**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
**FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

| | |
|---|---|
| **INTEXACT TECHNOLOGIES LIMITED,**<br><br>Plaintiff,<br><br>v.<br><br>**SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,**<br><br>Defendant. | Civil Action No.: 21-cv-7522<br><br>**TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED** |

# COMPLAINT FOR INFRINGEMENT OF PATENT

Plaintiff Intexact Technologies Limited ("Plaintiff" or "Intexact"), through its attorneys, complains of Samsung Electronics America, Inc. ("Defendant"), and alleges the following:

## PARTIES

1. Plaintiff Intexact Technologies Limited is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Hong Kong that maintains its principal place of business in Hong Kong.

2. Defendant Samsung, Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of New York, having a principal place of business at 85 Challenger Road, Ridgefield Park, New Jersey 07660. Upon information and belief, Defendant may be served with process c/o C T Corporation System, 28 Liberty Street, New York, New York 10005.

## 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. 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, is incorporated in this district, and has an established place of business in this District. In addition, Intexact has suffered harm in this district.

**PATENT-IN-SUIT**

7. Plaintiff is the assignee of all right, title and interest in United States Patent No. 7,161,483 (the "483 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, Plaintiff possesses the exclusive right and standing to prosecute the present action for infringement of the Patent-in-Suit by Defendant.

**The '483 Patent**

8. The '483 Patent is entitled "Inegrated programmable system for controlling the operation of electrical and/or electronic appliances of a premises" and issued January 9, 2007. The application leading to the '483 Patent was filed on December 17, 2003. A true and correct copy of the '483 Patent is attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** and incorporated herein by reference.

9. The '483 Patent is valid and enforceable.

**COUNT 1: INFRINGEMENT OF THE '483 PATENT**

10. Plaintiff incorporates the above paragraphs herein by reference.

11. **Direct Infringement.** Defendant has been and continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the '483 Patent by making, using, offering to sell, selling and/or importing, without limitation, at least "Samsung's SmartThings Home Security System" identified in the charts

incorporated into this Count below (among the "Exemplary Defendant Products") that infringe at least the exemplary claims of the '483 Patent also identified in the charts incorporated into this Count below (the "Exemplary '483 Patent Claims") literally or by the doctrine of equivalents. On information and belief, other devices that infringe the claims of the '483 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 '483 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 '483 Patent. On information and belief, Defendant has also continued to sell the Exemplary Defendant 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 '483 Patent. Thus, on information and belief, Defendant is contributing to and/or inducing the infringement of the '483 Patent.

15. **Induced Infringement.** Defendant actively, knowingly, and intentionally has been and continues to induce infringement of the '483 Patent, literally or by the doctrine of equivalents, by selling Exemplary Defendant Products to their customers for use in end-user products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '483 Patent.

16. **Contributory Infringement.** Defendant actively, knowingly, and intentionally has been and continues materially contribute to their own customers' infringement of the '483 Patent, literally or by the doctrine of equivalents, by selling Exemplary Defendant Products to their

customers for use in end-user products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '483 Patent. Moreover, the Exemplary Defendant Products are not a staple article of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.

17. Exhibit 2 includes charts comparing the Exemplary '483 Patent Claims to the Exemplary Defendant Products. As set forth in these charts, the Exemplary Defendant Products practice the technology claimed by the '483 Patent. Accordingly, the Exemplary Defendant Products incorporated in these charts satisfy all elements of the Exemplary '483 Patent Claims.

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

19. Plaintiff 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, Plaintiff respectfully requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

## PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests the following relief:

A. A judgment that the '483 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 '483 Patent;

C. An accounting of all damages not presented at trial;

D. A judgment that awards Plaintiff all appropriate damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 for Defendant's past infringement and, with respect to the '483 patent, any continuing

or future infringement, 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;

E. And, if necessary, to adequately compensate Plaintiff for Defendant's infringement, an accounting:

i. that this case be declared exceptional within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 285 and that Plaintiff be awarded its reasonable attorneys' fees against Defendant that it incurs in prosecuting this action;

ii. that Plaintiff be awarded costs, and expenses that it incurs in prosecuting this action; and

iii. that Plaintiff be awarded such further relief at law or in equity as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: September 8, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

Together with:

SAND, SEBOLT & WERNOW CO., LPA

Howard L. Wernow
(*pro hac vice forthcoming)*

Aegis Tower – Suite 1100
4940 Munson Street NW
Canton, Ohio 44718
Telephone: (330) 244-1174
Facsimile: (330) 244-1173
Email: Howard.Wernow@sswip.com

LOAKNAUTH LAW, P.C.

*/s/* Nicholas Loaknauth
SDNY Bar No.: NL0880
1460 Broadway
New York, New York 10036
Telephone: (212) 641-0745
Facsimile: (718) 301-1247
Email: nick@loaknauthlaw.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF