

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

MOSAID TECHNOLOGIES INC.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Civil No. 2:23-cv-00129
v.)	
)	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
MEDIATEK, INC.)	
MEDIATEK USA, INC.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff MOSAID Technologies Inc. (“Plaintiff” or “MOSAID”) files this Complaint for Patent Infringement against Defendants MediaTek, Inc. (“MTK”) and MediaTek USA, Inc. (“MTK USA”) (MTK and MTK USA collectively, “MediaTek”), alleging as follows:

NATURE OF SUIT

1. This is a claim for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code.

PARTIES, JURISDICTION, AND VENUE

2. This action arises under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 101, *et seq.* This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

I. MOSAID

3. MOSAID (f/k/a Conversant Intellectual Property Management, Inc.) is a Canadian company having a principal place of business at 515 Legget Drive, Suite 100, Ottawa, ON, Canada. MOSAID’s subsidiary, Conversant Intellectual Property Management Corp., is located at 5830 Granite Parkway #100-247, Suite 247, Plano, Texas 75024.

4. MOSAID was founded in 1975 by engineers Richard Foss and Robert Harland. MOSAID focused its early efforts on inventing ways to improve Dynamic Random Access Memory (DRAM) semiconductor chips. MOSAID's engineers also designed and built test equipment for debugging prototype memory chips.

5. MOSAID is now a leading patent management company with a world-class licensing team and an enviable record of success. MOSAID's success is defined by the numerous licenses it has signed with industry leaders. MOSAID prides itself on its patent expertise, a determination to engage in meaningful negotiation, and a commitment to transparency and the principled enforcement of high-quality patents.

6. MOSAID is the assignee and owns all right, title, and interest to United States Patent No. 7,051,306 ("the '306 Patent"), United States Patent No. 7,945,885 ("the '885 Patent"), United States Patent No. 7,996,811 ("the '811 Patent"), United States Patent No. 8,253,438 ("the '438 Patent"), United States Patent No. 8,854,077 ("the '077 Patent"), United States Patent No. 9,350,349 ("the '349 Patent"), and United States Patent No. 7,224,563 ("the '563 Patent"). The '306 Patent, '885 Patent, '811 Patent, '438 Patent, '077 Patent, '349 Patent, and '563 Patent are collectively referred to herein as the "Asserted Patents."

II. MEDIATEK

7. Upon information and belief, Defendant MediaTek, Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Taiwan, and is located at No. 1, Dusing Road 1, Hsinchu Science Park, Hsinchu City 30078, Taiwan.

8. Upon information and belief, MTK makes, uses, offers for sale, sells in the United States, and/or imports into the United States, a variety of semiconductor products. For example, MTK manufactures and sells semiconductors and/or processors for mobile phones and tablets, among other consumer products.

9. Upon information and belief, MTK makes, uses, offers for sale, sells in the United States, and/or imports into the United States, certain processors including at least the MT6755 (Helio P10), MT6797 (Helio X20), MT6853 (Dimensity 720), and the MT6983 (Dimensity 9000), among other substantially similar processors, (collectively, the “Infringing Products”) that utilize the inventions of the Asserted Patents.

10. MTK sells its Infringing Products to numerous companies in the United States.

11. MTK is subject to specific and general personal jurisdiction in this Court. This Court has personal jurisdiction over MTK because, upon information and belief, MTK has engaged in continuous, systematic, and substantial activities within this State, including substantial marketing and sales of products and services within this State and District. Furthermore, upon information and belief, this Court has personal jurisdiction over MTK because MTK has committed acts of infringement giving rise to MOSAID’s claims for patent infringement within and directed to this District.

12. On information and belief, MTK has conducted, and does conduct, substantial business in this District, directly and/or through subsidiaries, agents, representatives, or intermediaries, including, but not limited to: (i) at least a portion of the acts of infringement alleged herein; (ii) purposefully and voluntarily placing one or more Infringing Products into the stream of commerce with the expectation that they will be purchased by consumers in this District; and/or (iii) regularly doing or soliciting business, engaging in other persistent courses of conduct, or deriving substantial revenue from goods and services provided to individuals in this State and in this District. Thus, MTK is subject to this Court’s specific and general personal jurisdiction pursuant to due process and the Texas Long-Arm Statute. To the extent MTK is not subject to jurisdiction in any state’s courts of general jurisdiction, this Court has personal jurisdiction over

MTK pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(k)(2) because MOSAID's claims arise under federal law and exercising jurisdiction is consistent with the United States Constitution and laws.

13. The exercise of personal jurisdiction over MTK would not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

14. Under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b)-(d) and 1400(b), venue is proper in this District as to MTK at least because MTK is a foreign corporation subject to personal jurisdiction in this District and has committed acts of infringement within this District giving rise to this action.

15. To the extent that there is no district in which an action may otherwise be brought against MTK, venue is proper in this District as to MTK under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(3) because MTK is subject to personal jurisdiction in this Court.

16. Upon information and belief, MediaTek USA, Inc. is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the state of Delaware, having a regular and established place of business in the Eastern District of Texas, including at 825 Watters Creek Blvd., Suite 265, Allen, Texas 75103. Upon information and belief, MTK USA also maintains other offices in the State of Texas, including in Irvine, Texas and Austin, Texas.

17. MTK USA is subject to specific and general personal jurisdiction in this Court. This Court has personal jurisdiction over MTK USA because it has engaged in continuous, systematic, and substantial activities within this State, including substantial marketing and sales of products and services within this State and District. Furthermore, upon information and belief, this Court has personal jurisdiction over MTK USA because MTK USA has committed acts of infringement giving rise to MOSAID's claims for patent infringement within and directed to this District.

18. Upon information and belief, MTK USA has conducted and does conduct substantial business in this District, directly and/or through subsidiaries, agents, representatives, or intermediaries, such substantial business including, but not limited to: (i) at least a portion of the acts of infringement alleged herein; (ii) purposefully and voluntarily placing one or more Infringing Products into the stream of commerce with the expectation that they will be purchased by consumers in this forum; and/or (iii) regularly doing or soliciting business, engaging in other persistent courses of conduct, or deriving substantial revenue from goods and services provided to individuals in Texas and in this District. Thus, MTK USA is subject to this Court's specific and general personal jurisdiction pursuant to due process and the Texas Long-Arm Statute.

19. The exercise of personal jurisdiction over MTK USA would not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

20. Upon information and belief, MTK USA has committed acts of infringement in this District and has regular and established places of business within this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b). Thus, venue is proper in this District as to MTK USA under 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b).

21. MTK USA maintains a permanent physical presence within this District. For example, it maintains regular and established places of business at 825 Watters Creek Blvd, Suite 265, Allen, Texas 75103.

22. Upon information and belief, MediaTek's locations in this District are regular and established places of business under 28 U.S.C. § 1391, 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b), and *In re Cray, Inc.*, 871 F.3d 1355, 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2017).

a. Upon information and belief, MediaTek's locations in this District are physical, geographical locations in this District. Each office location comprises one or more buildings or office spaces from which the business of MediaTek is carried out. Upon

information and belief, the locations are set apart for the purpose of carrying out MediaTek's business, including, but not limited to, making, using, selling, offering for sale, and/or supporting Infringing Products. Upon information and belief, MediaTek advertises its physical locations in this District as places of its business.

b. Upon information and belief, MediaTek's locations in this District are regular and established. MediaTek identifies on its website (<https://corp.mediatek.com/about/office-locations/mediatek-usa-offices>) its address in this District as a regular and established place of MediaTek's business.

c. Upon information and belief, MediaTek's locations in this District are places of business of MediaTek. Upon information and belief, MediaTek conducts business from its locations in this District, including but not limited to, making, using, selling, offering for sale, and/or supporting Infringing Products.

d. Upon information and belief, MediaTek's locations in this District are physical, geographical location(s) in this District from which MediaTek carries out its business.

e. Upon information and belief, MediaTek employees work at MediaTek's locations in this District. Upon information and belief, these MediaTek employees are regularly and physically present at MediaTek's locations during business hours and conduct MediaTek's business while working there.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

I. PATENTS-IN-SUIT

23. United States Patent No. 7,051,306 ("the '306 Patent") is entitled "Managing Power on Integrated Circuits Using Power Islands". The United States Patent and Trademark

Office duly and legally issued the '306 Patent on May 23, 2006, from U.S. Patent Application No. 10/840,893, filed on May 7, 2004.

