

HON. THERESA L. FRICKE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

HERITAGE IP LLC

Plaintiff,

v.

NINTENDO OF AMERICA, INC.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 21-CV-01333-TLF

AMENDED COMPLAINT

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff Heritage IP LLC (“Heritage” or “Plaintiff”) hereby asserts the following claims for patent infringement against Defendant Nintendo of America Inc., (“Defendant”), and alleges as follows:

SUMMARY

1. Heritage owns United States Patent No. 6,854,067 (“Asserted Patent”).

2. Defendant infringes the Asserted Patent by implementing, without authorization, Heritage’s proprietary technologies in at least its Pokémon GO PLUS product (“Accused Products”).

3. By this action, Heritage seeks to obtain compensation for the harm it has suffered as a result of Defendant’s infringement of the Asserted Patent.

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1 4. This is a civil action for patent infringement arising under the patent
2 laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1 *et seq.*

3 5. Defendant has infringed and continue to infringe, and at least as early
4 as the filing and/or service of this Complaint, has induced and continues to induce
5 infringement of, and has contributed to and continues to contribute to infringement
6 of, at least one or more claims of Heritage’s Asserted Patent at least by making, us-
7 ing, selling, and/or offering to sell its products and services in the United States, in-
8 cluding in this District.

9 6. Heritage is the legal owner by assignment of the Asserted Patent,
10 which were duly and legally issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Of-
11 fice (“USPTO”). Heritage seeks monetary damages for Defendant’s infringement
12 of the Asserted Patent.

THE PARTIES

13
14 7. Plaintiff Heritage IP LLC is a Texas limited liability company with its
15 principal place of business at 10900 Research Blvd, Ste 160C PMB 1042, Austin,
16 TX 78759. Heritage is the owner of intellectual property rights at issue in this ac-
17 tion.

18 8. On information and belief, Defendant Nintendo of America Inc., is a
19 Washington corporation having a principal place of business at 4600 150th Ave
20 NE, Redmond, WA, 98052. Defendant may be served through its registered agent,
21 CT Corporation System, at 1999 Bryan St., Suite 900, Dallas, TX 75201.

22 9. On information and belief, Defendants directly and/or indirectly de-
23 velops, designs, manufactures, distributes, markets, offers to sell and/or sells in-
24 fringing products and services in the United States, including in the Western Dis-
25 trict of Texas, and otherwise directs infringing activities to this District in connec-
26 tion with its products and services.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1 10. As this is a civil action for patent infringement arising under the
2 patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1 *et seq.*, this Court has subject matter
3 jurisdiction over the matters asserted herein under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

4 11. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant, in part because
5 Defendant does continuous and systematic business in this District, including by
6 providing infringing products and services to the residents of this District that De-
7 fendant knew would be used within this District, and by soliciting business from
8 the residents of this District. For example, Defendant is subject to personal juris-
9 diction in this Court because, *inter alia*, and on information and belief, Defendant
10 has a regular and established office in this District and directly and through agents
11 regularly does, solicits, and transacts business in this District.

12 12. In particular, Defendant has committed and continues to commit acts
13 of infringement in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271, and has made, used, marketed, dis-
14 tributed, offered for sale, sold, and/or imported infringing products in the State of
15 Texas, including in this District, and engaged in infringing conduct within and di-
16 rected at or from this District. For example, Defendant has purposefully and vol-
17 untarily placed the Accused Products into the stream of commerce with the expect-
18 ation that the Accused Products will be used in this District. The Accused Prod-
19 ucts have been and continue to be distributed to and used in this District. Defen-
20 dant’s acts cause and have caused injury to Heritage, including within this District.

21 13. Venue is proper in this District under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §
22 1400(b) at least because Defendant has committed acts of infringement in this Dis-
23 trict and has a regular and established office in this District.

