

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
AUSTIN DIVISION**

MICROELECTRONIC INNOVATIONS,  
LLC,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

ANALOG DEVICES, INC.,

*Defendant.*

**Civil Action No. 1:23-cv-779**

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

Plaintiff Microelectronic Innovations, LLC (“Plaintiff”), for its Complaint against Defendant Analog Devices, Inc., (“Defendant”), alleges the following:

**NATURE OF THE ACTION**

1. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1 *et seq.*

**THE PARTIES**

2. Plaintiff is a limited liability company organized under the laws of the State of Delaware with a registered agent at 717 North Union Street, Wilmington, DE, 19805.

3. Upon information and belief, Defendant is a Massachusetts corporation and has offices and facilities across North America, South America, Europe, Africa, and Asia, including its corporate headquarters at One Analog Way, Wilmington, MA 01887. (*See* <https://www.analog.com/en/about-adi/corporate-information.html>.) Defendant also maintains a regular and established place of business at 3900 N. Capital of Texas Highway, Austin, TX.

78746. (See <https://www.analog.com/en/about-adi/corporate-information/sales-distribution.html>.) Defendant also has a registered agent for service of process, Corporation Service Company d/b/a CSC-Lawyers Inc., located at 211 E. 7th Street, Suite 620, Austin, TX 78701. Upon information and belief, Defendant makes, uses, imports, offers to sell, and/or sells products and related services throughout the United States, including in this judicial district, and introduces infringing products and services into the stream of commerce knowing that they would be sold and/or used in this judicial district and elsewhere in the United States.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

4. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the Patent Laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code. This claim arises under federal law.

5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

6. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant under the laws of the State of Texas, due at least to its substantial business presence in Texas and in this judicial district, directly or through intermediaries, including: (i) at least a portion of the infringement alleged herein; and (ii) regularly doing or soliciting business, engaging in other persistent courses of conduct and/or deriving substantial revenue from goods and services sold in the State of Texas. Defendant is registered to do business in the State of Texas, has offices in the State of Texas including in this judicial district, and has continuously transacted business in the State of Texas, including having committed acts of patent infringement in the Western District of Texas as alleged herein.

7. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b)-(d) and 1400(b). Defendant maintains a regular and established place of business at 3900 N. Capital of Texas Highway, Austin, TX. 78746, and, upon information and belief, has and continues to commit acts of patent infringement in this judicial district as alleged herein.

8. On information and belief, Defendant currently employs in its Austin facility in this District, personnel in positions related to at least the sales, design, engineering, development, testing, and/or customer support of products that are relevant to the Asserted Patents, and continues advertising additional employment positions at its Austin facility.

(<https://analogdevices.wd1.myworkdayjobs.com/External>.)

## **BACKGROUND**

### **The Invention**

9. The patents asserted herein were invented by inventors employed by STMicroelectronics S.A. of France, STMicroelectronics S.r.l. of Italy, STMicroelectronics N.V. of the Netherlands, or STMicroelectronics Pvt. Ltd., and/or affiliates thereof (collectively “STMicroelectronics”), to whom the inventors were obligated to assign their patent rights, including to U.S. Patent Nos. 7,130,594 (“the ’594 patent”); 7,177,605 (“the ’605 patent”); 7,298,218 (“the ’218 patent”); and 7,671,769 (“the ’769 patent”), (collectively the “Asserted Patents”). The Asserted Patents were subsequently assigned by STMicroelectronics to France Brevets of France, and then assigned them to Plaintiff. True and correct copies of the Asserted Patents are attached as Exhibits A-1, B-1, C-1, and D-1, respectively.

10. The patents resulted from the pioneering efforts of Patrick Cerisier of France (’594 and ’605 patents), Andréa Panigada of Italy (’594 patent), Giovanni Cerusa of Italy (’605 patent), Mostafa Ghazali of France (’218 patent), Jouffre Pierre-Olivier of France (’218 patent), and Giovanni Antonio Cesura and Roberto Giampiero Massolini of Italy (’769 patent), in the area of microelectronics technology.

11. The patented inventions disclosed in the Asserted Patents resolves technical problems related to microelectronic circuits.

12. The claims of the Asserted Patents do not merely recite the performance of some well-known business practice from the pre-Internet world along with the requirement to perform it on the Internet. Instead, the claims of the Asserted Patents recite inventive concepts that are deeply rooted in specific microelectronic circuitry and architecture.

13. In addition, the claims of the Asserted Patents recite inventive concepts that improve the functioning of that circuitry as compared to prior art components as set forth in the Asserted Patents.

14. Moreover, the claims of the Asserted Patents recite inventive concepts that are not merely routine or conventional, and provide new and novel solutions to specific problems related to improving the performance of specific microelectronic products.

