its attorneys, complains of
15 Infratel US, Inc. (“Defendant”), and alleges the following:
16

17 **PARTIES**

18
19 1. Plaintiff Valyrian IP LLC is a company established in Texas with its
20 principal place of business at 6009 W Parker Rd, Ste 149 - 1012, Plano, TX 75093-
21 8121.
22

23
24 2. Defendant Infratel US, Inc. is a corporation organized and existing
25 under the laws of Washington that maintains an established place of business at
26

2101 9th Avenue Suite 205 Seattle, WA 98121. Defendant can be served through
1 its registered agent, Registered Agents Inc., at 100 N Howard St, Ste R, Spokane,
2 WA, 99201
3

4 **JURISDICTION**

5
6 3. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the patent laws
7 of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code.
8

9 4. This Court has exclusive subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C.
10 §§ 1331 and 1338(a).
11

12 5. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because it has
13 engaged in systematic and continuous business activities in this District and is
14 incorporated in this District's state. As described below, Defendant has committed
15 acts of patent infringement giving rise to this action within this District.
16
17

18 **VENUE**

19
20 6. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b) because
21 Defendant has committed acts of patent infringement in this District and is
22 incorporated in this District's state.
23
24
25
26

PATENT-IN-SUIT

1
2 7. Plaintiff is the assignee of all right, title and interest in United States
3 Patent No. 6,970,706 (the “Patent-in-Suit”); including all rights to enforce and
4 prosecute actions for infringement and to collect damages for all relevant times
5 against infringers of the Patent-in-Suit. Accordingly, Plaintiff possesses the
6 exclusive right and standing to prosecute the present action for infringement of the
7 Patent-in-Suit by Defendant.
8

9
10 **THE '706 PATENT**

11
12 8. The ‘706 Patent is entitled ““Hierarchical Call Control with Selective
13 Broadcast Audio Messaging System” and issued November 29, 2005. The
14 application leading to the ‘706 Patent was filed on December 5, 2000. A true and
15 correct copy of the ‘706 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated
16 herein by reference.
17

18 9. The ‘706 Patent is valid and enforceable.
19

20 10. The present invention relates to personal telephone systems that are
21 able to transmit and receive digital signals between fixed sets and fixed stations in a
22 cordless system. (See Ex. 1, at 1:8-10.) More particularly, the present invention
23 relates to providing a hierarchical call control with a selective broadcast messaging
24 service in a cordless telephone system. (See Ex. 1 at 1:11- 13.)
25
26

11. Time division multiple access (TDMA) cordless phone systems

1 provide a base unit that is able to provide connections for a plurality of mobile
2 units, such as handsets. (See Ex. 1 at 1:16-18.) Such TDMA systems use time
3 division to provide a plurality of slots, where the base (fixed part) transmits to an
4 individual (portable unit) mobile unit during a particular slot of time and receives
5 from the individual mobile unit during a particular slot of time. (See Ex. 1 at 1:19-
6 23.)
7
8

9 12. At the time of the inventions, there was a lack of capability to
10 simultaneously send a voice message to all mobile units associated with a base unit.
11 (See Ex. 1 at 1:39-42.) Since conventional cordless telephone systems did not
12 provide a broadcast mode, it was impossible for a base station to send a call from an
13 identified caller to only a specific mobile unit. (See Ex. 1 at 1:49- 52.) Conventional
14 cordless systems were also incapable of broadcasting a message deemed to be an
15 important message to all, or even a selected group, of mobile units. (See Ex. 1 at
16 1:52-55.)
17
18
19

20 13. The inventions disclosed in the Patents-in-Suit were not well-
21 understood, routine, or conventional. At the time the Patent-in-Suit was filed, there
22 existed various problems in how mobile communications devices processed
23 environmental inputs. In a cordless phone system having a base station and a
24 plurality of mobile units, it is desirable to provide a mechanism whereby an
25
26

1 identified call is sent only to a specified mobile unit whereas an important call is
2 broadcast to most of the mobile units and a mechanism whereby a broadcast
3 message is delivered to only selected mobile units. (See Ex. 1 at 1:56-62.)