THE ’067 PATENT

24
25 14. U.S. Patent No. 6,854,067 (“the ’067 Patent”) is entitled “Method and
26 System for Interaction Between a Processor and a Power on Reset circuit to Dy-

namically Control Power States in a Microcontroller,” and was issued on February
1 8, 2005. A true and correct copy of the ’067 Patent is attached as Exhibit 1.

2 15. The ’067 Patent was filed on June 22, 2001 as U.S. Patent Application
3 No. 09/887,923.

4 16. Heritage is the owner of all rights, title, and interest in and to the ’067
5 Patent, with the full and exclusive right to bring suit to enforce the ’067 Patent, in-
6 cluding the right to recover for past infringement.

7 17. The ’067 Patent is valid and enforceable under United States Patent
8 Laws.

9 18. The ’067 Patent recognized several problems with existing microcon-
10 trollers having Power on Reset (POR) circuits. Specifically, the prior art was
11 “problematic because it either fails to address microcontroller power stability is-
12 sues beyond initial boot-up POR, requires the dedication of existing system re-
13 sources to address them, or requires the provision of additional resources to ad-
14 dress them.” Exhibit 1 at 1:63-67.

15 19. For instance, the ’067 Patent recognized that “[d]edicating existing re-
16 sources, internal to the microcontroller, to sense, analyze, and react to post-booting
17 power instability removes circuitry from other possible applications.” *Id.* at 2:4-7.
18 “Further, these effectively internal control functions demand the expenditure of
19 power, heat dissipation, logic, memory, and other System infrastructure and en-
20 ergy.” *Id.* at 2:7-9. “These finite System resources then become unavailable for
21 executing the design external control functions of the microcontroller. Thus, mi-
22 crocontroller performance can Suffer.” *Id.* at 2:10-12.

23 20. The ’067 Patent also recognized problems with providing additional
24 resources (e.g. adding them into the microcontroller) made the microcontroller
25 more expensive to manufacture and operate, “in terms of also demanding the addi-
26 tional expenditures of power, heat dissipation, logic, memory, and other System in-

1 frastructure and energy to meet an effectively internal control function, especially
2 to achieve power control automatically.” *Id.* at 2:13-22.

3 21. To address one or more shortcomings of these existing microcon-
4 trollers, the ’067 Patent discloses, *inter alia*, a “method and system which effec-
5 tively functions to provide dynamic power control capabilities for a microcon-
6 troller.” The ’067 Patent further discloses a method and system that retains the in-
7 herent advantages of existing POR and processor technology to accomplish the
8 foregoing requirements with no extra demand on system resources or requirement
9 for additional System resources. *Id.* at 2:52-63.

10 22. The ’067 Patent provided an unconventional solution by using the
11 POR and SMB to continually monitor the voltage levels provided to the microcon-
12 troller in order to change the state of the microcontroller from a fully operational
13 state to power safe reset state. See *Heritage IP LLC v. August Home, Inc.* 1:20-cv-
14 723 D.I. 16 Ex. 1 Decl. David Hartup at ¶ 19 (attached hereto as Exhibit 3) (citing
15 ’067 Patent at 11:59-64; 12:43-56.) “Using the POR and SMB to continually moni-
16 tor voltage levels and to control functions of the microcontroller as a result, such as
17 providing an interrupt or changing the power state of the microcontroller, was not
18 something that was commonly done at the time of the invention. This suggested
19 by the patent itself.” *Id.*

20 23. For example, claim 1 provides that the SMP be connected to the POR
21 and microcontroller and that the SMP receive and be responsive to signals from the
22 POR. The POR is used to sense a power state, determines the suitability of the
23 power state, informs the microcontroller and SMP of the state of the power state,
24 and controls certain functions of the microcontroller as a result, such as providing
25 an interrupt or placing the microcontroller in a fully operational state or a reset
26 state as a result. It accomplished this using the circuit shown in Figure 2. This ap-
27 proach was unconventional at the time of the ’067 Patent. *Id.* at ¶ 20.

