## Xinlin Li Morrow (State Bar No. 281707) 1 xinlin@moni.law **MORROW NI LLP** 2 3333 Michelson Drive Suite 300 Irvine, CA 92612 3 Telephone: (213) 282-8166 4 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 7 8 Chengdu Ruihan Yongtai Trading Co., Ltd. Case No. dba Mooyran US, a Chinese corporation, 9 Zhengzhou Chonger Network Technology **COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY** 10 Co., Ltd. dba Mooyran Authorized Shop, a JUDGMENT OF PATENT NON-Chinese corporation, and Guigang Tianshi **INFRINGEMENT** 11 Trading Co., Ltd. dba SFOUR, a Chinese Corporation, 12 **JURY DEMANDED** Plaintiffs, 13 v. 14 Aaron Chien, an individual, Te-Ju Chien, an 15 individual, and Hsin-Yi Wang, an individual, Jasco Products Company LLC, an Oklahoma 16 Corporation, 17 18 Defendants. 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Case 2:24-cv-04379 Document 1 Filed 05/27/24 Page 1 of 8 Page ID #:1

Case No. To be assigned

Complaint for Declaratory Judgment

1	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF PATENT NON-INFRINGEM	ENT					
2	Plaintiffs Chengdu Ruihan Yongtai Trading Co., Ltd. dba Mooyran US ("Mooyran US	5"),					
3	Zhengzhou Chonger Network Technology Co., Ltd. dba Mooyran Authorized Shop ("Mooyran						
4	Authorized Shop"), and Guigang Tianshi Trading Co., Ltd. dba SFOUR ("SFOUR"), file this						
5	Complaint against Defendants Aaron Chien ("Aaron"), Te-Ju Chien ("Te-Ju"), Hsin-Yi Wang						
6	("Wang"), and Jasco Products Company LLC ("Jasco"), and respectfully allege as follows:						
7	NATURE OF THIS ACTION						
8	1. This is a declaratory judgment action for non-infringement of U.S. Patent No.						
9	9,719,654 ("the '654 patent").						
10	<u>PARTIES</u>						
11	2. Plaintiff Mooyran US is a corporation organized under the laws of the People's	S					
12	Republic of China, with a principal place of business in Chengdu City, Sichuan Province, the						
13	People's Republic of China.						
14	3. Plaintiff Mooyran Authorized Shop is a corporation organized under the laws of	of					
15	the People's Republic of China, with a principal place of business in Zhengzhou City, Henan						
16	Province, the People's Republic of China.						
17	4. Plaintiff SFOUR is a corporation organized under the laws of the People's						
18	Republic of China, with a principal place of business in Guigang City, Guangxi Province, the						
19	People's Republic of China.						
20	5. Defendants Aaron, Te-Ju and Wang (collectively, the "Individual Defendants"	) are					
21	believed to be individuals resident in the State of California at 151 Blue Crystal Dr., Walnut,						
22	California 91789.						
23	6. Defendant Jasco is, based on information and belief, is a limited liability						
24	corporation organized under the laws of Oklahoma, with a principal place of business in						
25	Oklahoma.						
26	JURISDICTION AND VENUE						
27	7. This action arises under the Patent Laws of the United States, Title 35, United						

27

25

26

13.

Plaintiff SFOUR sells a product in the night light category named the "SFOUR

Star Projector, Galaxy Night Light, Astronaut Starry Nebula Ceiling LED Lamp with Timer and

Remote" in this District and across the U.S., via listing on Amazon.com. The unique ASIN for

this product's listing on Amazon.com is B09Q2WL7C6 (also, "SFOUR Astronaut LED").

