1	Susan S.Q. Kalra (CA State Bar No. 167	740)	
2	RAMEY LLP 5020 Montrose Blvd., Suite 800		
3	Houston, Texas 77006 Telephone: (800) 993-7499 Fax: (832) 900-4941		
4	Southern California Office:		
5	811 Wilshire Blyd., 17th Floor		
6	Los Angeles, CA 90017 Telephone: (800) 993-7499 Fax: (832) 900-4941		
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
8	VDPP, LLC		
9	UNITED STATES	S DISTRICT COURT	
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
11	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
12	VDDD IIC	Case No.: 5:24-cy-01672	
13	VDPP, LLC, Plaintiff,	Case Ivo 3.24-cv-01072	
14	v.	PLAINTIFF'S ORIGINAL COMPLAINT FOR PATENT	
15	MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC,	INFRINGEMENT	
16	Defendant.	(25 II S C 8 271)	
17		(35 U.S.C. § 271)	
18		JURY TRIAL DEMANDED	
19			
20	PLAINTIFF'S ORIGINAL COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT		
21	VDPP, LLC ("Plaintiff" or "VDPP") files this Original Complaint and demand for		
2223	jury trial seeking relief from patent infringement of the claims of U.S. Patent		
24			
25	No. 9,426,452 ("the '452 patent"), (referred to as the "Patent-in-Suit") by Motorola		
26	Mobility LLC ("Defendant" or "Motorola").		
27			
28			
20			

9

12

11

13 14

15

17

16

18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25

26 27

28

I. THE PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff VDPP, LLC 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 Delaware.
- 3. Defendant has a regular and established place of business located at 1000 Enterprise Way Sunnyvale, CA 94089. On information and belief, Defendant sells and offers to sell products and services throughout California, including in this judicial district, and introduces products and services that perform infringing methods or processes into the stream of commerce knowing that they would be sold in California and this judicial district.
- 4. Defendant can be served with process through their registered agent, CT Corporation System, 330 N Brand Blvd, Glendale, CA, 91203, at its place of business, or anywhere else it may be found.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 5. This Court has original subject-matter jurisdiction over the entire action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a) because Plaintiff's claim arises under an Act of Congress relating to patents, namely, 35 U.S.C. § 271.
- 6. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because: (i) Defendant is present within or has minimum contacts within the State of California and this judicial district; (ii) Defendant has purposefully availed itself of the privileges of conducting

business in the State of California and in this judicial district; and (iii) Plaintiff's cause of action arises directly from Defendant's business contacts and other activities in the State of California and in this judicial district.

7. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and 1400(b). Defendant has committed acts of infringement and has a regular and established place of business in this District. Further, venue is proper because Defendant conducts substantial business in this forum, directly or through intermediaries, including: (i) at least a portion of the infringements 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 provided to individuals in California and this District.

III. INFRINGEMENT - Infringement of the '452 Patent

- 8. On August 23, 2016, U.S. Patent No. 9,426,452 ("the '452 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 '452 patent by assignment.
- 9. The '452 patent relates to an electrically controlled spectacle frame and optoelectronmic lenses housed in the frame.
- 10. Defendant maintains, operates, and administers systems, products, and services in the field of motion pictures that infringes one or more of claims of the '452

patent, including one or more of claims 1-4, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents. Defendant put the inventions claimed by the '452 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.

as Exhibit B. These allegations of infringement are preliminary and are therefore subject to 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 optoelectronmic lenses housed in the frame) and related services such as to cause infringement of one or more of claims 1-4 of the '452 patent, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents. Moreover, Defendant has known of the '452 patent and the technology underlying it from at least the filing date of the lawsuit. For clarity, direct infringement is previously alleged in this complaint.

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

12. 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 optoelectronmic lenses housed in the frame) and related services such as to cause infringement of one or more of claims 1-4 of the '452 patent, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents. Moreover, Defendant has known of the '452 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.

13. Defendant has caused and will continue to cause Plaintiff damage by direct and indirect infringement of (including inducing infringement of) the claims of the '452 patent.

IV. CONDITIONS PRECEDENT

14. 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. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief as follows:

a. enter judgment that Defendant has infringed the claims of the '452 patent;

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

- b. award Plaintiff damages in an amount sufficient to compensate it for Defendant's infringement of the Patent-in-Suit 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;
- 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 (if) 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 Defendant 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.

1	Dated: March 18, 2024	Respectfully submitted,
2		RAMEY LLP
3		/-/ Common C.O. Wallan
4		/s/ Susan S.Q. Kalra Susan S.Q. Kalra (CA State Bar No. 16740)
5		5020 Montrose Blvd., Suite 800 Houston, Texas 77006
6 7		Telephone: (800) 993-7499
8		Fax: (832) 900-4941
9		Attorneys for Plaintiff
10		VDPP, LLC
11		
12	DEMA	ND FOR JURY TRIAL
13		
14	Plaintiff hereby requests a trial by jury on issues so triable by right.	
15	Dated: March 18, 2024	Respectfully submitted,
16		RAMEY LLP
17		/s/ Susan S.Q. Kalra
18		Susan S.Q. Kalra (CA State Bar No. 16740)
19		skalra@rameyfirm.com 5020 Montrose Blvd., Suite 800
20		Houston, Texas 77006
21		Telephone: (800) 993-7499 Fax: (832) 900-4941
22		
23		Attorneys for Plaintiff
24		VDPP, LLC
25		
26		
27		
28		