15. Finally, the patented inventions disclosed in the Asserted Patents do not preempt all the ways that such microelectronic products can be configured, nor do they preempt any other well-known or prior art technology.

16. Accordingly, the claims in the Asserted Patents recite a combination of specific elements and structures sufficient to ensure that the claim in substance and in practice amounts to significantly more than a patent-ineligible abstract idea.

**COUNT I – INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,130,594**

17. The allegations set forth in the foregoing paragraphs are incorporated into this First Claim for Relief.

18. On October 31, 2006, the '594 patent was duly and legally issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office under the title “Power Amplification Device, Especially with Reduced Input Dynamic Swing, in Particular for a Cellular Mobile Telephone.”

19. Plaintiff is the assignee and owner of the right, title, and interest in and to the '594 patent, including the right to assert all causes of action arising under said patent and the right to any remedies for infringement of it.

20. Upon information and belief, Defendant has and continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the '594 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) by, without authority, making, using, importing, offering to sell, and/or selling products and services throughout the United States, including in this judicial district, and introducing infringing products and services into the stream of commerce knowing that they would be sold and/or used in this judicial district and elsewhere in the United States, specifically one or more power amplification devices, which by way of example includes Defendant's Broadband Up/Downconverting Mixers with Integrated Fractional-N PLL and VCO products including, but not limited to, Defendant's exemplary "ADRF6655" product. *See* Exhibit A-2; *see also* <https://www.analog.com/media/en/technical-documentation/data-sheets/ADRF6655.pdf>. Defendant's exemplary ADRF6655 product and each of Defendant's similarly configured devices are identified herein as the "Accused Products". Exhibit E hereto contains a non-exhaustive listing of additional products identified from Defendant's website that are considered "Accused Products."

21. Exemplary infringement analysis showing infringement of at least claim 1 of the '594 patent by the exemplary Accused Products is set forth in Exhibit A-2. This infringement analysis is necessarily preliminary, as it is provided in advance of any discovery provided by Defendant with respect to its Accused Products. Plaintiff reserves all rights to amend, supplement, and modify this preliminary infringement analysis as discovery progresses. Nothing in the attached claim chart should be construed as any express or implied contention or admission regarding the construction of any term or phrase of the claims of the '594 patent.

22. The Accused Products infringed and continue to infringe at least claim 1 of the '594 patent, by meeting each claim element either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, as set forth in Exhibit A-2.

23. Plaintiff has been harmed by the Defendant's infringement of the '594 patent.

**COUNT II – INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,177,605**

24. The allegations set forth in the foregoing paragraphs are incorporated into this Second Claim for Relief.

25. On February 13, 2007, the '605 patent was duly and legally issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office under the title "Power Amplification Device, in Particular for a Cellular Mobile Telephone."

26. Plaintiff is the assignee and owner of the right, title, and interest in and to the '605 patent, including the right to assert all causes of action arising under said patent and the right to any remedies for infringement of it.

27. Upon information and belief, Defendant has and continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the '605 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) by making, using, importing, offering to sell, and/or selling products and related services throughout the United States, including in this judicial district, and introducing infringing products and services into the stream of commerce knowing that they would be sold and/or used in this judicial district and elsewhere in the United States, specifically one or more power amplification devices, which by way of example includes Defendant's Broadband Up/Downconverting Mixer with Integrated Fractional-N PLL and VCO products including, but not limited to, Defendant's exemplary "ADRF6655" product. *See* Exhibit A-2; *see also* <https://www.analog.com/media/en/technical-documentation/data-sheets/ADRF6655.pdf>. Defendant's exemplary ADRF6655 product and

each of Defendant's similarly configured devices are identified herein as the "Accused Products". Exhibit E hereto contains a non-exhaustive listing of additional products identified from Defendant's website that are considered "Accused Products".

28. Exemplary infringement analysis showing infringement of at least claim 1 of the '605 patent by the exemplary Accused Products is set forth in Exhibit B-2. This infringement analysis is necessarily preliminary, as it is provided in advance of any discovery provided by Defendant with respect to its Accused Products. Plaintiff reserves all rights to amend, supplement, and modify this preliminary infringement analysis as discovery progresses. Nothing in the attached claim chart should be construed as any express or implied contention or admission regarding the construction of any term or phrase of the claims of the '605 patent.

29. The Accused Products infringed and continue to infringe at least claim 1 of the '605 patent, by meeting each claim element either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, as set forth in Exhibit B-2.

30. Plaintiff has been harmed by the Defendant's infringement of the '605 patent.

**COUNT III – INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,298,218**

31. The allegations set forth in the foregoing paragraphs are incorporated into this Third Claim for Relief.

32. On November 20, 2007, the '218 patent was duly and legally issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office under the title "Frequency Synthesizer Architecture."