24. The '306 Patent is entitled to the benefit of U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/468,742, entitled "System and Method for Managing Power in Integrated Circuits", filed on May 7, 2003.

25. MOSAID is the current owner of all rights, title, and interest in and to the '306 Patent, including the right to sue for past damages.

26. A true and correct copy of the '306 Patent is attached hereto as **Exhibit A** and is incorporated by reference herein.

27. The '306 Patent generally relates to systems and methods to manage power in an integrated circuit using power islands. The integrated circuit includes a plurality of power islands where power consumption is independently controlled within each of the power islands. A power manager determines a target power level for one of the power islands. The power manager then determines an action to change a consumption power level of the one of the power islands to the target power level. The power manager performs the action to change the consumption power level of the one of the power islands to the target power level.

28. Claim 16 is illustrative of the claimed invention of the '306 Patent. It is directed to:

16. A system for an integrated circuit comprising a plurality of power islands where power consumption is independently controlled within each of the power islands, the system comprising:

power control circuitry configured to control power for one of the power islands; and

a power manager configured to determine a target power level for the one of the power islands based on needs and operation of the integrated circuit, determine at least one of actions to change a power consumption level of the one of the power islands to the target power level, and perform the at least one of the actions to change the power consumption level of the one of the power islands to the target power level where one of the actions comprises selecting a frequency for the one of the power islands.

29. Numerous companies enjoy a license to the '306 Patent. MediaTek previously enjoyed a limited license to the '306 Patent, but that license expired on March 7, 2016. MediaTek is not currently licensed to the '306 Patent.

30. United States Patent No. 7,945,885 (“the '885 Patent”) is entitled “Power Managers for an Integrated Circuit”. The United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued the '885 Patent on May 17, 2011, from U.S. Patent Application No. 12/176,645, filed on July 21, 2008.

31. The '885 Patent is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 11/336,097, filed on January 20, 2006, entitled “Power Managers for an Integrated Circuit”, and which issued on August 19, 2008 as U.S. Patent No. 7,415,680, which is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/840,893, filed on May 7, 2004, entitled “Managing Power on Integrated Circuits Using Power Islands”, and which issued on May 23, 2006 as the '306 Patent, which claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/468,742, titled “System and Method for Managing Power in Integrated Circuits”, filed May 7, 2003.

32. MOSAID is the current owner of all rights, title, and interest in and to the '885 Patent, including the right to sue for past damages.

33. A true and correct copy of the '885 Patent is attached hereto as **Exhibit B** and is incorporated by reference herein.

34. The '885 Patent generally relates to a system for an integrated circuit comprising a plurality of power islands and includes a first power manager and a second power manager. The first power manager manages a first power consumption for the integrated circuit based on needs and operation of the integrated circuit. The second power manager communicates with the first power manager and manages a second power consumption for one of the power islands.

35. Claim 39 is illustrative of the claimed invention of the '885 Patent. It is directed to:

39. A system comprising:

an integrated circuit;

a plurality of power islands of the integrated circuit having associated power consumptions, each of the power consumptions being independently controllable by changing a supply voltage and operating frequency;

one or more power consumption signals indicating one or more of the power consumptions;

a power manager coupled to each of the power islands configured to monitor the one or more power consumption signals, the power manager being configured to individually control each of the power consumptions, and the power manager being configured to change power consumption in at least one of the power islands in response to a power consumption change request.

36. Numerous companies enjoy a license to the '885 Patent. MediaTek previously enjoyed a limited license to the '885 Patent, but that license expired on March 7, 2016. MediaTek is not currently licensed to the '885 Patent.

37. United States Patent No. 7,996,811 ("the '811 Patent") is entitled "Power Managers for an Integrated Circuit". The United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued the '811 Patent on August 9, 2011, from U.S. Patent Application No. 12/332,529, filed on December 11, 2008.

38. The '811 Patent is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 12/176,645, filed on July 21, 2008, entitled "Power Managers for an Integrated Circuit", and which issued May 17, 2011 as the '885 Patent, which is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 11/336,097, filed on January 20, 2006, entitled "Power Managers for an Integrated Circuit", and which issued on August 19, 2008 as U.S. Patent No. 7,415,680, which is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/840,893, filed on May 7, 2004, entitled "Managing Power on Integrated Circuits Using Power Islands", and which issued on May 23, 2006 as the '306 Patent, which claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/468,742, entitled "System and Method for Managing Power in Integrated Circuits", filed May 7, 2003.

39. MOSAID is the current owner of all rights, title, and interest in and to the '811 Patent, including the right to sue for past damages.

40. A true and correct copy of the '811 Patent is attached hereto as **Exhibit C** and is incorporated by reference herein.

41. The '811 Patent generally relates to a system for an integrated circuit comprising a plurality of power islands and includes a first power manager and a second power manager. The first power manager manages a first power consumption for the integrated circuit based on needs and operation of the integrated circuit. The second power manager communicates with the first power manager and manages a second power consumption for one of the power islands.

42. Claim 30 is illustrative of the claimed invention of the '811 Patent. It is directed to:

30. A system comprising:
an integrated circuit;

a plurality of power islands of the integrated circuit having associated power consumptions, each of the power consumptions adapted to be independently controlled, and a first of the power islands being configured to communicate synchronously and asynchronously with a second of the power islands; and

a power manager to control the power consumptions, and

at least one of the power islands adapted to have the power manager control its associated power consumption in that the system is configured to have:

a supply voltage to the at least one of the power islands changed, and

a frequency of operation of the at least one of the power islands changed.

43. Numerous companies enjoy a license to the '811 Patent. MediaTek previously enjoyed a limited license to the '811 Patent, but that license expired on March 7, 2016. MediaTek is not currently licensed to the '811 Patent.

44. United States Patent No. 8,253,438 (“the '438 Patent”) is entitled “Low Leakage and Data Retention Circuitry”. The United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued the '438 Patent on August 28, 2012, from U.S. Patent Application No. 13/074,291, filed on March 29, 2011.

45. The '438 Patent is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 12/542,352, filed August 17, 2009, which is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 12/284,311, filed September 19, 2008 (now U.S. Patent No. 7,592,837), which is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 11/998,725, filed November 30, 2007 (now U.S. Patent No. 7,443,197), which is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 11/732,181, filed April 2, 2007 (now U.S. Patent No. 7,348,804), which is a divisional and claims the priority benefit of U.S. Patent Application No. 11/041,687, filed January 20, 2005 (now U.S. Patent No. 7,227,383), which claims the priority benefit of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/546,574, filed February 19, 2004 and U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/586,565, filed July 9, 2004.

46. MOSAID is the current owner of all rights, title, and interest in and to the '438 Patent, including the right to sue for past damages.

47. A true and correct copy of the '438 Patent is attached hereto as **Exhibit D** and is incorporated by reference herein.

48. The '438 Patent generally relates to an integrated circuit that includes first circuitry and sleep transistor circuitry. The first circuitry receives input signals and processes the input signals. The first circuitry also retains data in a sleep state that has low leakage. The sleep transistor circuitry is coupled to the first circuitry and receives a sleep signal that has a negative voltage. The sleep circuitry reduces power consumption of the first circuitry in the sleep state to have low leakage based on the sleep signal while retaining the data in the first circuitry.

