

1 Susan S.Q. Kalra (CA State Bar No. 16740)
Email: skalra@rameyfirm.com
2 RAMEY LLP
811 Wilshire Blvd.,
3 17th Floor
4 Los Angeles, California 90017

5 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*
6 VDPP, LLC,

7
8 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
10 **WESTERN DIVISION**

11 VDPP, LLC,
Plaintiff
12 v.
13 BELKIN INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
14 Defendant

Case No.: 2:24-cv-06330-SPG-AJR

**PLAINTIFF’S FIRST AMENDED
COMPLAINT FOR PATENT
INFRINGEMENT**

(35 U.S.C. § 271)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

17
18 VDPP LLC (“Plaintiff” or “VDPP”) files this First Amended Complaint and
19 demand for jury trial seeking relief from patent infringement of the claims of U.S.
20 Patent No. 10,021,380 (“the ’380 patent”) (referred to as the “Patent-in-Suit”) by
21 Belkin International, Inc., (“Defendant” or “Belkin”). Defendant has not filed an
22 Answer.
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **I. THE PARTIES**

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

4
5 2. On information and belief, Defendant is an incorporation organized and
6 existing under the laws of the State of Delaware. On information and belief,
7 Defendant has an established place of business in this District at 555 AVIATION
8 BLVD, SUITE 180, EL SEGUNDO, CA 90245. Defendant can be served with
9 process through their registered agent, The Corporation Trust Company, Corporation
10 Trust Center, 1209 Orange Street, Wilmington, Delaware 19801, at its place of
11 business, or anywhere else it may be found.
12
13

14 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

15
16 3. This Court has original subject-matter jurisdiction over the entire action
17 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a) because Plaintiff's claim arises under an
18 Act of Congress relating to patents, namely, 35 U.S.C. § 271.
19

20 4. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because: (i) Defendant is
21 present within or has minimum contacts within the State of California and this judicial
22 district; (ii) Defendant has purposefully availed itself of the privileges of conducting
23 business in the State of California and in this judicial district; and (iii) Plaintiff's cause
24 of action arises directly from Defendant's business contacts and other activities in the
25 State of California and in this judicial district.
26
27
28

1 5. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and 1400(b).
2 Defendant has committed acts of infringement and has a regular and established place
3 of business in this District. Further, venue is proper because Defendant conducts
4 substantial business in this forum, directly or through intermediaries, including: (i) at
5 least a portion of the infringements alleged herein; and (ii) regularly doing or
6 soliciting business, engaging in other persistent courses of conduct and/or deriving
7 substantial revenue from goods and services provided to individuals in California and
8 this District.
9
10

11 **III. INFRINGEMENT OF THE '380 PATENT**

12 6. On July 10, 2018, U.S. Patent No. 10,021,380 (“the '380 patent”, included as
13 Exhibit A and part of this complaint) entitled “Faster State Transitioning for
14 Continuous Adjustable 3Deeps Filter Spectacles Using Multi-Layered Variable Tint
15 Materials” was duly and legally issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.
16 Plaintiff owns the '380 patent by assignment.
17
18

19 7. The '380 patent relates to methods and systems for modifying an image.
20

21 8. Defendant manufactures, maintains, operates, and administers systems,
22 products, and services that infringe one or more of claims of the '380 patent, including
23 one or more of claims 1-30, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents. Defendant
24 puts the inventions claimed by the '380 patent into service (i.e., used them); but for
25 Defendant's actions, the claimed-inventions embodiments involving Defendant's
26 products and services would never have been put into service. Defendant's acts
27
28

1 complained of herein caused those claimed-invention embodiments as a whole to
2 perform, and Defendant's procurement of monetary and commercial benefit from it.

3
4 9. Support for the allegations of infringement may be found in the preliminary
5 exemplary table attached as Exhibit B. These allegations of infringement are
6 preliminary and are therefore subject to change.

7
8 10. Defendant has caused Plaintiff damage by direct infringement of (including
9 inducing infringement of) the claims of the '380 patent.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IV. CONDITIONS PRECEDENT

11 11. Plaintiff is a non-practicing entity, with no products to mark. Plaintiff has
12 pleaded all statutory requirements to obtain pre-suit damages. Further, all conditions
13 precedent for recovery are met. Under the rule of reason analysis, Plaintiff has taken
14 reasonable steps to ensure marking by any licensee producing a patented article.

