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

VIDEOLABS, INC. and
VL COLLECTIVE IP LLC

Plaintiffs,

v.

HISENSE CO. LTD., HISENSE VISUAL TECHNOLOGY CO. LTD. F/K/A QINGDAO HISENSE ELECTRIC CO. LTD.; HISENSE INTERNATIONAL CO. LTD.; HISENSE INTERNATIONAL (HONG KONG) AMERICA INVESTMENTS CO. LTD., GUIYANG HISENSE ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., HISENSE ELECTRONICA MEXICO S.A. de C.V. and HISENSE INTERNATIONAL (HK) CO. LTD.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No.: 2:24-cv-904

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiffs VideoLabs, Inc. ("VL") and VL Collective IP LLC ("VL IP") (collectively "VideoLabs" or "Plaintiffs") through their attorneys, for their Complaint against Hisense Co. Ltd., Hisense Visual Technology Co. Ltd. f/k/a Qingdao Hisense Electric Co. Ltd.; Hisense International Co. Ltd.; Hisense International (Hong Kong) America Investments Co. Ltd., Guiyang Hisense Electronics Co., Ltd, Hisense Electronica Mexico S.A. de C.V. and Hisense International (HK) Co. Ltd., (collectively, "Defendants" or "Hisense"), demand a trial by jury and allege as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. Digital video has become fundamental to how society interacts, communicates,

educates, and entertains. In fact, video consumption now accounts for more than 82% of all Internet traffic.[1] The ability to reliably provide high-quality and secure video content drives the growth of digital platforms that are increasingly integral to the global economy.

2. The advent of high-quality video as a staple of digital consumption did not happen instantaneously. As with any complex technology, digital video presented implementation challenges. Many companies spent many years and resources to develop new and innovative technologies that guide how video is created, streamed, secured, managed, and consumed.

3. Various inventions and technological advances have transformed digital video. Some of these technologies, such as techniques to efficiently compress video file size, address central challenges to storing and transmitting video. Others enable video content to be efficiently and securely streamed to the many user devices that exist today. Yet others involve managing and organizing videos to provide viewers easier access to content and address how they interact with content. Successful video streaming thus requires a myriad of technologies that necessarily coordinate with one another.

4. Because various companies played roles in developing the foundational technology for today's digital video, no single company can provide the high-quality video experiences that consumers have come to expect without using technology owned by other companies. Companies wisely focus their innovation activities and R&D investments on developing unique products and services while relying on the sum total of all other industry investment in the various technologies that enable their products and services to work in the global, connected technology market.

5. The founders of VideoLabs recognized this problem and understood that collective

[1] *See The Sustainable Future of Video Entertainment*, INTERDIGITAL (Aug. 2020), https://www.interdigital.com/white_papers/the-sustainable-future-of-video-entertainment?submit_success=true.

action was needed to address it. If the companies that developed critical video technologies worked together, everyone could benefit: all innovators could receive fair compensation for their contributions, companies deploying video technology could respect other innovators' patented technologies and license them on affordable and predictable terms, and consumers could experience better and more affordable video technology.

6. In 2019, with support from widely recognized industry leaders, VideoLabs launched a platform to achieve these goals. VideoLabs spent millions of dollars and thousands of hours analyzing the video space and identifying the patents that reflect the innovations with the highest impact. VideoLabs then compiled a portfolio of these core patents, obtaining them from leading companies, including Hewlett Packard Enterprise, Alcatel-Lucent S.A., Siemens AG, Swisscom AG, 3Com, Panasonic, LG, and Nokia.

7. VideoLabs then opened-up participation in its platform to all willing companies. In exchange for low-cost membership or licensing fees, VideoLabs provides efficient access to its aggregated patent portfolio and a commitment to seek out the most important patents in the video industry and acquire them to the benefit of the industry. Many prominent companies recognized the benefits of the VideoLabs platform and worked with VideoLabs to efficiently and responsibly license its video technology patents.

8. Today, VideoLabs' licensing platform has evolved and grown significantly from the early days. VideoLabs' primary focus continues to be serving patent implementers in the broader video industry by identifying, acquiring, aggregating, and licensing high-quality patents through its unique collective platform and providing companies flexible licensing structures (including membership) for more efficient licensing. VideoLabs has expanded its focus on serving patent innovators to provide them a better path to realize fair compensation for their patents. VideoLabs also

works in partnership with patent owners by building and running independent licensing programs specifically focused on licensing the partner's patent portfolio as a service to them and the IP industry.

9. To this day, VideoLabs continues to promote an efficient, respected, and balanced intellectual property environment where technology companies have predictable design freedom and innovators who contribute impactful patented inventions can obtain fair and just compensation. It has and continues to successfully bring on many patent owners, licensees and members to its efficient and equitable licensing platform. Equitable licensing dictates that all patent implementers accept their responsibility to license. When one (or many) peer company(ies) elects to holdout or refuses to negotiate in good faith for a license to valid patents that are infringed and enforceable, it unfairly disadvantages those companies who chose to license responsibly.

10. Unfortunately, Hisense has not worked responsibly to license VideoLabs' video technology patents. Hisense is one of the world's largest users of video technologies and sells smart televisions, tablet computers and mobile devices, among other products. It is enmeshed in practically every aspect of video, from creation to processing, delivery, and display.

11. VideoLabs contacted Hisense in December 2022 to offer Hisense the benefit of VideoLabs' platform and to alert it to its use of VideoLabs' patented technology. Despite the parties engaging in several licensing discussions, Hisense refuses to take a license. Accordingly, VideoLabs felt that it had no recourse but to file an action to stop Hisense's unauthorized use of VideoLabs' patents. Failure to take action would undermine the equity and viability of VideoLabs' licensing platform and permit further free riding by Hisense of the significant innovations of VideoLabs' patents.

12. This case is ultimately about ensuring the integrity of the patent system and compensating patent owners for their protected innovations. Respect for intellectual property, as the

law requires, is essential to incentivize innovation and promote technological progress. Accordingly, VideoLabs brings this action under the patent laws, 35 U.S.C. § 1 *et seq.*, in order to stop Hisense's willful infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 8,291,236, 8,667,304, 7,769,238, 7,970,059 and 8,605,794 (collectively, "Asserted Patents").