49. Claim 1 is illustrative of the claimed invention of the '438 Patent. It is directed to:

1. An integrated circuit comprising:

a plurality of power islands having associated power consumptions, each of the power islands including circuitries and sleep transistors in coupled relation with the circuitries, and the sleep transistors being included within the integrated circuit to facilitate reduction of power consumed by the circuitries;

a power island manager configured to dynamically change the power consumptions based on needs and operation of the integrated circuit, the power island manager in communication with at least one of the power islands; and

an adaptive leakage controller configured to control change of a variable voltage to be applied to the sleep transistors, and the power island manager configured to generate the variable voltage based on a control signal received from the adaptive leakage controller.

50. Numerous companies enjoy a license to the '438 Patent. MediaTek is not licensed to the '438 Patent.

51. United States Patent No. 8,854,077 (“the '077 Patent”) is entitled “Low Leakage and Data Retention Circuitry”. The United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally

issued the '077 Patent on October 7, 2014, from U.S. Patent Application No. 13/569,613, filed on August 8, 2012.

52. The '077 Patent is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 13/074,291, filed March 29, 2011 (now the '438 Patent), which is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 12/542,352, filed August 17, 2009 (now U.S. Patent No. 7,940,081), which is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 12/284,311, filed September 19, 2008 (now U.S. Patent No. 7,592,837), which is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 11/998,725, filed November 30, 2007 (now U.S. Patent No. 7,443,197), which is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 11/732,181, filed April 2, 2007 (now U.S. Patent No. 7,348,804), which is a divisional and claims the priority benefit of U.S. Patent Application No. 11/041,687, filed January 20, 2005 (now U.S. Patent No. 7,227,383), which claims the priority benefit of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/546,574, filed February 19, 2004 and U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/586,565, filed July 9, 2004.

53. MOSAID is the current owner of all rights, title, and interest in and to the '077 Patent, including the right to sue for past damages.

54. A true and correct copy of the '077 Patent is attached hereto as **Exhibit E** and is incorporated by reference herein.

55. The '077 Patent generally relates to an integrated circuit that includes first circuitry and sleep transistor circuitry. The first circuitry receives input signals and processes the input signals. The first circuitry also retains data in a sleep state that has low leakage. The sleep transistor circuitry is coupled to the first circuitry and receives a sleep signal that has a negative voltage. The sleep circuitry reduces power consumption of the first circuitry in the sleep state to have low leakage based on the sleep signal while retaining the data in the first circuitry.

56. Claim 1 is illustrative of the claimed invention of the '077 Patent. It is directed to:

1. A method carried out in an integrated circuit that includes an adaptive leakage controller, a power manager and a plurality of power islands, the method comprising:

receiving, at the power manager, a control signal from the adaptive leakage controller; and;

employing the power manager to dynamically change power consumptions of the plurality of power islands, the employing the power manager to dynamically change power consumptions including: generating a variable voltage based on the control signal; and providing the variable voltage to at least one of low leakage sleep circuits of the integrated circuit.

57. Numerous companies enjoy a license to the '077 Patent. MediaTek is not licensed to the '077 Patent.

58. United States Patent No. 9,350,349 (“the '349 Patent”) is entitled “Low Leakage and Data Retention Circuitry”. The United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued the '349 Patent on May 24, 2016, from U.S. Patent Application No. 14/480,143, filed on September 8, 2014.

59. The '349 Patent is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 13/569,613, filed August 8, 2012, which is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 13/074,291, filed March 29, 2011 (now the '438 Patent), which is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 12/542,352, filed August 17, 2009 (now U.S. Patent No. 7,940,081), which is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 12/284,311, filed September 19, 2008 (now U.S. Patent No. 7,592,837), which is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 11/998,725, filed November 30, 2007 (now U.S. Patent No. 7,443,197), which is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 11/732,181, filed April 2, 2007 (now U.S. Patent No. 7,348,804), which is a divisional and claims the priority benefit of U.S. Patent Application No. 11/041,687, filed January 20, 2005 (now U.S. Patent No.

7,227,383), which claims the priority benefit of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/586,565, filed July 9, 2004, and U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/546,574, filed February 19, 2004.

60. MOSAID is the current owner of all rights, title, and interest in and to the '349 Patent, including the right to sue for past damages.

61. A true and correct copy of the '349 Patent is attached hereto as **Exhibit F** and is incorporated by reference herein.

62. The '349 Patent generally relates to an integrated circuit that includes first circuitry and sleep transistor circuitry. The first circuitry receives input signals and processes the input signals. The first circuitry also retains data in a sleep state that has low leakage. The sleep transistor circuitry is coupled to the first circuitry and receives a sleep signal that has a negative voltage. The sleep circuitry reduces power consumption of the first circuitry in the sleep state to have low leakage based on the sleep signal while retaining the data in the first circuitry.

63. Claim 1 is illustrative of the claimed invention of the '349 Patent. It is directed to:

1. An integrated circuit comprising:

a plurality of power islands having associated power consumptions capable of being dynamically changed, each of the power islands including circuitries and sleep transistors in coupled relation with the circuitries; and;

a sleep generator in communication with at least one of the power islands to provide a variable voltage, and

the sleep transistors being included within the integrated circuit to facilitate reduction of power consumed by the circuitries, and the sleep transistors being configured to receive the variable voltage that is:

i) generated by the sleep generator based on a control signal receivable from an adaptive leakage controller; and

ii) changed under control of the adaptive leakage controller.

64. Numerous companies enjoy a license to the '349 Patent. MediaTek is not licensed to the '349 Patent.

65. United States Patent No. 7,224,563 ("the '563 Patent") is entitled "Method and Device for Circuit Control". The United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued the '563 Patent on May 29, 2007, from U.S. Patent Application No. 10/651,360, filed on August 29, 2003.

66. The '563 Patent is entitled to the benefit of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/480,056, filed June 20, 2003, entitled "A System for Rapid Adaptation of Clock Frequency to Voltage Transients".

67. MOSAID is the current owner of all rights, title, and interest in and to the '563 Patent, including the right to sue for past damages.

68. A true and correct copy of the '563 Patent is attached hereto as **Exhibit G** and is incorporated by reference herein.

69. The '563 Patent generally relates to circuit control that comprises sensing a delivered voltage to a portion of an integrated circuit, determining an appropriate frequency for the portion the integrated circuit, and providing the appropriate frequency to the integrated circuit.

70. Claim 1 is illustrative of the claimed invention of the '563 Patent. It is directed to:

1. A method of circuit control, comprising:

sensing a delivered voltage to a portion of an integrated circuit;

determining an appropriate frequency for the portion of the integrated circuit; and

providing the appropriate frequency to said portion of said integrated circuit.

71. Numerous companies enjoy a license to the '563 Patent. MediaTek is not licensed to the '563 Patent.

II. DEFENDANTS' KNOWLEDGE OF THE ASSERTED PATENTS

72. MediaTek had knowledge of the Asserted Patents prior to the filing of this suit.

73. On or about March 16, 2017, MOSAID (f/k/a Conversant Intellectual Property Management) sent a letter to David Su, Vice President and General Counsel of Defendant MediaTek, Inc., seeking to renew MediaTek's license to MOSAID's patent portfolio, including the Asserted Patents. (*See Exhibit H.*)

74. MOSAID's March 16, 2017 letter to MediaTek included exemplary claim charts exhibiting MediaTek's infringement of several patents, including the '306, '885, and '811 Patents.