- 14. Together, the Mooyran Astronaut LED and SFOUR Astronaut LED are the Accused Products. The Accused Products are protected by three U.S. design patents, U.S Patent Nos. D965848, D969391, and D977177.
- 15. On information and belief, Individual Defendants are the owners by assignment of the '654 patent, and Defendant Jasco is the exclusive licensee of the '654 patent. A copy of the '654 Patent is attached here as **Exhibit A**.
- 16. The '654 Patent is entitled "LED and/or Laser Light Has More Than One Optics Means to Create Wider or Big Areas Image" and has 10 claims. The '654 Patent bears an issuance date of August 1, 2017.
- 17. On information and belief, sometime prior to March 27, 2024, Defendants reported to Amazon.com that the Accused Products infringed the '654 patent, and requested that Amazon.com remove Plaintiffs' listings of the same. In making this report, Defendants also requested to use Amazon.com's Amazon Patent Evaluation Express ("APEX") Procedure to attempt resolution of their infringement dispute with Plaintiffs, by providing their information for this purpose. When requesting the APEX Procedure, Defendants had provided the contact information of Defendant Jasco's in-house counsel as the contact for the patent owner or patent owner's authorized representative.
- 18. On or about March 27, 2024, Mooyran US received an e-mail from Amazon.com, stating that it had received a report from Defendants claiming that the Mooyran Astronaut LED (identified in the e-mail as an accused product by its ASIN of B09FL6YR9L) infringes the '654 patent. A copy of the email is attached as Exhibit **B**. The Amazon.com email stated that Amazon.com would remove the listing for the Accused Product unless, among other things, Mooyran US resolved their claim with the patent owner directly or filed an action for declaratory judgment of non-infringement of the asserted patent in a federal district court within three weeks, or agreed to participate in APEX within three weeks.
  - 19. Also on or about March 27, 2024, Mooyran Authorized Shop received an e-mail

1	from Amazon.com, stating that it had received a report from Defendants claiming that the
2	Mooyran Astronaut LED (identified in the e-mail as an accused product by its ASIN of
3	B09FL6YR9L) infringes the '654 patent. A copy of the email is attached as Exhibit C. The
4	Amazon.com email stated that Amazon.com would remove the listing for the Accused Product
5	unless, among other things, Mooyran Authorized Shop resolved their claim with the patent owner
6	directly or filed an action for declaratory judgment of non-infringement of the asserted patent in a
7	federal district court within three weeks, or agreed to participate in APEX within three weeks.

- 20. Similarly, on or about March 28, 2024, SFOUR received an e-mail from Amazon.com, stating that it had received a report from Defendants claiming that the SFOUR Astronaut LED (identified in the e-mail by its ASIN of B09Q2WL7C6) infringes the '654 patent. A copy of the email is attached as Exhibit **D**. The Amazon.com email stated that Amazon.com would remove the listing for the Accused Product unless, among other things, SFOUR resolved their claim with the patent owner directly or filed an action for declaratory judgment of non-infringement of the asserted patent in a federal district court within three weeks, or agreed to participate in APEX within three weeks.
- 21. Plaintiffs continue, and intend to continue, listing and selling the Accused Products on Amazon.com. The e-mails from Amazon.com evidence a risk of removal of the Amazon.com listings for the Accused Products. Such removal threatens to cause substantial harm to Plaintiffs' sales and therefore Plaintiffs' business. A substantial share of sales of the Accused Products are made through orders received on Amazon.com. And for all Plaintiffs, California is their largest market for the Accused Products.
- 22. Since Plaintiffs' receipts of the above-described e-mails from Amazon.com, Plaintiffs have each agreed to participate in the non-binding APEX process with Defendants.
- 23. A single evaluation case (with one case number) has been initiated, to which all the Plaintiffs, and Defendants, are party. The evaluation has begun, an evaluator has been assigned, and the patent owner (Defendants) have submitted its initial written arguments explaining how the asserted patent claim allegedly covers the Accused Products on May 20, 2024. Defendant Jasco's

in-house counsel appears to be representing all four Defendants, including the Individual Defendants from California, in communicating with the evaluator and submitting Defendants' arguments.