THE PARTIES

13. VL was founded in 2018 as part of an industry-sponsored and funded effort to reduce the cost and risk of technological gridlock associated with diverse patent ownership. VL's leadership has decades of experience in intellectual property licensing, during which they have completed over 1,000 intellectual property transactions worldwide and drawn more than $6 billion in revenue.

14. VL is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its principal place of business in Palo Alto, California.

15. VL IP was founded in 2019 as a subsidiary of VideoLabs, Inc.

16. VL IP is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its principal place of business in Palo Alto, California.

17. On information and belief Defendant Hisense Co. Ltd., ("Hisense Co.") is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the People's Republic of China. It has a place of business at Hisense Tower No. 17, Donghaixi Road, Qingdao, Shandong Provence, 266071, China. Hisense Co. may be served with process by serving the Texas Secretary of State, 1019 Brazos Street, Austin, Texas 78701 as its registered agent because it engages in business in Texas but has not designated or maintained a resident agent for service of process in Texas as required by statute. This action arises out of that business.

18. On information and belief, Hisense Co., together with its subsidiaries and other affiliates of the Hisense group of companies, manufactures and sells smart TV and entertainment

systems across the globe. As of June 2024, global shipments of Hisense TVs for Q1 2024 hit a total of 6.32M, ranking Hisense No. 2 overall in the global market from 2022 to 2024 Q1.[2] Hisense's Q1 2024 global TV shipment volume share was 13.6% with a global shipment revenue share of 12.1%. Hisense is ranked No. 2 globally for TV shipments and No. 1 in 100 inch TVs in both 2023 and Q1 2024. As the technology and market leader in the field of Laser TV, Hisense also enjoyed a Q1 2024 worldwide Laser TV volume share of 53.4%.[3] Hisense Co. is a subsidiary of Quindao Huatong State-owned Capital Investment and Operation Group Co.

19. On information and belief Defendant Hisense Visual Technology Co. Ltd. f/k/a Qingdao Hisense Electric Co. Ltd. ("Hisense Visual") is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the People's Republic of China. It has a place of business at 218 Qianwangang Road, Qingdao Economic & Technological Development Zone, Qingdao, Shandong Province, 266555, China. Hisense Visual may be served with process by serving the Texas Secretary of State, 1019 Brazos Street, Austin, Texas 78701 as its registered agent because it engages in business in Texas but has not designated or maintained a resident agent for service of process in Texas as required by statute. This action arises out of that business.

20. On information and belief, Hisense Visual is a partial subsidiary of Hisense Group Holding Co. Ltd., which is one of multiple Hisense entities. It is involved in the research, design, development, testing and manufacture of electronic devices, including TVs. In collaboration with other Hisense affiliates, Hisense Visual is also involved in the importation of TVs into the United States. Hisense Visual was formerly known as Qingdao Hisense Electronics Co. Ltd. and before that, as Hisense Electric Co. Ltd.

---

[2] https://global.hisense.com/about-hisense/newsroom/hisense-tv-ranked-no-2-globally-in-q1-2024.

[3] *Id*.

21. On information and belief Defendant Hisense International Co. Ltd. is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the People's Republic of China. It has a place of business at No. 218 Qianwangang Road, Economic and Technological Development Zone, Qiandao, Shandong Province, 266555, China. Hisense International Co. Ltd. may be served with process by serving the Texas Secretary of State, 1019 Brazos Street, Austin, Texas 78701 as its registered agent because it engages in business in Texas but has not designated or maintained a resident agent for service of process in Texas as required by statute. This action arises out of that business.

22. On information and belief, Hisense International Co. Ltd. is a partial subsidiary of multiple Hisense entities, including Hisense Visual. In collaboration with other Hisense affiliates, Hisense International Co. Ltd. is also involved in the importation of TVs into the United States.

23. On information and belief Defendant Hisense International (Hong Kong) America Investments Co. Ltd. ("Hisense HK America") is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of Hong Kong SAR. It has a place of business at Room 3101-3105, Singga Commercial Centre, No. 148 Connaught Road West, Hong Kong SAR, China. Hisense HK America may be served with process by serving the Texas Secretary of State, 1019 Brazos Street, Austin, Texas 78701 as its registered agent because it engages in business in Texas but has not designated or maintained a resident agent for service of process in Texas as required by statute. This action arises out of that business.

24. On information and belief, Hisense HK America is a partial subsidiary of Hisense International America Holdings Co. Ltd., which is one of multiple Hisense entities. In collaboration with other Hisense affiliates, Hisense HK America is involved in the importation of TVs into the United States.

25. On information and belief Defendant Guiyang Hisense Electronics Co., Ltd., is a

corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the People's Republic of China. It has a principal place of business at No. 39, Honghe Road, Econonic Technology Development Zone, Guiyang, Guizhou 55006, China.

26. On information and belief, Defendant Hisense Electronica Mexico S.A. de C.V. is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of Mexico. It has a place of business at Blvd. Hisense (Sharp), 3510 Parque Industrial Rosarito Playas de Rosarito, B.C., C.P, 22710, Mexico.

27. On information and belief Defendant Hisense International (HK) Co. Ltd., ("Hisense International (HK)") is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of Hong Kong SAR. It has a place of business at Room 3101-3105, Singga Commercial Centre, No. 148 Connaught Road West, Hong Kong SAR, China. Hisense International (HK) may be served with process by serving the Texas Secretary of State, 1019 Brazos Street, Austin, Texas 78701 as its registered agent because it engages in business in Texas but has not designated or maintained a resident agent for service of process in Texas as required by statute. This action arises out of that business.

28. On information and belief, Hisense International (HK) is a partial subsidiary of Hisense International Co. Ltd., which is one of multiple Hisense entities. In collaboration with other Hisense affiliates, Hisense International (HK) is involved in the importation of TVs into the United States.

29. On information and belief, the Defendants identified in paragraphs 17-28 above (collectively "Hisense") are an interrelated group of companies which together comprise one of the world's largest manufacturers of televisions and one of the leading sellers of televisions in the United States, including the Hisense brand.