COUNT I: INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,854,067

1 24. Heritage incorporates by reference and re-alleges paragraphs 1-23 of
2 this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

3 25. Defendant has infringed and is infringing, either literally or under the
4 doctrine of equivalents, the '067 Patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271 *et seq.*, di-
5 rectly and/or indirectly, by making, using, offering for sale, or selling in the United
6 States, and/or importing into the United States without authority or license, the Ac-
7 cused Products.

8 26. As just one non-limiting example, set forth below (with claim lan-
9 guage in bold and italics) is exemplary evidence of infringement of Claim 1 of the
10 '067 Patent in connection with the Accused Products. This description is based on
11 publicly available information. Heritage reserves the right to modify this descrip-
12 tion, including, for example, on the basis of information about the Accused Prod-
13 ucts that it obtains during discovery.

14 ***1(a): In a microcontroller with an embedded processor, a switched mode***
15 ***pump power supply and power on reset circuit, a method of dynamically control-***
16 ***ling a plurality of power stability functions for said microcontroller, said method***
17 ***comprising:*** Defendant makes, uses, sells, and/or offers to sell a device or system
18 that practices the method in accordance with Claim 1.

19 For instance, the Accused Products include an DA14580 SoC which has an
20 integrated transceiver and an ARM Cortex M0 microcontroller. See Exhibit 1.

21 ***1(b): Supplying a power state to said microcontroller from said switched***
22 ***mode pump power supply, wherein said processor and said power on reset circuit***
23 ***are interconnectedly coupled, and wherein said switched mode pump power sup-***
24 ***ply is interconnectedly coupled with said power on reset circuit and responsive to***
25 ***signals therefrom;***—Defendant makes, uses, sells, and/or offers to sell a device or
26 system that supplies a power state to the microcontroller from the power supply,

wherein the processor and power on reset circuit are interconnectedly coupled and the power supply is interconnectedly coupled with the power on reset circuit.

For instance, the Accused Product practices supplying a power state (e.g., a power state corresponding to a buck converted voltage) to said microcontroller (e.g., Arm Cortex-M0 based microcontroller) from said switched mode pump power supply (e.g., buck converter), wherein said processor (e.g., ARM Cortex M0 core processor) and said power on reset circuit are interconnectedly coupled, and wherein said switched mode pump power supply (e.g., buck converter) is interconnectedly coupled with said power on reset circuit (e.g., connected through LDO_RET) and responsive to signals therefrom (e.g., generated VDD). *Id.*

1(c): sensing a power state condition of said power state;—Defendant makes, uses, sells, and/or offers to sell a device or system that sense a power state condition of the power state.

For instance, the Accused Products practices sensing a power state condition (e.g., power state corresponding to a voltage level) of said power state (e.g., power state corresponding to a buck converted voltage). *Id.*

1(d): determining a suitability status of said power state condition;—Defendant makes, uses, sells, and/or offers to sell a device or system that determines a suitability status of the power state condition.

For instance, the Accused Products compare with threshold voltage of the power state condition (e.g., power state corresponding to a voltage level). *Id.*

1(e): communicating said suitability status between said power on reset circuit and said processor;—Defendant makes, uses, sells, and/or offers to sell a device or system that communicates suitability status between the power on reset circuit and said processor.

For instance, as noted above, the Accused Products practice communicating (e.g., generation PWR ON RESET signal) said suitability status (e.g., comparison

output with threshold voltage) between said power on reset circuit and said processor (e.g., ARM Cortex core processor) *Id.*

1(f): controlling certain functions of said microcontroller accordingly.—

Defendant makes, uses, sells, and/or offers to sell a device or system that controls certain functions of the microcontroller accordingly.

For instance, the Accused Products practices controlling certain functions of said microcontroller accordingly (e.g., POR signal resets specific registers of the controller of DA14580 which controls various functions). *Id.*

27. Additionally, Defendant has been and/or currently is an active inducer of infringement of the '067 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) and contributory infringer of the '067 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(c).

28. At least as early as of the date of the filing of the Complaint, Defendants have had actual knowledge of the '067 Patent.

29. Defendants have provided the Accused Products to its customers and, on information and belief, instructions to use the Accused Products in an infringing manner while being on notice of (or willfully blind to) the '067 Patent and Defendants' infringement. Therefore, on information and belief, Defendants knew or should have known of the '067 Patent and of its own infringing acts, or deliberately took steps to avoid learning of those facts.

30. Defendant knowingly and intentionally encourages and aids at least its end-user customers to directly infringe the '067 Patent.

31. Defendant's end-user customers directly infringe at least one or more claims of the '067 Patent by using the Accused Products in their intended manner to infringe. Defendant induces such infringement by providing the Accused Products and instructions to enable and facilitate infringement, knowing of, or being willfully blind to the existence of, the '067 Patent. On information and belief, Defendant specifically intends that its actions will result in infringement of one or

1 more claims of the '067 Patent, or subjectively believe that their actions will result
2 in infringement of the '067 Patent, but took deliberate actions to avoid learning of
3 those facts, as set forth above.

4 32. Additionally, Defendant contributorily infringes at least one or more
5 claims of the '067 Patent by providing the Accused Products and/or software com-
6 ponents thereof, that embody a material part of the claimed inventions of the '067
7 Patent, that are known by Defendant to be specially made or adapted for use in an
8 infringing manner, and are not staple articles with substantial non-infringing uses.
9 The Accused Products are specially designed to infringe at least one or more
10 claims of the '067 Patent, and their accused components have no substantial non-
11 infringing uses. In particular, on information and belief, the software modules and
12 code that implement and perform the infringing functionalities identified above are
13 specially made and adapted to carry out said functionality and do not have any sub-
14 stantial non-infringing uses.

15 33. At least as early as the filing and/or service of the Original Complaint,
16 Defendant's infringement of the '067 Patent was and continues to be willful and
17 deliberate, entitling Heritage to enhanced damages.

18 34. Additional allegations regarding Defendant's knowledge of the '067
19 Patent and willful infringement will likely have evidentiary support after a reason-
20 able opportunity for discovery.

21 35. Defendant's infringement of the '067 Patent is exceptional and enti-
22 tles Heritage to attorneys' fees and costs incurred in prosecuting this action under
23 35 U.S.C. § 285.

24 36. Heritage is in compliance with any applicable marking and/or notice
25 provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 287 with respect to the '067 Patent.

37. Heritage is entitled to recover from Defendant all damages that Heritage has sustained as a result of Defendant's infringement of the '067 Patent, including, without limitation, a reasonable royalty.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Heritage respectfully requests:

A. That Judgment be entered that Defendant has infringed at least one or more claims of the '067 Patent, directly and/or indirectly, literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents;

B. An award of damages sufficient to compensate Heritage for Defendant's infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 284, including an enhancement of damages on account of Defendant's willful infringement;

C. That the case be found exceptional under 35 U.S.C. § 285 and that Heritage be awarded its reasonable attorneys' fees;

D. Costs and expenses in this action;

E. An award of prejudgment and post-judgment interest; and

F. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Pursuant to Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Heritage respectfully demands a trial by jury on all issues triable by jury.

DATED this 3rd day of February, 2022.

By: s/ Philip P. Mann
Philip P. Mann, WSBA No. 28860
MANN LAW GROUP PLLC
403 Madison Ave N. Suite 240
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
Telephone: (206) 436-0900
email: phil@mannlawgroup.com

Together with:

Jimmy Chong
CHONG LAW FIRM, PA
2961 Centerville Road, Suite 350
Wilmington, DE 19808
Telephone: (302) 999-9480
Facsimile: (302) 800-1999
Email: chong@chonglawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff
Heritage IP LLC

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

1 I hereby certify on the date indicated below, I electronically filed the
2 foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send
3 notification of such filing to all parties who have appeared in this matter.

4 DATED: February 3, 2022 /s/ Philip P. Mann

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28