24. As a result of the Defendants' above-described conduct, Plaintiffs have at least a reasonable apprehension of enforcement of the '654 Patent against them and harm flowing to them therefrom. Therefore, Plaintiffs file this action in order to resolve an actual and justiciable controversy between the parties.

## **COUNT I: DECLARATION OF NON-INFRINGEMENT**

- 25. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege the allegations in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
- 26. Plaintiffs have not infringed and do not infringe, directly or indirectly, any valid and enforceable claim of the '654 patent.
- 27. Specifically, the Accused Products do not satisfy at least the claim limitations of "more than one optical element having a geometric shape, each said optical element having reflective and/or refractive properties, wherein the more than one optical element includes at least one first optical element arranged to reflect, refract, enlarge shape, and/or diffuse light beams from the at least one LED and/or laser light and at least one second optical element arranged to reflect, refract, enlarge, shape, and/or diffuse an image formed by the light beams from the first optical element" and "wherein light beams emitted by the at least one LED and/or laser light are reflected and/or refracted by the at least one first optical element before traveling or passing through the at least one second optical element to create a wider range or bigger size of image for projection to at least one external surface, said external surface including a ceiling, wall, or other surface" in claims 1 through 8. The Accused Products also do not satisfy similar claim limitations of "more than one optical element having a geometric shape, said optical elements each having a surface having reflective and/or refractive optics-properties, wherein the more than one optical element includes at least one first optical element arranged to reflect, refract, enlarge, shape, and/or diffuse light beams from the at least one LED and/or laser light and at least one second optical element

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- arranged to reflect, refract, enlarge, shape, and/or diffuse an image formed by the light beams from the first optical element" and "wherein said at least one first optical element reflects and/or refracts light beams before they travel or pass through at least one second optical element to create a wider range or bigger size of image for projection onto a ceiling, wall, or other surface ..." in claims 9 and 10.
- 28. The Accused Products also do not satisfy the claim limitation of "wherein image moving effects are created without a motor by causing said plurality of LEDs and/or laser light sources to sequentially flash, fade-in and fade-out, change colors, randomly turn on and off, or exhibit other LED light performances, effects, duration, or duty cycles to cause a viewed image to appear to be moving" in claim 9.
- 29. In addition, the Accused Products do not satisfy the claim limitation of "wherein said moving optical element is made of a light block-out material with shaped openings, cutouts, windows, or a stencil, and wherein the moving optical element has a predetermined optical texture or desired shape with a variety or plurality of different thicknesses to allow light passing through to create said moving image" in claim 10.
- 30. Because each of Accused Products does not include at least the above recited limitation, the Accused Products do not infringe any claims of the '654 Patent.

## PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request that judgment be entered:

- Declaring that Plaintiffs have not and does not infringe, directly, contributorily, by inducement, literally or by equivalents, jointly, or willfully, any claim of the '654
  Patent by making, using, selling, offering to sell, and/or importing of the Accused
  Products;
- Declaring that the Accused Products do not infringe, directly, contributorily, by inducement, literally or by equivalents, jointly, or willfully, any claim of the '654 Patent;
- c. Declaring this case exceptional under 35 U.S.C. § 285 at least as a result of

Case 2:24-c	v-04379	Document 1	Filed 05/27/24	Page 8 of 8	Page ID #:8		
d. e.	Defendants' assertion of the '654 Patent despite Defendants' knowledge of Plaintiffs' non-infringement, and ordering Defendants to pay Plaintiffs' reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses in this action;  Ordering Defendants to pay Plaintiffs' costs pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1920; and Awarding Plaintiffs any other remedy or relief to which it may be entitled and which the Court deems just, proper, and equitable.						
DATED: May	27, 2024		MORROW	MORROW NI LLP			
			By:	/s/ Xinlin Li I	Morrow		
			3333 Miche	Xinlin Li Morrow 3333 Michelson Drive Suite 300			
			•	Irvine, CA 92612 Telephone: (213) 282-8166			
			Email: xinlin@moni.law				
			Attorneys fo	r Plaintiffs			