30. On information and belief, the Hisense Defendants named above and their affiliates are part of the same corporate structure and distribution chain for the making, importing, offering to

sell, selling and using of the accused devices in the United States, including in the State of Texas generally and this judicial district in particular. For example, Hisense states that it has established 64 overseas companies and offices for localization operation.[4]

31. On information and belief, the Hisense Defendants named above and their affiliates share the same management, common ownership, advertising platforms, facilities, distribution chains and platforms and the same accused products and related technologies. The Hisense Defendants therefore operate as a unitary business venture and are jointly and severally liable for the acts of patent infringement alleged herein.

32. The parties to this action are properly joined under 35 U.S.C. § 299 because the right to relief asserted against Defendants jointly and severally arises out of the same series of transactions or occurrences relating to the making, using, offering to sell, selling and importing of the same products. Additionally, questions of fact common to all Defendants will arise in this action.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

33. This action arises under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code. Subject matter jurisdiction is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

34. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants in this action pursuant to due process and/or the Texas Long Arm Statute because (1) Defendants conduct business and continue to conduct business in Texas, (2) Defendants have committed and continue to commit acts of patent infringement in this District, by among other things, making, using, offering to sell and selling accused products in Texas and/or importing accused products into Texas, including by Internet sales

[4] https://global.hisense.com/about-hisense/overview.

and sales via retail and wholesale stores, inducing others to commit patent infringement in Texas and/or committing at least a portion of any other infringement alleged herein. In addition, or in the alternative, this Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(k)(2).

35. On information and belief, personal jurisdiction also exists specifically over each of the Defendants because they have overlapping executives, interlocking corporate structures and close relationships as manufacturer, importer and distributor of accused products.

36. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to at least 28 U.S.C. §1391 and §1400(b). Upon information and belief, Defendants have conducted and continue to conduct business in this District; (2) Defendants have committed and continue to commit acts of patent infringement in this District and/or (3) Defendants are foreign entities.

THE VIDEOLABS PATENTS-IN-SUIT

A. U.S. Patent No. 8,291,236

37. U.S. Patent No. 8,291,236 (the "'236 patent"), titled "Methods and Apparatuses for Secondary Conditional Access Server," issued on October 16, 2012. VL owns all rights and title to the '236 patent, as necessary to bring this action. A true and correct copy of the '236 patent is attached as Exhibit A.

38. The original assignee of the '236 patent is Digital Keystone, Inc. ("Digital Keystone") a Silicon-Valley based video technology company. Digital Keystone develops digital entertainment technologies, including security software for video applications. In the early 2000s, when the inventions of the '236 patent were in development, Digital Keystone was developing world-first digital entertainment solutions that bridged the personal computer, consumer electronics and content industries. Next generation digital cable TVs, PC-based entertainment systems and media distribution networks were powered by Digital Keystone hardware and software technologies. And Digital

Keystone was also licensing its industry-leading security technology to TV broadcasters, consumer electronics manufacturers, developers of digital home components, and chip manufacturers.[5] In partnership with Microsoft and CableLabs, Digital Keystone developed the world's first secure Pay TV bridge, which was demonstrated by Bill Gates in his keynote speech during the 2006 Consumer Electronics Show.[6] Digital Keystone was at the forefront of enabling secure content access throughout the entire home.

39. Conditional access ("CA") refers to techniques for limiting the access of content (such as TV programs and movies) to authorized users. CA systems have historically been developed for both cable TV (CAS) and, more recently, for OTT services (DRM). Regardless of the implementation, conditional access serves as a type of access management, requiring certain criteria to be met before granting access to protected content. For example, in a CA system for digital television, the media content is scrambled (encrypted) before broadcasting. The key used for scrambling/descrambling the media content in a CA system is called a control word, and it is securely provided to subscribers through entitlement control messages and entitlement management messages. A security device, such as a set top box, uses the control word to descramble (decrypt) the received media content and reproduce the content for display. Similarly, in a DRM system for content streaming, the content is encrypted before distribution. The key(s) used for encrypting the media content in a DRM system is/are typically maintained by a license server, and requested by the media player when the content is attempted to be played. The license server authenticates the requesting

---

[5] *Company Overview*, Digital Keystone (2003). https://web.archive.org/web/20031206063740/http://www.digitalkeystone.com/profile/mission.htm

[6] *Microsoft and CableLabs Announce Agreement to Enable High-Definition Digital Cable Programming on Windows-Based PCs* (Press release), Microsoft, November 16, 2005; *Gates Outlines Vision for the Digital Lifestyle and Showcases New Products and Technologies From Microsoft* (Press release), Microsoft, January 4, 2006. https:// https://news.microsoft.com/2005/11/16/microsoft-and-cablelabs-announce-agreement-to-enable-high-definition-digital-cable-programming-on-windows-based-pcs/.

user, and the decryption keys are provided to permitted users. The media player uses the received keys to decrypt and render the content for viewing.

40. In digital television, for example, the media content (e.g., video and audio signals) is converted into a digital form using the MPEG-2 format. The digital form of the media content of one program is multiplexed together with those of other programs for transmission so that multiple programs appear to be transmitted simultaneously. The CA system scrambles the digital form of programs and transmits the entitlement control messages and the entitlement management messages with the digital form of programs for broadcast either within the multiplex (e.g., satellite) or through an out-of-band channel (e.g., cable).

41. Typically, a set-top box (STB) at the receiving end descrambles the data stream and decodes the MPEG-2 data for viewing. A tuner portion of the STB receives the incoming signal, demodulates it and reconstitutes the transport stream, which contains many packets of information. The STB can de-multiplex the entitlement management messages and entitlement control messages and the media content. The data (e.g., service key and control word) contained in the entitlement management message and entitlement control message are used to descramble the encrypted programming material. The STB then renders the MPEG-2 data for viewing.

42. A digital rights management (DRM) system manages rights digitally. Digital rights management uses encryption software to protect electronic information and prevent widespread distribution. In a typical digital rights management scheme, a DRM server software program "wraps" the digital content through encryption according to applicable policies. A DRM client software program "unwraps" the content and makes it accessible in accordance with its rights. The rights are typically distributed to clients separately from the "wrapped" electronic information. DRM clients may include desktop PCs, handheld devices, set-top boxes, mobile phones and other portable devices.

In addition to encrypting/scrambling the digital content to limit the distribution, a digital rights management system may also provide the description, identification, trading, protection, monitoring and tracking of various forms of rights.

