

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

**VDPP, LLC
Plaintiff,**

v.

**BEST BUY CO., INC.,
Defendant**

Civil Action No. 2:24-cv-00164

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

PLAINTIFF'S ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, VDPP, LLC, (“VDPP”) files this Original Complaint and demand for jury trial seeking relief from patent infringement of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 10,021,380 (“the ‘380 patent”) (Exhibit A) and the claims of US Patent No. 9,948,922 (“the ’922 patent) (Exhibit C) (the “patents-in-suit”) by Best Buy CO., INC. (“Best Buy” or “Defendant”).

I. THE PARTIES

1. Plaintiff VDPP is a company organized under the laws of Oregon with a principal place of business located in Corvallis, Oregon.

2. On information and belief, Defendant is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Minnesota. Defendant has its headquarters at PO BOX 9312, Minneapolis, MN 55440 USA.

3. Defendant can be served at C T Corporation, 1999 Bryan St., Suite 900, Dallas, Texas 75201, at its place of business, or anywhere else it may be found.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This civil action arises under the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1 *et seq.*, including without limitation 35 U.S.C. §§ 271, 281, 283, 284, and 285 based on Defendant's

unauthorized commercial manufacture, use, importation, offer for sale, and sale of the Accused Products in the United States. This is a patent infringement lawsuit over which this Court has subject matter jurisdiction under, *inter alia*, 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332, and 1338(a).

5. This United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas has general and specific personal jurisdiction over Defendant because, directly or through intermediaries, Defendant has committed acts within the District giving rise to this action and are present in and transact and conduct business in and with residents of this District and the State of Texas.

6. Plaintiff's causes of action arise, at least in part, from Defendant's contacts with and activities in this District and the State of Texas.

7. Defendant has committed acts of infringing the patents-in-suit within this District and the State of Texas by making, using, selling, offering for sale, and/or importing in or into this District and elsewhere in the State of Texas, products claimed by the patents-in-suit, including without limitation products made by practicing the claimed methods of the patents-in-suit. Defendant, directly and through intermediaries, makes, uses, sells, offers for sale, imports, ships, distributes, advertises, promotes, and/or otherwise commercializes such infringing products into this District and the State of Texas. Defendant regularly conducts and solicits business in, engages in other persistent courses of conduct in, and/or derives substantial revenue from goods and services provided to residents of this District and the State of Texas.

8. Furthermore, this Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant, because in addition to Defendant's online website and advertising within this District; Defendant has regular and established places of business throughout this District, including at least at 422 W Loop 281, Ste 100 Longview, TX 75605.

9. The amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000 exclusive of interests and costs.

10. Venue is proper in this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b) based on information set forth herein, which is hereby repeated and incorporated by reference. Further, upon information and belief, Defendant has committed or induced acts of infringement, and/or advertise, market, sell, and/or offer to sell products, including infringing products, in this District. In addition, and without limitation, Defendant has regular and established places of business throughout this District, including at least at 422 W Loop 281, Ste 100 Longview, TX 75605.

III. INFRINGEMENT

A. Infringement of the '922 Patent

11. On April 17, 2018, U.S. Patent No. 9,948,922 (“the '922 patent,” included as Exhibit A and part of this complaint) entitled “Faster State Transitioning for Continuous Adjustable 3DeepS Filter Spectacles Using Multi-Layered Variable Tint Materials” was duly and legally issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Plaintiff owns the '922 patent by assignment.

12. The '922 patent relates to an electrically controlled spectacle frame and optoelectronic lenses housed in the frame.

13. Defendant maintains, operates, and administers systems, products, and services in the field of motion pictures that infringes one or more of claims of the '922 patent, including one or more of claims 1-12, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents. Defendant put the inventions claimed by the '922 Patent into service (i.e., used them); but for Defendant's actions, the claimed-inventions embodiments involving Defendant's products and services would never have been put into service. Defendant's acts complained of herein caused those claimed-invention embodiments as a whole to perform, and Defendant's procurement of monetary and commercial benefit from it.

14. Support for the allegations of infringement may be found in the preliminary exemplary table attached as Exhibit B. These allegations of infringement are preliminary and are therefore subject to change.

15. Defendant has and continues to induce infringement. Defendant has actively encouraged or instructed others (e.g., its customers and/or the customers of its related companies), and continues to do so, on how to use its products and services (e.g., a system related to an electrically controlled spectacle frame and optoelectronic lenses housed in the frame) and related services such as to cause infringement of one or more of claims 1-12 of the '922 patent, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents. Moreover, Defendant has known of the '922 patent and the technology underlying it from at least the filing date of the lawsuit.¹ For clarity, direct infringement is previously alleged in this complaint.

16. Defendant has and continues to contributorily infringe. Defendant has actively encouraged or instructed others (e.g., its customers and/or the customers of its related companies), and continues to do so, on how to use its products and services (e.g., a system related to an electrically controlled spectacle frame and optoelectronic lenses housed in the frame) and related services such as to cause infringement of one or more of claims 1-12 of the '922 patent, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents. Moreover, Defendant has known of the '922 patent and the technology underlying it from at least the filing date of the lawsuit.² For clarity, direct infringement is previously alleged in this complaint.