75. On January 17, 2018, MOSAID met with MediaTek and provided MediaTek with exemplary claim charts exhibiting MediaTek's infringement of several patents, including each of the Asserted Patents.

76. Since January 17, 2018, MOSAID and MediaTek have engaged in numerous technical and business discussions relating to a license for MOSAID's patent portfolio, including each of the Asserted Patents. During those discussions, MOSAID offered to provide MediaTek with a license to the Asserted Patents. But to date, MediaTek has not made any offer to license MOSAID's patent portfolio, including the Asserted Patents.

77. Before filing this lawsuit, on November 29, 2022, MOSAID attempted one last time to resolve this dispute, and again, MOSAID offered to license its patent portfolio, including the Asserted Patents, to MediaTek on reasonable terms. But again, MediaTek refused.

III. THE INFRINGING PRODUCTS

78. MediaTek manufactures, uses, offers for sale and/or sells in the United States, and/or imports into the United States, processors, including the Infringing Products, for use in a variety of consumer electronics, including mobile phones and tablets. Consumer electronics

containing the Infringing Products have been, and continue to be, widely available for sale in the United States.

79. MediaTek's infringing products include at least the Infringing Products, or substantially similar processors, made, used, sold, or offered for sale in the United States, and/or imported into the United States.

80. MediaTek has and continues to advertise the Infringing Products on the MediaTek website.

81. MediaTek advertises the Helio P10 (MT6755) on its website at <https://www.mediatek.com/products/smartphones-2/mt6755-helio-p10>.

82. MediaTek advertises the Helio X20 (MT6797) on its website at [https://www.mediatek.com/products/smartphones-2/mt6797-helio-x20#:~:text=MediaTek%20Helio%20X20%20\(MT6797\)%20provides,performance%20and%20extended%20battery%20life](https://www.mediatek.com/products/smartphones-2/mt6797-helio-x20#:~:text=MediaTek%20Helio%20X20%20(MT6797)%20provides,performance%20and%20extended%20battery%20life).

83. MediaTek advertises the Dimensity 9000 (MT6983) on its website at <https://www.mediatek.com/products/smartphones-2/mediatek-dimensity-9000>.

84. MediaTek advertises the Dimensity 720 (MT6853) on its website at <https://www.mediatek.com/products/smartphones-2/dimensity-720>.

COUNT I: INFRINGEMENT OF THE '306 PATENT

85. MOSAID incorporates by reference and realleges paragraphs 1 through 84 as if specifically set forth herein.

86. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), MediaTek is and has been directly infringing one or more of the claims of the '306 Patent, including at least Claim 16, either literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, by making, using, selling, and/or offering for sale in the United States, and/or importing into the United States, without authority, at least the Infringing Products.

87. During license discussions, MOSAID provided MediaTek with claim charts explaining in detail MediaTek's infringement of the '306 Patent, including at least Claim 16.

88. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b), MediaTek is and has been infringing one or more of the claims of the '306 Patent, including at least Claim 16, indirectly by inducing the infringement of one or more claims of the '306 Patent, including at least Claim 16, by third parties, including for example MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, in this District and elsewhere in the United States. Direct infringement by, for example, MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, occurs by at least the use of the Infringing Products.

89. Upon information and belief, MediaTek supplies hardware, firmware, and/or software, including software drivers, that are especially made or especially adapted to practice the inventions claimed in the '306 Patent, including at least Claim 16 of the '306 Patent, to induce third parties, including for example MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, to use the Infringing Products in a manner that would infringe one or more claims of the '306 Patent, including at least Claim 16 of the '306 Patent.

90. Upon information and belief, MediaTek furnishes instructive materials, technical support, and information concerning the operation and use of the Infringing Products, including with MediaTek's firmware or software drivers, and markets and advertises the Infringing Products on its website, to induce third parties, including MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, to use the Infringing Products in a manner that would infringe one or more claims of the '306 Patent, including at least Claim 16 of the '306 Patent.

91. MediaTek knew or should have known of the '306 Patent through a series of correspondence and meetings expressly notifying MediaTek of the '306 Patent and MediaTek's

infringement thereof. As a result, MediaTek knew it infringed one or more claims of the '306 Patent, including at least Claim 16 of the '306 Patent, at least as early as March 16, 2017. Despite this knowledge, MediaTek continued to induce third parties, including MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, to infringe one or more claims of the '306 Patent, including at least Claim 16 of the '306 Patent with the specific intent to cause infringement. MediaTek knew or should have known that those acts would induce actual infringement by third parties, including MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, of one or more of the claims of the '306 Patent, including at least Claim 16.

92. MediaTek has actual knowledge of the '306 Patent, and its infringement thereof, at least as of the date of filing of this Complaint.

93. Therefore, Defendants have induced infringement by others of one or more of the claims of the '306 Patent, including at least Claim 16, with the specific intent to induce acts that constitute infringement of the '306 Patent and with knowledge that such acts infringed one or more claims of the '306 Patent, including at least Claim 16 of the '306 Patent.

94. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(c), MediaTek is and has been infringing one or more of the claims of the '306 Patent, including at least Claim 16, indirectly by contributing to the infringement of one or more of the claims of the '306 Patent, including at least Claim 16, by third parties, including for example MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, in this District and elsewhere in the United States. Direct infringement by, for example, MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, occurs by at least the use of the Infringing Products.

95. MediaTek makes and sells hardware and/or software components (*e.g.* processors and/or software drivers) especially made or especially adapted to practice the invention claimed in

the '306 Patent, including at least Claim 16 of the '306 Patent, and that (i) is a material part of the invention and (ii) is not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use at least because it is specifically designed to perform the claimed functionality. Any other use of such hardware and/or software would be unusual, far-fetched, illusory, impractical, occasional, aberrant, or experimental.

96. Therefore, Defendants have contributed to the infringement by others of one or more of the claims of the '306 Patent, including at least Claim 16.

97. MediaTek's infringement of one or more claims of the '306 Patent, including at least Claim 16 of the '306 Patent, has been, and continues to be, willful.

98. MediaTek had actual knowledge of the '306 Patent at least as early as March 16, 2017, when MOSAID notified MediaTek of the '306 Patent, and MediaTek's infringement thereof. Despite knowing of the '306 Patent as early as March 16, 2017, MediaTek did not cease its infringing activities.

99. As explained above, between March 16, 2017 and November 29, 2022, MOSAID notified MediaTek on several occasions of the '306 Patent and MediaTek's infringement of one or more claims of the '306 Patent, including at least Claim 16 of the '306 Patent.

100. Despite this knowledge, MediaTek continued to infringe one or more claims of the '306 Patent, including at least Claim 16 of the '306 Patent, in disregard of MOSAID's patent rights. As a result, MediaTek deliberately and intentionally infringed the '306 Patent, and continues to do so, after receiving express and actual knowledge of both the '306 Patent and its infringement thereof.

101. Therefore, MediaTek's infringement of the '306 Patent has been and continues to be willful, wanton, malicious, in bad faith, deliberate, consciously wrongful, flagrant, or

characteristic of a pirate, entitling MOSAID to increased damages pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284 and to attorneys' fees and costs incurred in prosecuting this action pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285.

COUNT II: INFRINGEMENT OF THE '885 PATENT

102. MOSAID incorporates by reference and realleges paragraphs 1 through 101 as if specifically set forth herein.

103. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), MediaTek is and has been directly infringing one or more of the claims of the '885 Patent, including at least Claim 39, either literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, by making, using, selling, and/or offering for sale in the United States, and/or importing into the United States, without authority, at least the Infringing Products.

104. During license discussions, MOSAID provided MediaTek with claim charts explaining in detail MediaTek's infringement of the '885 Patent, including at least Claim 39.

105. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b), MediaTek is and has been infringing one or more of the claims of the '885 Patent, including at least Claim 39, indirectly by inducing the infringement of one or more claims of the '885 Patent, including at least Claim 39, by third parties, including for example MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, in this District and elsewhere in the United States. Direct infringement by, for example, MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, occurs by at least the use of the Infringing Products.

106. Upon information and belief, MediaTek supplies hardware, firmware, and/or software, including software drivers, that are especially made or especially adapted to practice the inventions claimed in the '885 Patent, including at least Claim 39 of the '885 Patent, to induce third parties, including for example MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, to use the Infringing Products in a manner that would infringe one or more claims of the '885 Patent, including at least Claim 39 of the '885 Patent.

107. Upon information and belief, MediaTek furnishes instructive materials, technical support, and information concerning the operation and use of the Infringing Products, including with MediaTek's firmware or software drivers, and markets and advertises the Infringing Products on its website, to induce third parties, including MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, to use the Infringing Products in a manner that would infringe one or more claims of the '885 Patent, including at least Claim 39.

108. MediaTek knew or should have known of the '885 Patent through a series of correspondence and meetings expressly notifying MediaTek of the '885 Patent and MediaTek's infringement thereof. As a result, MediaTek knew it infringed one or more claims of the '885 Patent, including at least Claim 39 of the '885 Patent, at least as early as March 16, 2017. Despite this knowledge, MediaTek continued to induce third parties, including MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, to infringe one or more claims of the '885 Patent, including at least Claim 39 of the '885 Patent, with the specific intent to cause infringement. MediaTek knew or should have known that those acts would induce actual infringement by third parties, including MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, of one or more of the claims of the '885 Patent, including at least Claim 39.

109. MediaTek has actual knowledge of the '885 Patent, and its infringement thereof, at least as of the date of filing of this Complaint.

110. Therefore, MediaTek has induced infringement by others of one or more of the claims of the '885 Patent, including at least Claim 39, with the specific intent to induce acts that constitute infringement of the '885 Patent and with knowledge that such acts infringed one or more claims of the '885 Patent, including at least Claim 39 of the '885 Patent.

111. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(c), MediaTek is and has been infringing one or more of the claims of the '885 Patent, including at least Claim 39, indirectly by contributing to the infringement of one or more of the claims of the '885 Patent, including at least Claim 39, by third parties, including for example MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, in this District and elsewhere in the United States. Direct infringement by, for example, MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, occurs by at least the use of the Infringing Products.

112. MediaTek makes and sells hardware and/or software components (*e.g.* processors and/or software drivers) especially made or especially adapted to practice the invention claimed in the '885 Patent, including at least Claim 39 of the '885 Patent, and that (i) is a material part of the invention and (ii) is not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use at least because it is specifically designed to perform the claimed functionality. Any other use of such hardware and/or software would be unusual, far-fetched, illusory, impractical, occasional, aberrant, or experimental.

113. Therefore, MediaTek has contributed to the infringement by others of one or more of the claims of the '885 Patent, including at least Claim 39.

114. MediaTek's infringement of one or more claims of the '885 Patent, including at least Claim 39 of the '885 Patent, has been, and continues to be, willful.

115. MediaTek had actual knowledge of the '885 Patent at least as early as March 16, 2017, when MOSAID notified MediaTek of the '885 Patent, and MediaTek's infringement thereof. Despite knowing of the '885 Patent as early as March 16, 2017, MediaTek did not cease its infringing activities.

116. As explained above, between March 16, 2017 and November 29, 2022, MOSAID notified MediaTek on several occasions of the '885 Patent and MediaTek's infringement of one or more claims of the '885 Patent, including at least Claim 39 of the '885 Patent.

117. Despite this knowledge, MediaTek continued to infringe one or more claims of the '885 Patent, including at least Claim 39 of the '885 Patent, in disregard of MOSAID's patent rights. As a result, MediaTek deliberately and intentionally infringed the '885 Patent, and continues to do so, after receiving express and actual knowledge of both the '885 Patent and its infringement thereof.

118. Therefore, MediaTek's infringement of the '885 Patent has been and continues to be willful, wanton, malicious, in bad faith, deliberate, consciously wrongful, flagrant, or characteristic of a pirate, entitling MOSAID to increased damages pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284 and to attorneys' fees and costs incurred in prosecuting this action pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285.

COUNT III: INFRINGEMENT OF THE '811 PATENT

119. MOSAID incorporates by reference and realleges paragraphs 1 through 118 as if specifically set forth herein.

120. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), MediaTek is and has been directly infringing one or more of the claims of the '811 Patent, including at least Claim 30, either literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, by making, using, selling, and/or offering for sale in the United States, and/or importing into the United States, without authority, at least the Infringing Products.

121. During license discussions, MOSAID provided MediaTek with claim charts explaining in detail MediaTek's infringement of the '811 Patent, including at least Claim 30.

122. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b), MediaTek is and has been infringing one or more of the claims of the '811 Patent, including at least Claim 30, indirectly by inducing the infringement of one or more of the claims of the '811 Patent, including at least Claim 30, by third

parties, including for example MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, in this District and elsewhere in the United States. Direct infringement by, for example, MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, occurs by at least the use of the Infringing Products.

123. Upon information and belief, MediaTek supplies hardware, firmware, and/or software, including software drivers, that are especially made or especially adapted to practice the inventions claimed in the '811 Patent, including at least Claim 30 of the '811 Patent, to induce third parties, including for example MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, to use the Infringing Products in a manner that would infringe one or more of the claims of the '811 Patent, including at least Claim 30 of the '811 Patent.

124. Upon information and belief, MediaTek furnishes instructive materials, technical support, and information concerning the operation and use of the Infringing Products, including with MediaTek's firmware or software drivers, and markets and advertises the Infringing Products on its website, to induce third parties, including MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, to use the Infringing Products in a manner that would infringe one or more claims of the '811 Patent, including at least Claim 30 of the '811 Patent.

125. MediaTek knew or should have known of the '811 Patent through a series of correspondence and meetings expressly notifying MediaTek of the '811 Patent and MediaTek's infringement thereof. As a result, MediaTek knew it infringed one or more of the claims of the '811 Patent, including at least Claim 30 of the '811 Patent, at least as early as March 16, 2017. Despite this knowledge, MediaTek continued to induce third parties, including MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, to infringe one or more claims of the '811 Patent, including at least Claim 30 of the '811 Patent, with the specific intent to cause

infringement. MediaTek knew or should have known that those acts would induce actual infringement by third parties, including MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, of one or more of the claims of the '811 Patent, including at least Claim 30.

126. MediaTek has actual knowledge of the '811 Patent, and its infringement thereof, at least as of the date of filing of this Complaint.

127. Therefore, MediaTek has induced infringement by others of one or more of the claims of the '811 Patent, including at least Claim 30, with the specific intent to induce acts that constitute infringement of the '811 Patent and with knowledge that such acts infringed one or more claims of the '811 Patent, including at least Claim 30 of the '811 Patent.

128. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(c), MediaTek is and has been infringing one or more of the claims of the '811 Patent, including at least Claim 30, indirectly by contributing to the infringement of one or more of the claims of the '811 Patent, including at least Claim 30, by third parties, including for example MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, in this District and elsewhere in the United States. Direct infringement by, for example, MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, occurs by at least the use of the Infringing Products.

129. MediaTek makes and sells hardware and/or software components (*e.g.* processors and/or software drivers) especially made or especially adapted to practice the invention claimed in the '811 Patent, including at least Claim 30 of the '811 Patent, and that (i) is a material part of the invention and (ii) is not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use at least because it is specifically designed to perform the claimed functionality. Any other use of such hardware and/or software would be unusual, far-fetched, illusory, impractical, occasional, aberrant, or experimental.