43. Both CAS and DRM systems are critically important technologies for securing valuable content programming intended for myriad consumer devices. To individually manage each such device, such as a set-top box, a mobile phone, a streaming media device, a laptop or desktop computer, or a smartTV, each device is typically provided with a unique identity so that the CA or DRM system can provide the necessary keys specifically for use on only the intended device. In this way, the integrity of the decryption keys can be maintained within the content provider's security domain. Typically, each device has a unique, secret user key so that an entitlement management message or a DRM license key for one device can only be decrypted using the unique user key of that device.

44. In the early-2000s, content consuming devices were proliferating rapidly, each with different device security platforms and capabilities, and content delivery standards were evolving to address the growing need for securing the integrity of the content being delivered to myriad networked devices. Conditional access techniques at the time of the invention suffered from the problem of being limited to one security technique so that each device was required to be associated with the security technique to operate correctly in a network.

45. The '236 patent addresses this problem by providing a more flexible security model that could allow devices to operate correctly under different security techniques while still maintaining the benefits of the primary security system of a content provider with full ability to control the dissemination of content securely across networking components with different security features and platforms. Ex. A at 2:56-60 ("bridging two security systems so that a primary security

system can control premium content distribution to external devices secured by a secondary security system"). The '236 patent allows, among other things, content to be distributed to legitimate, authorized devices of two different security systems. *Id.* at 3:1-7. The inventors developed a novel approach by implementing a new type of networked device to bridge primary and secondary security domains and pass access-protected content from the primary security domain to the secondary security domain, such as a localized network within the home, or the Internet, so that authorized devices in the secondary security domain can access secured content. *Id.* at 7:19-43; 7:66-8:2; 8:39-61. The inventors recognized that incorporating security messages into the primary conditional access protocols could allow the networked device to act as a client in the primary security domain and as a control information provider of the secondary security domain. *Id.* at 7:19-39. The networked device common to both domains could then conditionally allow clients in the secondary security domain to access the content, converting the protected content from one protected format to another protected format. *Id.* at 7:40-43; 17:42-51.

46. As such, the '236 patent describes and claims novel improvements to the networked system allowing content to be distributed to proper devices, including devices that do "not support[] the primary digital rights management system" of the content provider. *Id.* at 3:8-15. The '236 patent thus allows, among other things, securely transferring content (e.g., premium video content) to a greater number of devices and types of devices.

B. U.S. Patent No. 8,667,304

47. U.S. Patent No. 8,667,304 (the "'304 patent"), titled "Methods and Apparatuses for Secondary Conditional Access Server," issued on March 4, 2014. VL owns all rights and title to the '304 patent, as necessary to bring this action. A true and correct copy of the '304 patent is attached as Exhibit B.

48. The original assignee of the '304 patent is Digital Keystone, Inc. ("Digital Keystone"), a Silicon-Valley based video technology company. Digital Keystone develops digital entertainment technologies, including security software for video applications. In the early 2000s, when the inventions of the '304 patent were in development, Digital Keystone was developing world-first digital entertainment solutions that bridged the personal computer, consumer electronics and content industries. Next generation digital cable TVs, PC-based entertainment systems and media distribution networks were powered by Digital Keystone hardware and software technologies. And Digital Keystone was also licensing its industry-leading security technology to TV broadcasters, consumer electronics manufacturers, developers of digital home components, and chip manufacturers.[7] In partnership with Microsoft and CableLabs, Digital Keystone developed the world's first secure Pay TV bridge, which was demonstrated by Bill Gates in his keynote speech during the 2006 Consumer Electronics Show.[8] Digital Keystone was at the forefront of enabling secure content access throughout the entire home.

49. As discussed with regard to the '236 patent *infra*, both CAS and DRM systems are critically important technologies for securing valuable content programming intended for myriad consumer devices. To individually manage each such device, such as a set-top box, a mobile phone, a streaming media device, a laptop or desktop computer, or a smartTV, each device is typically provided with a unique identity so that the CA or DRM system can provide the necessary keys

---

[7] *Company Overview*, Digital Keystone (2003). https://web.archive.org/web/20031206063740/http://www.digitalkeystone.com/profile/mission.htm.

[8] *Microsoft and CableLabs Announce Agreement to Enable High-Definition Digital Cable Programming on Windows-Based PCs* (Press release), Microsoft, November 16, 2005; *Gates Outlines Vision for the Digital Lifestyle and Showcases New Products and Technologies From Microsoft* (Press release), Microsoft, January 4, 2006. https://news.microsoft.com/2005/11/16/microsoft-and-cablelabs-announce-agreement-to-enable-high-definition-digital-cable-programming-on-windows-based-pcs/.

specifically for use on only the intended device. In this way, the integrity of the decryption keys can be maintained within the content provider's security domain. Typically, each device has a unique, secret user key so that an entitlement management message or a DRM license key for one device can only be decrypted using the unique user key of that device.

50. In the early-2000s, content consuming devices were proliferating rapidly, each with different device security platforms and capabilities, and content delivery standards were evolving to address the growing need for securing the integrity of the content being delivered to myriad networked devices. Conditional access techniques at the time of the invention suffered from the problem of being limited to one security technique so that each device was required to be associated with the security technique to operate correctly in a network.

51. The '304 patent is a continuation of the '236 patent, and, like the '236 patent, the '304 patent addresses this problem, allowing, among other things, content to be distributed to legitimate, authorized devices of two different security systems. Ex. B at 3:4-10. Content may be distributed to proper devices, including devices that do "not support[] the primary digital rights management system" of the content provider. *Id.* at 3:11-11. As such, the '304 patent allows, among other things, securely transferring content (e.g., premium video content) to a greater number of devices and types of devices by providing a more flexible security model that could allow devices to operate correctly under different security techniques while still maintaining the benefits of the primary security system of a content provider with full ability to control the dissemination of content securely across networking components with different security features and platforms.

C. U.S. Patent No. 7,769,238

52. On August 3, 2010, the United States Patent Office issued U.S. Patent No. 7,769,238, titled "Picture Coding Method And Picture Decoding Method" (the "'238 patent"). VL owns all

rights and title to the ’238 patent, as necessary to bring this action. A true and correct copy of the ’238 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

53. The ’238 patent generally relates to video and audio coding. Video and audio coding refers to both the encoding and decoding of video or audio content. Video and audio coding may include compression techniques that minimize the size of the data that is sent between the encoder and the decoder by, e.g., removing redundancies and then efficiently representing the remaining data for transmission.