33. Plaintiff is the assignee and owner of the right, title, and interest in and to the '218 patent, including the right to assert all causes of action arising under said patent and the right to any remedies for infringement of it.

34. Upon information and belief, Defendant has and continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the '218 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) by making, using, importing, offering to sell, and/or selling products and services throughout the United States, including in this judicial district, and introducing infringing products and services into the stream of commerce knowing that they would be sold and/or used in this judicial district and elsewhere in the United States, specifically one or more of Defendant's Microwave Wideband Synthesizers with Integrated VCO products including, but not limited to, Defendant's exemplary "ADF4372" product. Defendant's ADF4372 products and each of Defendant's similarly configured devices are identified herein as the "Accused Products." Exhibit E hereto contains a non-exhaustive listing of additional products identified from Defendant's website that are considered "Accused Products."

35. Exemplary infringement analysis showing infringement of at least claim 31 of the '218 patent by the exemplary Accused Products is set forth in Exhibit C-2. This infringement analysis is necessarily preliminary, as it is provided in advance of any discovery provided by Defendant with respect to its Accused Products. Plaintiff reserves all rights to amend, supplement, and modify this preliminary infringement analysis as discovery progresses. Nothing in the attached claim chart should be construed as any express or implied contention or admission regarding the construction of any term or phrase of the claims of the '218 patent.

36. The Accused Products infringed and continue to infringe at least claim 31 of the '218 patent, by meeting each claim element either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, as set forth in Exhibit C-2.

37. Plaintiff has been harmed by the Defendant's infringement of the '218 patent.



**COUNT IV – INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,671,769**

38. The allegations set forth in the foregoing paragraphs are incorporated into this Fourth Claim for Relief.

39. On March 2, 2010, the '769 patent was duly and legally issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office under the title “Multistage Analog/Digital Converter and Method for Calibrating Said Converter.”

40. Plaintiff is the assignee and owner of the right, title, and interest in and to the '769 patent, including the right to assert all causes of action arising under said patent and the right to any remedies for infringement of it.

41. Upon information and belief, Defendant has and continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the '769 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) by making, using, importing, offering to sell, and/or selling products and services throughout the United States, including in this judicial district, and introducing infringing products and services into the stream of commerce knowing that they would be sold and/or used in this judicial district and elsewhere in the United States, specifically one or more of Defendant's 16-Bit, 25MSPS/10MSPS ADC products, including but not limited to, Defendant's exemplary LTC2203/LTC2202 products. *See* Exhibit D-2. *See also* <https://www.analog.com/media/en/technical-documentation/data-sheets/22032fd.pdf>.

Defendant's LTC2203/LTC2202 products and each of Defendant's similarly configured devices are identified herein as the “Accused Products”. Exhibit E hereto contains a non-exhaustive listing of additional products identified from Defendant's website that are considered “Accused Products.”

42. Exemplary infringement analysis showing infringement of at least claim 16 of the '769 patent is set forth in Exhibit D-2. This infringement analysis is necessarily preliminary, as it

is provided in advance of any discovery provided by Defendant with respect to its Accused Products. Plaintiff reserves all rights to amend, supplement, and modify this preliminary infringement analysis as discovery progresses. Nothing in the attached claim chart should be construed as any express or implied contention or admission regarding the construction of any term or phrase of the claims of the '769 patent.

43. The Accused Products infringed and continue to infringe at least claim 16 of the '769 patent, by meeting each claim element either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, as set forth in Exhibit D-2

44. Plaintiff has been harmed by the Defendant's infringement of the '769 patent.

**JURY DEMAND**

Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all issues triable as such.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment for itself and against Defendant as follows:

A. An adjudication that the Defendant has infringed one or more claims of each of the Asserted Patents;

B. An award of damages to be paid by Defendant adequate to compensate Plaintiff for Defendant's past infringement of one or more claims of the Asserted Patents, and any continuing or future infringement through the date such judgment is entered, including interest, costs, expenses, and an accounting of all infringements by Defendant;

C. A declaration that this case is exceptional under 35 U.S.C. § 285, and an award of Plaintiff's reasonable attorneys' fees; and

D. An award to Plaintiff of such further relief at law or in equity as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: July 12, 2023

DEVLIN LAW FIRM LLC

/s/ James Lennon

Timothy Devlin  
tdevlin@devlinlawfirm.com

James Lennon  
jlennon@devlinlawfirm.com

Alan Wright  
awright@devlinlawfirm.com

1526 Gilpin Avenue  
Wilmington, DE 19806

Telephone: (302) 449-9010

Facsimile: (302) 353-4251

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
*Microelectronic Innovations, LLC*