130. Therefore, MediaTek has contributed to the infringement by others of one or more of the claims of the '811 Patent, including at least Claim 30.

131. MediaTek's infringement of one or more of the claims of the '811 Patent, including at least Claim 30 of the '811 Patent, has been, and continues to be, willful.

132. MediaTek had actual knowledge of the '811 Patent at least as early as March 16, 2017, when MOSAID notified MediaTek of the '811 Patent, and MediaTek's infringement thereof. Despite knowing of the '811 Patent as early as March 16, 2017, MediaTek did not cease its infringing activities.

133. As explained above, between March 16, 2017 and November 29, 2022, MOSAID notified MediaTek on several occasions of the '811 Patent and MediaTek's infringement of one or more of the claims of the '811 Patent, including at least Claim 30 of the '811 Patent.

134. Despite this knowledge, MediaTek continued to infringe one or more of the claims of the '811 Patent, including at least Claim 30 of the '811 Patent, in disregard of MOSAID's patent rights. As a result, MediaTek deliberately and intentionally infringed the '811 Patent, and continues to do so, after receiving express and actual knowledge of both the '811 Patent and its infringement thereof.

135. Therefore, MediaTek's infringement of the '811 Patent has been and continues to be willful, wanton, malicious, in bad faith, deliberate, consciously wrongful, flagrant, or characteristic of a pirate, entitling MOSAID to increased damages pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284 and to attorneys' fees and costs incurred in prosecuting this action pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285.

COUNT IV: INFRINGEMENT OF THE '438 PATENT

136. MOSAID incorporates by reference and realleges paragraphs 1 through 135 as if specifically set forth herein.

137. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), MediaTek is and has been directly infringing one or more of the claims of the '438 Patent, including at least Claim 1, either literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, by making, using, selling, and/or offering for sale in the United States, and/or importing into the United States, without authority, at least the Infringing Products.

138. During license discussions, MOSAID provided MediaTek with claim charts explaining in detail MediaTek's infringement of the '438 Patent, including at least Claim 1.

139. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b), MediaTek is and has been infringing one or more of the claims of the '438 Patent, including at least Claim 1, indirectly by inducing the infringement of one or more claims of the '438 Patent, including at least Claim 1, by third parties, including for example MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, in this District and elsewhere in the United States. Direct infringement by, for example, MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, occurs by at least the use of the Infringing Products.

140. Upon information and belief, MediaTek supplies hardware, firmware, and/or software, including software drivers, that are especially made or especially adapted to practice the inventions claimed in the '438 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '438 Patent, to induce third parties, including for example MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, to use the Infringing Products in a manner that would infringe one or more claims of the '438 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '438 Patent.

141. Upon information and belief, MediaTek furnishes instructive materials, technical support, and information concerning the operation and use of the Infringing Products, including with MediaTek's firmware or software drivers, and markets and advertises the Infringing Products on its website, to induce third parties, including MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the

Infringing Products, to use the Infringing Products in a manner that would infringe one or more claims of the '438 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '438 Patent.

142. MediaTek knew or should have known of the '438 Patent through a series of correspondence and meetings expressly notifying MediaTek of the '438 Patent and MediaTek's infringement thereof. As a result, MediaTek knew it infringed one or more claims of the '438 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '438 Patent, at least as early as January 17, 2018. Despite this knowledge, MediaTek continued to induce third parties, including MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, to infringe one or more claims of the '438 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '438 Patent with the specific intent to cause infringement. MediaTek knew or should have known that those acts would induce actual infringement by third parties, including MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, of one or more of the claims of the '438 Patent, including at least Claim 1.

143. MediaTek has actual knowledge of the '438 Patent, and its infringement thereof, at least as of the date of filing of this Complaint.

144. Therefore, MediaTek has induced infringement by others of one or more of the claims of the '438 Patent, including at least Claim 1, with the specific intent to induce acts that constitute infringement of the '438 Patent and with knowledge that such acts infringed one or more claims of the '438 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '438 Patent.

145. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(c), MediaTek is and has been infringing one or more of the claims of the '438 Patent, including at least Claim 1, indirectly by contributing to the infringement of one or more of the claims of the '438 Patent, including at least Claim 1, by third parties, including for example MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, in this District and elsewhere in the United States. Direct infringement by, for example,

MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, occurs by at least the use of the Infringing Products.

146. MediaTek makes and sells hardware and/or software components (*e.g.* processors and/or software drivers) especially made or especially adapted to practice the invention claimed in the '438 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '438 Patent, and that (i) is a material part of the invention and (ii) is not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use at least because it is specifically designed to perform the claimed functionality. Any other use of such hardware and/or software would be unusual, far-fetched, illusory, impractical, occasional, aberrant, or experimental.

147. Therefore, MediaTek has contributed to the infringement by others of one or more of the claims of the '438 Patent, including at least Claim 1.

148. MediaTek's infringement of one or more claims of the '438 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '438 Patent, has been, and continues to be, willful.

149. MediaTek had actual knowledge of the '438 Patent at least as early as January 17, 2018, when MOSAID notified MediaTek of the '438 Patent and MediaTek's infringement thereof. Despite knowing of the '438 Patent as early as January 17, 2018, MediaTek did not cease its infringing activities.

150. As explained above, between January 17, 2018 and November 29, 2022, MOSAID notified MediaTek on several occasions of the '438 Patent and MediaTek's infringement of one or more claims of the '438 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '438 Patent.

151. Despite this knowledge, MediaTek continued to infringe one or more claims of the '438 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '438 Patent, in disregard of MOSAID's patent rights. As a result, MediaTek deliberately and intentionally infringed the '438 Patent, and continues to do

so, after receiving express and actual knowledge of both the '438 Patent and its infringement thereof.

152. Therefore, MediaTek's infringement of the '438 Patent has been and continues to be willful, wanton, malicious, in bad faith, deliberate, consciously wrongful, flagrant, or characteristic of a pirate, entitling MOSAID to increased damages pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284 and to attorneys' fees and costs incurred in prosecuting this action pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285.

COUNT V: INFRINGEMENT OF THE '077 PATENT

153. MOSAID incorporates by reference and realleges paragraphs 1 through 152 as if specifically set forth herein.

154. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), MediaTek is and has been directly infringing one or more of the claims of the '077 Patent, including at least Claim 1, either literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, by making, using, selling, and/or offering for sale in the United States, and/or importing into the United States, without authority, at least the Infringing Products.

155. During license discussions, MOSAID provided MediaTek with claim charts explaining in detail MediaTek's infringement of the '077 Patent, including at least Claim 1.

156. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b), MediaTek is and has been infringing one or more of the claims of the '077 Patent, including at least Claim 1, indirectly by inducing the infringement of one or more claims of the '077 Patent, including at least Claim 1, by third parties, including for example MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, in this District and elsewhere in the United States. Direct infringement by, for example, MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, occurs by at least the use of the Infringing Products.

157. Upon information and belief, MediaTek supplies hardware, firmware, and/or software, including software drivers, that are especially made or especially adapted to practice the

inventions claimed in the '077 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '077 Patent, to induce third parties, including for example MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, to use the Infringing Products in a manner that would infringe one or more claims of the '077 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '077 Patent.

158. Upon information and belief, MediaTek furnishes instructive materials, technical support, and information concerning the operation and use of the Infringing Products, including with MediaTek's firmware or software drivers, and markets and advertises the Infringing Products on its website, to induce third parties, including MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, to use the Infringing Products in a manner that would infringe one or more claims of the '077 Patent, including at least Claim 1.