54. The ’238 patent was developed by engineers at Panasonic, one of the largest consumer electronics companies at the time of the invention and a major innovator in Internet technologies. In 2002, when the patent application was first filed for the ’238 patent, and as set forth in Panasonic’s 2002 annual report, Panasonic was a world leader in digital video technologies. Panasonic developed video coding technologies and designed consumer electronics, including TVs, DVD players and memory cards, for storing, processing and displaying video content. The inventions of the ’238 patent are the result of years of research by Panasonic engineers at the cutting edge of video processing and coding.

55. Encoding video content allows the content to be made small for storage and transmission, while decoding pursuant to the ’238 patent permits the viewer to watch high-quality content on his or her device. In addition to making real-time streaming of content possible, every incremental increase in compression efficiency yields substantial benefits to companies that store, process, transmit or access video.

56. The ’238 patent describes breakthrough techniques for decoding audiovisual content so that it can be transmitted and stored with fewer resources. The patent vastly improves upon existing methods, and the core technology it describes has been used throughout the industry for years as the

gold standard for coding video.

57. In particular, the ’238 patent is directed to decoding audio and video content. With respect to video, the ’238 patent describes a type of coding called “Context-based Adaptive Variable Length Coding,” or “CAVLC.” *See, e.g.*, Ex. C at 1:49-52. Content encoded would then be stored or transmitted before ultimately being decoded for playback using the techniques of the ’238 patent.

58. When encoded, the image data in a particular image block is represented by, among other things, “coefficients.” *Id*. at 1:63-67; 7:38-43; 21:60-66; 25:29-36. Larger coefficients for a block may indicate a larger amount of changes in that block as compared with a reference block. *See id.* For many blocks, there are no such changes, and so all the coefficients have a value of zero. *See id.* at 21:60-66. The inventors of the ’238 patent recognized that these “zero-coefficient” blocks allow for compression. *See*, *e.g.*, *id.* at 1:49-52.

59. The inventors of the ’238 patent realized that the decoder did not need to know every single time a zero-coefficient block existed; rather, the decoder needs to know only when blocks have *non-zero* coefficients. They devised a technique wherein data about zero-coefficient blocks are effectively not encoded at all, and only non-zero coefficient block data is stored and transmitted. *See*, *e.g.*, *id.* at 1:49-52, 56-62; 1:65-2:10. The inventors thereby achieved nearly perfect compression for these zero-coefficient blocks by communicating them practically without sending any information whatsoever. *See id.* at 2:11-14.

60. The inventors made substantial contributions to the efficiency of entropy coding. They recognized that the coefficients in neighboring blocks were a good predictor of the coefficients in the block being analyzed, and so could be used to select the optimal coding table for the block, yielding enhanced compression. *See*, *e.g.*, *id.* at 9:34-37; 13:4-11. The inventors disclosed using the same coding table for both inter- and intra-predictive coding, which was inefficient because there could be

significant differences between neighboring blocks in the current frame and blocks in subsequent frames. *See*, *e.g.*, *id.* at 1:33-38. Due to these limitations in the use of coding tables, compression efficiency in previously known entropy coding techniques would vary significantly between different types of content, and generally decreased as the quality of content increased. *Id.* at 1:39-44. These problems (and others) were overcome by the inventors of the '238 patent.

61. The innovations of the '238 patent provided a significant advance in compression that was recognized throughout the industry. In fact, the compression techniques of the '238 patent are used in the ubiquitous video codec, H.264. H.264 was revolutionary in the video industry, as it provided a quantum leap of improvement over the video codecs that had previously been commonly used, such as Motion JPEG video and MPEG-2. In particular, H.264 "has an 80% lower bitrate than Motion JPEG video" and "the bitrate savings can be as much as 50% or more compared to MPEG-2."[9]

D. U.S. Patent No. 7,970,059

62. On June 28, 2011, the United States Patent Office issued U.S. Patent No. 7,970,059, titled "Variable Length Coding Method and Variable Length Decoding Method" (the "'059 patent"). VL owns all rights and title to the '059 patent, as necessary to bring this action. A true and correct copy of the '059 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit D.

63. The '059 patent generally relates to video and audio coding. Video and audio coding refers to both the encoding and decoding of video or audio content. Video and audio coding may include compression techniques to minimize the size of the data that is sent between the encoder and the decoder by removing redundancies and then efficiently representing the remaining data for

[9] *What is H264 Encoding?*, BlackBox, https://www.blackbox.co.uk/gb-gb/page/38313/Resources/Technical-Resources/Black-Box-Explains/AV/What-is-H264-video-encoding/.

transmission.

64. The ’059 patent was developed by engineers at Panasonic, one of the largest consumer electronics companies at the time of the invention and a major innovator in Internet technologies. In 2002, when the patent application was first filed for the ’059 patent, and as set forth in Panasonic’s 2002 annual report, Panasonic was a world leader in digital video technologies. Panasonic developed video coding technologies and designed consumer electronics, including TVs, DVD players and memory cards, for storing, processing and displaying video content. The inventions of the ’059 patent are the result of years of research by Panasonic engineers at the cutting edge of video processing and coding.

65. Encoding video content pursuant to the ’059 patent allows the content to be made small for storage and transmission, while decoding permits the viewer to watch high-quality content on his or her device. In addition to making real-time streaming of content possible, every incremental increase in compression efficiency yields substantial benefits to companies that store, process, transmit or access video.

66. The ’059 patent describes breakthrough techniques for decoding audiovisual content so that it can be transmitted and stored with fewer resources. The patent vastly improves upon existing methods for coding video.

67. In particular, the ’059 patent is directed to decoding audio and video content. With respect to video, the ’059 patent describes a type of coding called “Context-based Adaptive Binary Arithmetic Coding,” or “CABAC,” and the ’059 patent describes using a plurality of probability tables that are switched during the coding process. *See, e.g.*, Ex. D at 1:49-56.

68. An arithmetic encoder converts a series of input signals into a representation that may be encoded as a single fractional number, which is communicated in the encoded bitstream. As a

result, fewer or less common symbol values are represented using fewer or larger numbers of bits, which can lead to more effective compression than variable length coding.