15 12. Plaintiff and its predecessors-in-interest have entered into settlement licenses
16 with several defendant entities, but none of the settlement licenses were to produce a
17 patented article, for or under the Plaintiff's patents. Duties of confidentiality prevent
18 disclosure of settlement licenses and their terms in this pleading, but discovery will
19 show that Plaintiff and its predecessors-in-interest have substantially complied with
20 Section 287(a). Furthermore, each of the defendant entities in the settlement licenses
21 did not agree that they were infringing any of Plaintiff's patents, including the Patent-
22 in-Suit, and thus were not entering into the settlement license to produce a patented
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 article for Plaintiff or under its patents. Further, to the extent necessary, Plaintiff will
2 limit its claims of infringement to method claims and thereby remove any requirement
3 for marking.
4

5 13.To the extent Defendant identifies an alleged unmarked product produced for
6 Plaintiff or under Plaintiff's patents, Plaintiff will develop evidence in discovery to
7 either show that the alleged unmarked product does not practice the Patent-in-suit and
8 that Plaintiff has substantially complied with the marking statute. Defendant has
9 failed to identify any alleged patented article for which Section 287(a) would apply.
10 Further, Defendant has failed to allege any defendant entity produces a patented
11 article.
12
13

14 14.The policy of § 287 serves three related purposes: (1) helping to avoid innocent
15 infringement; (2) encouraging patentees to give public notice that the article is
16 patented; and (3) aiding the public to identify whether an article is patented. These
17 policy considerations are advanced when parties are allowed to freely settle cases
18 without admitting infringement and thus do not require marking. All settlement
19 licenses were to end litigation and thus the policies of §287 are not violated. Such a
20 result is further warranted by 35 U.S.C. §286 which allows for the recovery of
21 damages for six years prior to the filing of the complaint.
22
23
24

25 15.For each previous settlement license, Plaintiff understood that (1) the
26 settlement license was the end of litigation between the defendant entity and Plaintiff
27 and was not a license where the defendant entity was looking to sell a product under
28

1 any of Plaintiff's patents; (2) the settlement license was entered into to terminate
2 litigation and prevent future litigation between Plaintiff and defendant entity for
3 patent infringement; (3) defendant entity did not believe it produced any product that
4 could be considered a patentable article under 35 U.S.C. §287; and, (4) Plaintiff
5 believes it has taken reasonable steps to ensure compliance with 35 U.S.C. §287 for
6 each prior settlement license.
7

8
9 16. Each settlement license that was entered into between the defendant entity and
10 Plaintiff was negotiated in the face of continued litigation and while Plaintiff believes
11 there was infringement, no defendant entity agreed that it was infringing. Thus, each
12 prior settlement license reflected a desire to end litigation and as such the policies of
13 §287 are not violated.
14

15
16 **V. JURY DEMAND**

17 Plaintiff hereby requests a trial by jury on issues so triable by right.
18

19 **VI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

20 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief as follows:

- 21 a. enter judgment that Defendant has infringed the claims of the '380 patent;
22
23 b. award Plaintiff damages in an amount sufficient to compensate it for
24 Defendant's infringement of the Patent-in-Suit in an amount no less than a
25 reasonable royalty or lost profits, together with pre-judgment and post-
26 judgment interest and costs under 35 U.S.C. § 284;
27
28

- 1 c. award Plaintiff an accounting for acts of infringement not presented at trial and
2 an award by the Court of additional damage for any such acts of infringement;
3
4 d. declare this case to be “exceptional” under 35 U.S.C. § 285 and award Plaintiff
5 its attorneys’ fees, expenses, and costs incurred in this action;
6
7 e. declare Defendant’s infringement to be willful and treble the damages,
8 including attorneys’ fees, expenses, and costs incurred in this action and an
9 increase in the damage award pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284; and
10
11 f. award Plaintiff such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

12 Dated: October 3, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

13 RAMEY LLP

14 /s/ Susan S.Q. Kalra

Susan S.Q. Kalra (CA State Bar No. 16740)

15 RAMEY LLP

16 811 Wilshire Blvd., 17th Floor

17 Los Angeles, California 90017

18 (800) 993-7499

(832) 900-4941 (facsimile)

19 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

20 *VDPP LLC*

21
22 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

23 Pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, I hereby certify that all
24 counsel of record who have appeared in this case are being served on this day of
25 October 3, 2024, with a copy of the foregoing via CM/ECF Filing.
26

27 /s/ Susan S.Q. Kalra

28 Susan S.Q. Kalra