159. MediaTek knew or should have known of the '077 Patent through a series of correspondence and meetings expressly notifying MediaTek of the '077 Patent and MediaTek's infringement thereof. As a result, MediaTek knew it infringed one or more claims of the '077 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '077 Patent, at least as early as January 17, 2018. Despite this knowledge, MediaTek continued to induce third parties, including MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, to infringe one or more claims of the '077 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '077 Patent, with the specific intent to cause infringement. MediaTek knew or should have known that those acts would induce actual infringement by third parties, including MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, of one or more of the claims of the '077 Patent, including at least Claim 1.

160. MediaTek has actual knowledge of the '077 Patent, and its infringement thereof, at least as of the date of filing of this Complaint.

161. Therefore, MediaTek has induced infringement by others of one or more of the claims of the '077 Patent, including at least Claim 1, with the specific intent to induce acts that constitute infringement of the '077 Patent and with knowledge that such acts infringed one or more claims of the '077 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '077 Patent.

162. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(c), MediaTek is and has been infringing one or more of the claims of the '077 Patent, including at least Claim 1, indirectly by contributing to the infringement of one or more of the claims of the '077 Patent, including at least Claim 1, by third parties, including for example MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, in this District and elsewhere in the United States. Direct infringement by, for example, MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, occurs by at least the use of the Infringing Products.

163. MediaTek makes and sells hardware and/or software components (*e.g.* processors and/or software drivers) especially made or especially adapted to practice the invention claimed in the '077 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '077 Patent, and that (i) is a material part of the invention and (ii) is not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use at least because it is specifically designed to perform the claimed functionality. Any other use of such hardware and/or software would be unusual, far-fetched, illusory, impractical, occasional, aberrant, or experimental.

164. Therefore, MediaTek has contributed to the infringement by others of one or more of the claims of the '077 Patent, including at least Claim 1.

165. MediaTek's infringement of one or more claims of the '077 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '077 Patent, has been, and continues to be, willful.

166. MediaTek had actual knowledge of the '077 Patent at least as early as January 17, 2018, when MOSAID notified MediaTek of the '077 Patent, and MediaTek's infringement thereof. Despite knowing of the '077 Patent as early as January 17, 2018, MediaTek did not cease its infringing activities.

167. As explained above, between January 17, 2018 and November 29, 2022, MOSAID notified MediaTek on several occasions of the '077 Patent and MediaTek's infringement of one or more claims of the '077 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '077 Patent.

168. Despite this knowledge, MediaTek continued to infringe one or more claims of the '077 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '077 Patent, in disregard of MOSAID's patent rights. As a result, MediaTek deliberately and intentionally infringed the '077 Patent, and continues to do so, after receiving express and actual knowledge of both the '077 Patent and its infringement thereof.

169. Therefore, MediaTek's infringement of the '077 Patent has been and continues to be willful, wanton, malicious, in bad faith, deliberate, consciously wrongful, flagrant, or characteristic of a pirate, entitling MOSAID to increased damages pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284 and to attorneys' fees and costs incurred in prosecuting this action pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285.

COUNT VI: INFRINGEMENT OF THE '349 PATENT

170. MOSAID incorporates by reference and realleges paragraphs 1 through 169 as if specifically set forth herein.

171. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), MediaTek is and has been directly infringing one or more of the claims of the '349 Patent, including at least Claim 1, either literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, by making, using, selling, and/or offering for sale in the United States, and/or importing into the United States, without authority, at least the Infringing Products.

172. During license discussions, MOSAID provided MediaTek with claim charts explaining in detail MediaTek's infringement of the '349 Patent, including at least Claim 1.

173. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b), MediaTek is and has been infringing one or more of the claims of the '349 Patent, including at least Claim 1, indirectly by inducing the infringement of one or more of the claims of the '349 Patent, including at least Claim 1, by third parties, including for example MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, in this District and elsewhere in the United States. Direct infringement by, for example, MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, occurs by at least the use of the Infringing Products.

174. Upon information and belief, MediaTek supplies hardware, firmware, and/or software, including software drivers, that are especially made or especially adapted to practice the inventions claimed in the '349 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '349 Patent, to induce third parties, including for example MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, to use the Infringing Products in a manner that would infringe one or more of the claims of the '349 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '349 Patent.

175. Upon information and belief, MediaTek furnishes instructive materials, technical support, and information concerning the operation and use of the Infringing Products, including with MediaTek's firmware or software drivers, and markets and advertises the Infringing Products on its website, to induce third parties, including MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, to use the Infringing Products in a manner that would infringe one or more claims of the '349 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '349 Patent.

176. MediaTek knew or should have known of the '349 Patent through a series of correspondence and meetings expressly notifying MediaTek of the '349 Patent and MediaTek's

infringement thereof. As a result, MediaTek knew it infringed one or more of the claims of the '349 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '349 Patent, at least as early as January 17, 2018. Despite this knowledge, MediaTek continued to induce third parties, including MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, to infringe one or more claims of the '349 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '349 Patent with the specific intent to cause infringement. MediaTek knew or should have known that those acts would induce actual infringement by third parties, including MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, of one or more of the claims of the '349 Patent, including at least Claim 1.

177. MediaTek has actual knowledge of the '349 Patent, and its infringement thereof, at least as of the date of filing of this Complaint.

178. Therefore, MediaTek has induced infringement by others of one or more of the claims of the '349 Patent, including at least Claim 1, with the specific intent to induce acts that constitute infringement of the '349 Patent and with knowledge that such acts infringed one or more claims of the '349 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '349 Patent.

179. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(c), MediaTek is and has been infringing one or more of the claims of the '349 Patent, including at least Claim 1, indirectly by contributing to the infringement of one or more of the claims of the '349 Patent, including at least Claim 1, by third parties, including for example MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, in this District and elsewhere in the United States. Direct infringement by, for example, MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, occurs by at least the use of the Infringing Products.

180. MediaTek makes and sells hardware and/or software components (*e.g.* processors and/or software drivers) especially made or especially adapted to practice the invention claimed in

the '349 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '349 Patent, and that (i) is a material part of the invention and (ii) is not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use at least because it is specifically designed to perform the claimed functionality. Any other use of such hardware and/or software would be unusual, far-fetched, illusory, impractical, occasional, aberrant, or experimental.

181. Therefore, MediaTek has contributed to the infringement by others of one or more of the claims of the '349 Patent, including at least Claim 1.

182. MediaTek's infringement of one or more of the claims of the '349 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '349 Patent, has been, and continues to be, willful.

183. MediaTek had actual knowledge of the '349 Patent at least as early as January 17, 2018, when MOSAID notified MediaTek of the '349 Patent, and MediaTek's infringement thereof. Despite knowing of the '349 Patent as early as January 17, 2018, MediaTek did not cease its infringing activities.

184. As explained above, between January 17, 2018 and November 29, 2022, MOSAID notified MediaTek on several occasions of the '349 Patent and MediaTek's infringement of one or more of the claims of the '349 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '349 Patent.

185. Despite this knowledge, MediaTek continued to infringe one or more of the claims of the '349 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '349 Patent, in disregard of MOSAID's patent rights. As a result, MediaTek deliberately and intentionally infringed the '349 Patent, and continues to do so, after receiving express and actual knowledge of both the '349 Patent and its infringement thereof.

186. Therefore, MediaTek's infringement of the '349 Patent has been and continues to be willful, wanton, malicious, in bad faith, deliberate, consciously wrongful, flagrant, or

characteristic of a pirate, entitling MOSAID to increased damages pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284 and to attorneys' fees and costs incurred in prosecuting this action pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285.

COUNT VII: INFRINGEMENT OF THE '563 PATENT

187. MOSAID incorporates by reference and realleges paragraphs 1 through 186 as if specifically set forth herein.

188. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), MediaTek is and has been directly infringing one or more of the claims of the '563 Patent, including at least Claim 1, either literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, by making, using, selling, and/or offering for sale in the United States, and/or importing into the United States, without authority, at least the Infringing Products.