69. The innovations of the '059 patent provided a significant advance in compression that was recognized throughout the industry. In fact, the compression techniques of the '059 patent are used in the ubiquitous video codec, H.264. H.264 was revolutionary in the video industry, as it provided a quantum leap of improvement over the video codecs that had previously been commonly used, such as Motion JPEG video and MPEG-2. In particular, H.264 "has an 80% lower bitrate than Motion JPEG video" and "the bitrate savings can be as much as 50% or more compared to MPEG-2."[10]

E. U.S. Patent No. 8,605,794

70. U.S. Patent No. 8,605,794 (the "'794 patent"), titled "Method for Synchronizing Content-Dependent Data Segments of Files," issued on December 10, 2013. VL IP owns all rights and title to the '794 patent, as necessary to bring this action. A true and correct copy of the '794 patent is attached as Exhibit E.

71. The original assignee of the '794 patent is Siemens Aktiengesellschaft ("Siemens"), one of the largest consumer electronics companies at the time of the invention and a major innovator in Internet technologies. In 2005 alone, the year in which Siemens filed for patent protection for the inventions of the '794 patent, Siemens invested €5.2 billion in research and development.[11]

72. In the early 2000s, the inventors realized that the way that audiovisual content (e.g., television shows and movies) was transmitted to consumers was fundamentally changing. While

[10] *What is H264 Encoding?*, BlackBox, https://www.blackbox.co.uk/gb-gb/page/38313/Resources/Technical-Resources/Black-Box-Explains/AV/What-is-H264-video-encoding/.

[11] https://www.siemens.com/investor/pool/en/investor_relations/downloadcenter/e05_00_gb2005_1336469.pdf.

content could be stored and accessed from media such as VHS tapes and DVDs, content was *transmitted* to consumers primarily through televisions—and had been for decades. Moreover, within each global region (e.g., the United States or Europe), all television content was encoded in a single formatting standard (e.g., the PAL standard in Europe and the NTSC standard in the United States) that could be played by all televisions. Ex. E at 1:23-33.

73. But with the increasing importance of the Internet, the types of devices to which content could be transmitted was proliferating. *See*, *e.g.*, *id.* at 1:34-43. Content was now being streamed to computers, laptops, PDAs, and other electronic devices. Unlike the conventional televisions, which were all designed to play content formatted in the same way, these new devices could play content encoded in any number of formats based on their capabilities. For example, a PDA, with its limited screen resolution and processing capabilities, could not process the higher quality content intended for high-resolution monitors connected to desktop computers. Additionally, a computer running a Windows operating system could play different content formats than an Apple computer.

74. The varying strength of Internet connections, particularly on wireless devices, also necessitated multiple content formats. For example, while a desktop computer might be capable of playing high resolution content, doing so was not desirable if the Internet connection for that computer was slow. Instead, it can be a better viewer experience for a lower quality version of the content to be transmitted more quickly rather than having the user constantly waiting for higher quality content to download. Content delivery companies further realized that it would be beneficial to be able to change the quality of content *during a stream*. That is, when an Internet connection is weak, send lower quality content; when the connection is strong, send higher quality content. Thus, not only were different content formats necessitated by different device capabilities — even for the

same device and during a single stream, but it was also advantageous to be able to vary the quality of the transmitted content.

75. Consumer expectations for the delivery of content also began to change. Whereas consumers could previously only watch whatever was "on TV," consumers increasingly began to expect to watch whatever they wanted whenever they wanted, i.e., "on demand." Consumers expected content to start playing at the click of a mouse, and to be able to jump to any point in the content and have playback resume immediately.

76. These changes in technology and consumer expectations led to new techniques for managing and processing audiovisual content. Content was no longer stored as a single file in a single location. Instead, for example, a movie's audio and video data was broken up into numerous "segments" that might be stored on various Internet servers. These segments could be more easily transmitted over the Internet to consumer devices, and content could be played as soon as the first few segments were received instead of waiting until the entire file had been downloaded.

77. Prior to the innovations of the '794 patent, however, there was not a suitable method for aligning the various audio and video segments that comprised a piece of content. The need was all the greater when switching between content formats midstream (e.g., to account for changing Internet bandwidth) or skipping to different points within a piece of content.

78. Known techniques at the time would align the segments for playback using timestamp information stored in each segment. Essentially, each segment included metadata indicating when in the timeline of the content the segment should be played (e.g., audio content from 5 minutes and 30 seconds of the movie to 6 minutes and 30 seconds of the movie). Once a segment was downloaded, this information would have to be read out (which could require decoding the segment), and then additional processing would be needed to order this segment with the other segments. This technique

was rooted in the nature of the old technologies, in which viewers received content in the order it was to be played, did not alternate in real time between different versions of the same content, and could not selectively play different parts of the content. Disadvantageously, this technique had a large overhead, and so could be slow and resource intensive. *See*, *e.g.*, *id.* at 2:4-12, 2:36-54.

79. The '794 patent improves upon these timestamp-based implementations. It describes a novel technique in which segments are ordered chronologically and aligned with corresponding segments (e.g., aligning a video segment with the correct audio segment) using predefined assignment rules. *See id.* at 2:36-42; 5:10-13. These assignment rules are not based on timestamps. *See id.* at 2:2-43. Instead, they flexibly permit the alignment of segments using rules appropriate for different contexts. This could include implementations in which, for example, each sequential video segment is aligned with every fourth audio segment. *See id.* at 2:55-60; 5:35-6:42. Alternatively, the assignment rules could be used to build pseudo-timelines that order and match audio and video segments based on the context of the content. *See id.* at 6:50-60. For example, key audio and video segments will align at the start of new scenes, changes in camera viewpoint, or the start of a song. The assignment rules of the '794 patent require little overhead and are thus significantly faster than timestamp-based techniques while also providing more options in the management of segments. *See*, *e.g.*, *id.* at 2:4-12, 2:36-54. This flexibility enables, for example, a user to jump to a key scene in a movie, and the corresponding segments to quickly be located, downloaded, and played. *See id.* at 3:20-28. This is because the context of content can be mapped to a particular segment, and then assignment rules can be used to quickly identify the corresponding and subsequent segments.