4 14. To achieve the foregoing and other objectives and in accordance with
5 the purpose of the present invention, a method for providing a hierarchical call
6 control paradigm in a cordless telephone system is described. (See Ex. 1 at 1:66-
7 2:2). The inventive hierarchical call control directs and controls incoming calls
8 depending on the phone number or settings that the customer programs into the
9 system, e.g., that he or she does not want to be disturbed by broadcasts. (See Ex. 1
10 at 2:2-6.)
11

12
13 15. The claims of the Patent-in-Suit do not merely recite the performance
14 of a familiar business practice with a requirement to perform it on the Internet.
15 Instead, the claims recite one or more inventive concepts that are rooted in
16 computerized electronic data communications networks and an improved method
17 for managing mobile device communications.
18

19
20 16. Moreover, the inventions taught in the Patent-in-Suit cannot be
21 performed with pen and paper or in the human mind. Indeed, they are rooted in
22 providing a mechanism whereby an identified call is sent only to a specified mobile
23 unit whereas an important call is broadcast to most of the mobile units and a
24 mechanism whereby a broadcast message is delivered to only Selected mobile units.
25
26

1 One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the patent would have understood that
2 the inventions could not be performed with pen and paper. Using a pen and paper
3 would be a practical impossibility running counter to the inventors' detailed
4 description of the inventions and language of the claims. Additionally, because the
5 Patent-in-Suit addresses problems rooted in limiting mobile device communication
6 by aggregating information from mobile device sensors and/or other information
7 sources, the solutions it teaches are not merely drawn to longstanding human
8 activities.
9

10 **COUNT I: INFRINGEMENT OF THE '706 PATENT**

11
12 17. Plaintiff incorporates the above paragraphs herein by reference.
13

14 18. **Direct Infringement.** Defendant has been and continues to directly
15 infringe one or more claims of the '706 Patent in at least this District by making,
16 using, offering to sell, selling and/or importing, without limitation, at least the
17 Defendant products identified in the charts incorporated into this Count below
18 (among the "Exemplary Defendant Products") that infringe at least the exemplary
19 claims of the '706 Patent also identified in the charts incorporated into this Count
20 below (the "Exemplary '706 Patent Claims") literally or by the doctrine of
21 equivalents. On information and belief, numerous other devices that infringe the
22
23
24
25
26

claims of the '706 Patent have been made, used, sold, imported, and offered for sale by Defendant and/or its customers.

19. Defendant also has and continues to directly infringe, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, the Exemplary '706 Patent Claims, by having its employees internally test and use these Exemplary Products.

20. Exhibit 2 includes charts comparing the Exemplary '706 Patent Claims to the Exemplary Defendant Products. As set forth in these charts, the Exemplary Defendant Products practice the technology claimed by the '706 Patent. Accordingly, the Exemplary Defendant Products incorporated in these charts satisfy all elements of the Exemplary '706 Patent Claims.

21. Plaintiff therefore incorporates by reference in its allegations herein the claim charts of Exhibit 2.

22. Plaintiff is entitled to recover damages adequate to compensate for Defendants infringement.

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

JURY DEMAND

1 24. Under Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff
2
3 respectfully requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

4
5
6 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests the following relief:

- 7
- 8 A. A judgment that the ‘706 Patent is valid and enforceable;
 - 9
 - 10 B. A judgment that Defendant has infringed directly one or more
11 claims of the ‘706 Patent;
 - 12
 - 13 C. An accounting of all damages not presented at trial;
 - 14
 - 15 D. A judgment that awards Plaintiff all appropriate damages under
16 35 U.S.C. § 284 for Defendants past infringement with respect to the ‘706
17 Patent
 - 18
 - 19 E. And, if necessary, to adequately compensate Plaintiff for
20 Defendants infringement, an accounting:
21
 - 22 i. that this case be declared exceptional within the meaning of 35
23 U.S.C. § 285 and that Plaintiff be awarded its reasonable attorneys
24 fees against Defendant that it incurs in prosecuting this action;
 - 25
 - 26