17. Defendant has caused and will continue to cause Plaintiff damage by direct and indirect infringement of (including inducing infringement of) the claims of the '922 patent.

¹ Plaintiff reserves the right to amend if discovery reveals an earlier date of knowledge.

² Plaintiff reserves the right to amend if discovery reveals an earlier date of knowledge.

B. Infringement of the '380 Patent

18. On July 10, 2018, U.S. Patent No. 10,021,380 (“the '380 patent,” included as Exhibit C and part of this complaint) entitled “Faster State Transitioning for Continuous Adjustable 3Deeps Filter Spectacles Using Multi-Layered Variable Tint Materials” was duly and legally issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Plaintiff owns the '380 patent by assignment.

19. The '380 patent relates to an electrically controlled spectacle frame and optoelectronic lenses housed in the frame.

20. Defendant maintains, operates, and administers systems, products, and services in the field of motion pictures that infringes one or more of claims of the '480 patent, including one or more of claims 1-30, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents. Defendant put the inventions claimed by the '480 Patent into service (i.e., used them); but for Defendant's actions, the claimed-inventions embodiments involving Defendant's products and services would never have been put into service. Defendant's acts complained of herein caused those claimed-invention embodiments as a whole to perform, and Defendant's procurement of monetary and commercial benefit from it.

21. Support for the allegations of infringement may be found in the preliminary exemplary table attached as Exhibit D. These allegations of infringement are preliminary and are therefore subject to change.

22. Defendant has and continues to induce infringement. Defendant has actively encouraged or instructed others (e.g., its customers and/or the customers of its related companies), and continues to do so, on how to use its products and services (e.g., a system related to an electrically controlled spectacle frame and optoelectronic lenses housed in the frame) and related services such as to cause infringement of one or more of claims 1-30 of the '380 patent, literally or under

the doctrine of equivalents. Moreover, Defendant has known of the '380 patent and the technology underlying it from at least the filing date of the lawsuit.³ For clarity, direct infringement is previously alleged in this complaint.

23. Defendant has and continues to contributorily infringe. Defendant has actively encouraged or instructed others (e.g., its customers and/or the customers of its related companies), and continues to do so, on how to use its products and services (e.g., a system related to an electrically controlled spectacle frame and optoelectronic lenses housed in the frame) and related services such as to cause infringement of one or more of claims 1-30 of the '380 patent, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents. Moreover, Defendant has known of the '380 patent and the technology underlying it from at least the filing date of the lawsuit.⁴ For clarity, direct infringement is previously alleged in this complaint.

24. Defendant has caused and will continue to cause Plaintiff damage by direct and indirect infringement of (including inducing infringement of) the claims of the '830 patent.

IV. CONDITIONS PRECEDENT

25. Plaintiff is a non-practicing entity, with no products to mark. Plaintiff has pled all statutory requirements to obtain pre-suit damages. Further, all conditions precedent to recovery are met.

V. JURY DEMAND

26. Plaintiff hereby requests a trial by jury on issues so triable by right.

VI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief as follows:

³ Plaintiff reserves the right to amend if discovery reveals an earlier date of knowledge.

⁴ Plaintiff reserves the right to amend if discovery reveals an earlier date of knowledge.

- a. enter judgment that Defendant has infringed the claims of the patents-in-suit;
- b. award Plaintiff damages in an amount sufficient to compensate it for Defendant's infringement, in an amount no less than a reasonable royalty or lost profits, together with pre-judgment and post-judgment interest and costs under 35 U.S.C. § 284;
- c. award Plaintiff an accounting for acts of infringement not presented at trial and an award by the Court of additional damage for any such acts of infringement; and
- d. declare this case to be "exceptional" under 35 U.S.C. § 285 and award Plaintiff its attorneys' fees, expenses, and costs incurred in this action;
- e. declare Defendant's infringement to be willful and treble the damages, including attorneys' fees, expenses, and costs incurred in this action and an increase in the damage award pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284;
- f. a decree addressing future infringement that either (i) awards a permanent injunction enjoining Defendant and its agents, servants, employees, affiliates, divisions, and subsidiaries, and those in association with Defendant from infringing the claims of the Patents-in-Suit, or (ii) awards damages for future infringement in lieu of an injunction in an amount consistent with the fact that for future infringement the Defendants will be an adjudicated infringer of a valid patent, and trebles that amount in view of the fact that the future infringement will be willful as a matter of law; and,
- g. award Plaintiff such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

Ramey LLP

/s/ William P. Ramey, III

William P. Ramey, III

Texas Bar No. 24027643

wramey@rameyfirm.com

Jeffrey E. Kubiak

Texas Bar No. 24028470

jkubiak@rameyfirm.com

5020 Montrose Blvd., Suite 800

Houston, Texas 77006

(713) 426-3923 (telephone)

(832) 900-4941 (fax)

Attorneys for VDPP, LLC