80. The assignment rules of the '794 patent are therefore much more compact and make the processing and playback of content much faster and require fewer computer and network resources. As described in the '794 patent, conventional methods require "a sizeable quantity of data"

and such "a large overhead" that it was "generally not made possible to synchronize different data types." *Id.* at 2:6-9. However, the inventions of the '794 patent "enable[s] content-related first and second data segments to be synchronized in a simple and standard-complaint manner" through use of assignment rules. *Id.* at 2:27. The improvements described and claimed in the '794 patent result in computing benefits including, e.g., less data, less overhead, lower processing costs, flexibility, and simplicity. As such, the '794 patent is rooted in improvements to computer technology.

81. Today, online video streaming is ubiquitous, and the ability to alter the format of content mid-stream has been standardized and is known as "adaptive bitrate streaming." There are two main protocols for this type of delivery: HTTP Live Streaming ("HLS") and Dynamic Adaptive Streaming over HTTP ("DASH"). These protocols are used to stream the vast majority of online video and by major streaming services.

82. The '794 patent is core to these technologies, which has been recognized by the video technology industry. MPEG LA, which pioneered the concept of technology-specific patent pools and has created and maintained patent pools that efficiently license key technologies worldwide, launched a patent pool for DASH in November 2016.[12] The '794 patent was submitted for inclusion into MPEG LA's DASH patent pool, evaluated by MPEG LA's patent experts, and at that time was declared as essential to using DASH to stream content. Indeed, the '794 patent is one of just 10 U.S. patents that previously have been deemed essential to DASH, and its importance to the streaming technology and foundational nature is evidenced by the fact that it has the earliest invention date of all patents in the pool. Numerous companies have taken a license to the '794 patent to obtain the right to use its technology to implement DASH.

[12] *MPEG LA Releases MPEG-DASH Patent Portfolio License*, MPEG LA (Nov. 17, 2016), https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20161117006154/en/MPEG-LA-Releases-MPEG-DASH-Patent-Portfolio-License.

FIRST COUNT

(INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,291,236)

83. VideoLabs incorporates by reference the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

84. VL is the assignee and lawful owner of all right, title, and interest in and to the '236 patent. The '236 patent is valid and enforceable.

85. On information and belief, Hisense has directly infringed and continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the '236 patent, including at least claim 130 of the '236 patent by, among other things, making, using, selling, offering for sale, and/or importing into the United States products that embody one or more of the inventions claimed in the '236 patent, including but not limited to the '236 patent Accused Instrumentalities, including Hisense devices compatible with HDCP, including Hisense devices configured to stream 4K and/or HDR content, such as, e.g., Hisense streaming players, including Hisense Smart TVs (e.g., Hisense 75R6030 Roku TV), Hisense Set-top boxes (e.g., Hisense Android TV Set-top Box IP960N), and Hisense TV Dongles (e.g., Hisense Android TV Dongle IP151D) as well as all reasonably similar products, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

86. The '236 patent Accused Instrumentalities satisfy all claim limitations of one or more claims of the '236 patent. A claim chart comparing exemplary independent claim 130 of the '236 patent to representative Accused Instrumentalities is attached as Exhibit F.

87. By making, using, offering for sale, selling and/or importing into the United States the '236 patent Accused Instrumentalities, Hisense has injured VideoLabs and is liable for infringement of the '236 patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

88. Hisense has been on notice of its infringement since at least June 7, 2023, when

VideoLabs sent a claim chart to Hisense and specifically informed Hisense of its infringement of the '236 patent.

89. Hisense of course knows how its products operate, and on information and belief, upon receiving notice of the '236 patent, began investigating the '236 patent and its infringement. Hisense has been given further notice of its infringement of the '236 patent through the filing of the Complaint in this Action. On information and belief, Hisense is either knowingly infringing the '236 patent or is willfully blind to its infringement — including by ignoring VideoLabs' communications and continuing to act in wanton disregard of VideoLabs' patent rights.

90. Despite becoming aware of or willfully blinding itself to its infringement of the '236 patent, Hisense has nonetheless continued to engage in and has escalated its infringing activities by continuing to develop, advertise, make available, and use the '236 patent Accused Instrumentalities. On information and belief, Hisense has made no attempts to design around the '236 patent or otherwise stop its infringing behavior.

91. Hisense's infringement of the '236 patent therefore has been and remains willful.

92. Hisense also indirectly infringes the '236 patent by inducing others to infringe and contributing to the infringement of others, including third-party users of the '236 patent Accused Instrumentalities in this District and throughout the United States. As described above, on information and belief, Hisense has known about the '236 patent since at least June 7, 2023.

93. Hisense actively and intentionally encouraged others to infringe the '238 patent. *See, e.g.*, *Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd.*, 545 U.S. 913, 936 (2005) (advertising or instructing an infringing use "show an affirmative intent that the product be used to infringe."); *Barry v. Medtronic, Inc.,* 914 F.3d 1310, 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2019) (advertising to customers and instructing them on how to engage in an infringing use satisfied the intent requirement); *Affinity Labs of Texas,*

LLC v. Toyota Motor North America., No. 13-cv-365, 2014 WL2892285, *7 (W. D. Tex. May 12, 2014) (intent satisfied where defendant provided "technical support and services, as well as detailed explanations, instructions and information as to arrangements, applications and uses" of accused products).

94. On information and belief, Hisense has actively induced the infringement of the '236 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) by actively inducing the infringement of the '236 patent Accused Instrumentalities by third parties in the United States. Hisense knew or was willfully blind to the fact that its conduct would induce these third parties to act in a manner that infringes the '236 patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

95. Hisense actively encouraged and continues to actively encourage third parties to directly infringe the '236 patent by, for example, marketing the '236 patent Accused Instrumentalities and infringing functionalities to consumers; working with consumers to implement, install and/or operate the '236 patent Accused Instrumentalities and infringing functionalities; fully supporting and managing consumers' continuing use of the '236 patent Accused Instrumentalities and infringing functionalities; and providing technical assistance to consumers during their continued use of the '236 patent Accused Instrumentalities and infringing functionalities.[13]

96. For example, Hisense induces third parties to infringe the '236 patent by encouraging them to operate the '236 Accused Instrumentalities, constituting infringement of the '236 patent. Hisense advertises and promotes the '236 Accused Instrumentalities and encourages consumers to

[13] *See, e.g.*, https://www.hisensebroadband.com/html/products/broadcast%20stb/; https://www.hisensebroadband.com/html/products/broadcast%20stb/20240809_466.html; https://www.hisense-usa.com/support/75r6030-75-4k-uhd-hisense-roku-tv-with-hdr-2020; https://www.hisensebroadband.com/html/products/dongle/20240809_467.html;

use them in an infringing manner.[14] In response, consumers acquire, configure, and operate the Hisense devices (e.g., Hisense's devices compatible with HDCP such as Hisense's Smart TVs) in an infringing manner.