189. During license discussions, MOSAID provided MediaTek with claim charts explaining in detail MediaTek's infringement of the '563 Patent, including at least Claim 1.

190. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b), MediaTek is and has been infringing one or more of the claims of the '563 Patent, including at least Claim 1, indirectly by inducing the infringement of one or more claims of the '563 Patent, including at least Claim 1, by third parties, including for example MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, in this District and elsewhere in the United States. Direct infringement by, for example, MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, occurs by at least the use of the Infringing Products.

191. Upon information and belief, MediaTek supplies hardware, firmware, and/or software, including software drivers, that are especially made or especially adapted to practice the inventions claimed in the '563 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '563 Patent, to induce third parties, including for example MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, to use the Infringing Products in a manner that would infringe one or more claims of the '563 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '563 Patent.

192. Upon information and belief, MediaTek furnishes instructive materials, technical support, and information concerning the operation and use of the Infringing Products, including with MediaTek's firmware or software drivers, and markets and advertises the Infringing Products on its website, to induce third parties, including MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, to use the Infringing Products in a manner that would infringe one or more claims of the '563 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '563 Patent.

193. MediaTek knew or should have known of the '563 Patent through a series of correspondence and meetings expressly notifying MediaTek of the '563 Patent and MediaTek's infringement thereof. As a result, MediaTek knew it infringed one or more claims of the '563 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '563 Patent, at least as early as January 17, 2018. Despite this knowledge, MediaTek continued to induce third parties, including MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, to infringe one or more claims of the '563 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '563 Patent with the specific intent to cause infringement. MediaTek knew or should have known that those acts would induce actual infringement by third parties, including MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, of one or more of the claims of the '563 Patent, including at least Claim 1.

194. MediaTek has actual knowledge of the '563 Patent, and its infringement thereof, at least as of the date of filing of this Complaint.

195. Therefore, MediaTek has induced infringement by others of one or more of the claims of the '563 Patent, including at least Claim 1, with the specific intent to induce acts that constitute infringement of the '563 Patent and with knowledge that such acts infringed one or more claims of the '563 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '563 Patent.

196. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(c), MediaTek is and has been infringing one or more of the claims of the '563 Patent, including at least Claim 1, indirectly by contributing to the infringement of one or more of the claims of the '563 Patent, including at least Claim 1, by third parties, including for example MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, in this District and elsewhere in the United States. Direct infringement by, for example, MediaTek's customers and/or end-users of the Infringing Products, occurs by at least the use of the Infringing Products.

197. MediaTek makes and sells hardware and/or software components (*e.g.* processors and/or software drivers) especially made or especially adapted to practice the invention claimed in the '563 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '563 Patent, and that (i) is a material part of the invention and (ii) is not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use at least because it is specifically designed to perform the claimed functionality. Any other use of such hardware and/or software would be unusual, far-fetched, illusory, impractical, occasional, aberrant, or experimental.

198. Therefore, MediaTek has contributed to the infringement by others of one or more of the claims of the '563 Patent, including at least Claim 1.

199. MediaTek's infringement of one or more claims of the '563 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '563 Patent, has been, and continues to be, willful.

200. MediaTek had actual knowledge of the '563 Patent at least as early as January 17, 2018, when MOSAID notified MediaTek of the '563 Patent, and MediaTek's infringement thereof. Despite knowing of the '563 Patent as early as January 17, 2018, MediaTek did not cease its infringing activities.

201. As explained above, between January 17, 2018 and November 29, 2022, MOSAID notified MediaTek on several occasions of the '563 Patent and MediaTek's infringement of one or more claims of the '563 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '563 Patent.

202. Despite this knowledge, MediaTek continued to infringe one or more claims of the '563 Patent, including at least Claim 1 of the '563 Patent, in disregard of MOSAID's patent rights. As a result, MediaTek deliberately and intentionally infringed the '563 Patent, and continues to do so, after receiving express and actual knowledge of both the '563 Patent and its infringement thereof.

203. Therefore, MediaTek's infringement of the '563 Patent has been and continues to be willful, wanton, malicious, in bad faith, deliberate, consciously wrongful, flagrant, or characteristic of a pirate, entitling MOSAID to increased damages pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284 and to attorneys' fees and costs incurred in prosecuting this action pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285.

DAMAGES

204. MediaTek's acts of infringement have caused damages to MOSAID, and MOSAID is entitled to recover the damages it has sustained as a result of MediaTek's wrongful acts in an amount to be determined at trial.

205. MOSAID is entitled to, and now seeks to, recover damages in an amount not less than the maximum amount permitted by law caused by MediaTek's acts of infringement.

206. As a result of MediaTek's acts of infringement, MOSAID has suffered actual and consequential damages. To the fullest extent permitted by law, MOSAID seeks recovery of damages in an amount to compensate for MediaTek's infringement. MOSAID further seeks any other damages to which MOSAID would be entitled to in law or in equity.

INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

207. MediaTek's acts of infringement have caused—and unless restrained and enjoined, MediaTek's acts of infringement will continue to cause—irreparable injury and damage to MOSAID for which MOSAID has no adequate remedy at law. Unless enjoined by this Court, MediaTek will continue to infringe the claims of the Asserted Patents.

ATTORNEYS' FEES

208. MOSAID is entitled to recover reasonable and necessary attorneys' fees under applicable law.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

209. Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, MOSAID demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, MOSAID prays for judgment and requests that the Court find in its favor and against MediaTek. MOSAID respectfully requests that the Court enter preliminary and final orders, declarations, and judgments against MediaTek as are necessary to provide MOSAID with the following relief:

- a. A judgment that MediaTek has infringed and/or is infringing one or more claims of the Asserted Patents, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, as alleged above;
- b. A judgment that MediaTek has infringed and/or is infringing one or more claims of the Asserted Patents, directly, as alleged above;
- c. A judgment that MediaTek has infringed and/or is infringing one or more claims of the Asserted Patents, indirectly, as alleged above;

d. A judgment that MediaTek's infringement of the claims of the Asserted Patents has been willful;

e. An award for all damages and costs arising out of MediaTek's infringement, to adequately compensate MOSAID for MediaTek's infringement of the Asserted Patents, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty, including supplemental damages for any continuing post-verdict infringement up until entry of the final judgment, with an accounting, as needed;

f. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest, jointly and severally, in an amount according to proof;

g. Treble damages based on MediaTek's willful infringement;

h. An accounting of damages and any future compensation due to MOSAID for MediaTek's infringement (past, present, or future) not specifically accounted for in a damages award (or other relief), and/or permanent injunctive relief;

i. A judgment that this case is exceptional and an award of reasonable attorneys' fees as provided by 35 U.S.C. § 285 and enhanced damages as provided by 35 U.S.C. § 284;

j. An award of costs of suit;

k. The entry of an order enjoining and restraining MediaTek and its parents, affiliates, subsidiaries, officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, successors, and assigns and all persons in active concert or participation therewith, from making, importing, using, offering for sale, selling, or causing to be sold any product falling within the scope of any claim of the Asserted Patents, or otherwise infringing or inducing infringement of any claim of the Asserted Patents; and

1. All further relief in law or in equity as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: March 28, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jamie H. McDole

Jamie H. McDole

LEAD COUNSEL

State Bar No. 24082049

Phillip B. Philbin

State Bar No. 15909020

Michael D. Karson

State Bar No. 24090198

WINSTEAD PC

2728 N. Harwood Street

Suite 500

Dallas, Texas 75201

Tel.: (214) 745-5400

Fax: (214) 745-5390

Email: jmcdole@winstead.com

pphilbin@winstead.com

mkarson@winstead.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

MOSAID Technologies Inc.