

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

Wiesblatt Licensing LLC, Plaintiff, v. Insight Enterprises, Inc., Defendant.	Case No. Patent Case Jury Trial Demanded
--	--

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff Wiesblatt Licensing LLC (“Plaintiff”), through its attorneys, complains of Insight Enterprises, Inc. (“Defendant”), and alleges the following:

PARTIES

1. Plaintiff Wiesblatt Licensing LLC is a company established in Texas with its principal place of business at 6001 W. Palmer Ln, Suite 370-1165, Austin, TX 78727.
2. Upon information and belief, Insight Enterprises, Inc. is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business located at 8825 N 23rd Avenue, Suite 100, Phoenix, AZ, 85021. Upon information and belief, Insight Enterprises, Inc. can be served with process through its registered agent Corporation Service Company 251 Little Falls Drive, Wilmington, DE, 19808.

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 and is incorporated in this District's state.

PATENT-IN-SUIT

7. Plaintiff is the assignee of all right, title and interest in United States Patent No. 8,396,112 (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 '112 PATENT

8. The '112 Patent is entitled "Circuitry and method for transferring data, and circuitry and method utilizing clock pulses" and issued March 12, 2013. The application leading to the '112 Patent was filed on November 28, 2016. A true and correct copy of the '112 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated herein by reference.
9. The '112 Patent is valid and enforceable.

COUNT 1: INFRINGEMENT OF THE '112 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 '112 Patent in at least this District by making, using, offering to sell, selling and/or importing, without limitation, at least the Defendant products identified in the charts incorporated into this Count below (among the "Exemplary Defendant Products") that infringe at least the exemplary claims of the '112 Patent also identified in the charts incorporated into this Count below (the "Exemplary '112 Patent Claims") literally or by the doctrine of equivalents. On information and belief, numerous other devices that infringe the claims of the '112 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 '112 Patent Claims, by having its employees internally test and use these Exemplary Products.
13. Exhibit 2 includes charts comparing the Exemplary '112 Patent Claims to the Exemplary Defendant Products. As set forth in these charts, the Exemplary Defendant Products practice the technology claimed by the '112 Patent. Accordingly, the Exemplary Defendant Products incorporated in these charts satisfy all elements of the Exemplary '112 Patent Claims.
14. Plaintiff therefore incorporates by reference in its allegations herein the claim charts of Exhibit 2.
15. Plaintiff is entitled to recover damages adequate to compensate for Defendants infringement.

JURY DEMAND

16. 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 '112 Patent is valid and enforceable
- B. A judgment that Defendant has infringed directly one or more claims of the '112 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 Defendants past infringement with respect to the '112 Patent.
- E. And, if necessary, to adequately compensate Plaintiff for Defendants 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: October 27, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

CHONG LAW FIRM PA

/s/ Jimmy Chong
Jimmy Chong (#4839)
2961 Centerville Road, Suite 350
Wilmington, DE 19808

Telephone: (302) 999-9480
Facsimile: (302) 800-1999
Email: chong@chonglawfirm.com

Counsel for Plaintiff
Wiesblatt Licensing LLC