97. On information and belief, Hisense contributorily infringes the '236 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(c) by importing, selling, and/or offering to sell within the United States the '236 patent Accused Instrumentalities (or components thereof) that constitute a material part of the claimed invention and are not staple articles of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use. For example, the Accused Instrumentalities are material, have no substantial non-infringing uses, and are known by Hisense to be especially made or adapted for use in a manner that infringes the '236 patent.

98. As a result of Hisense's direct and indirect infringement of the '236 patent, VideoLabs is entitled to monetary damages in an amount adequate to compensate for Hisense's infringement, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty for the use made of the invention by Hisense, together with interest and costs as fixed by the Court.

99. On information and belief, despite having knowledge of the '236 patent and knowledge that it is directly and/or indirectly infringing one or more claims of the '236 patent, Hisense has nevertheless continued its infringing conduct and disregarded an objectively high likelihood of infringement. Hisense's infringing activities relative to the '236 patent have been, and continue to be, willful, wanton, malicious, deliberate, consciously wrongful, and an egregious case of misconduct beyond typical infringement such that VideoLabs is entitled to enhanced damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 up to three times the amount found or assessed.

100. Hisense's acts of direct and indirect infringement have caused and continue to cause

[14] *See, e.g.*, https://www.hisensebroadband.com/html/products/broadcast%20stb/20240809_466.html; https://www.hisense-usa.com/support/75r6030-75-4k-uhd-hisense-roku-tv-with-hdr-2020; https://www.hisensebroadband.com/html/products/dongle/20240809_467.html;

damage to VideoLabs. VideoLabs is entitled to damages in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §§ 271, 281, and 284 sustained as a result of Hisense's wrongful acts in an amount to be proven at trial.

SECOND COUNT

(INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,667,304)

101. VideoLabs incorporates by reference the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

102. VL is the assignee and lawful owner of all right, title, and interest in and to the '304 patent. The '304 patent is valid and enforceable.

103. On information and belief, Hisense has directly infringed and continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the '304 patent, including at least claim 5 of the '304 patent by, among other things, making, using, selling, offering for sale, and/or importing into the United States products that embody one or more of the inventions claimed in the '304 patent, including but not limited to the '304 patent Accused Instrumentalities, including Hisense devices compatible with HDCP, including, e.g., 4K TVs (e.g., Hisense 75R6030) as well as all reasonably similar products, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

104. The '304 patent Accused Instrumentalities satisfy all claim limitations of one or more claims of the '304 patent. A claim chart comparing exemplary independent claim 5 of the '304 patent to representative Accused Instrumentalities is attached as Exhibit G.

105. By making, using, offering for sale, selling and/or importing into the United States the '304 patent Accused Instrumentalities, Hisense has injured VideoLabs and is liable for infringement of the '304 patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

106. Hisense has been on notice of its infringement since at least June 7, 2023, when VideoLabs sent a claim chart to Hisense and specifically informed Hisense of its infringement of the

'304 patent.

107. Hisense of course knows how its products operate, and on information and belief, upon receiving notice of the '304 patent, began investigating the '304 patent and its infringement. Hisense has been given further notice of its infringement of the '304 patent through the filing of the Complaint in this Action. On information and belief, Hisense is either knowingly infringing the '304 patent or is willfully blind to its infringement — including by ignoring VideoLabs' communications and continuing to act in wanton disregard of VideoLabs' patent rights.

108. Despite becoming aware of or willfully blinding itself to its infringement of the '304 patent, Hisense has nonetheless continued to engage in and has escalated its infringing activities by continuing to develop, advertise, make available, and use the '304 patent Accused Instrumentalities. On information and belief, Hisense has made no attempts to design around the '304 patent or otherwise stop its infringing behavior.

109. Hisense's infringement of the '304 patent therefore has been and remains willful.

110. Hisense also indirectly infringes the '304 patent by inducing others to infringe and contributing to the infringement of others, including third-party users of the '304 patent Accused Instrumentalities in this District and throughout the United States. As described above, on information and belief, Hisense has known about the '304 patent since at least June 7, 2023.

111. Hisense actively and intentionally encouraged others to infringe the '238 patent. *See, e.g.*, *Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd.*, 545 U.S. 913, 936 (2005) (advertising or instructing an infringing use "show an affirmative intent that the product be used to infringe."); *Barry v. Medtronic, Inc.,* 914 F.3d 1310, 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2019) (advertising to customers and instructing them on how to engage in an infringing use satisfied the intent requirement); *Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC v. Toyota Motor North America.,* No. 13-cv-365, 2014 WL2892285, *7 (W. D. Tex. May 12,

2014) (intent satisfied where defendant provided "technical support and services, as well as detailed explanations, instructions and information as to arrangements, applications and uses" of accused products).

112. On information and belief, Hisense has actively induced the infringement of the '304 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) by actively inducing the infringement of the '304 patent Accused Instrumentalities by third parties in the United States. Hisense knew or was willfully blind to the fact that its conduct would induce these third parties to act in a manner that infringes the '304 patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

113. Hisense actively encouraged and continues to actively encourage third parties to directly infringe the '304 patent by, for example, marketing the '304 patent Accused Instrumentalities and infringing functionalities to consumers; working with consumers to implement, and/or operate the '304 patent Accused Instrumentalities and infringing functionalities; fully supporting and managing consumers' continuing use of the '304 patent Accused Instrumentalities and infringing functionalities; and providing technical assistance to consumers during their continued use of the '304 patent Accused Instrumentalities and infringing functionalities.[15]

114. For example, Hisense induces third parties to infringe the '304 patent by encouraging and instructing them to, e.g., connect streaming devices to the Accused Instrumentalities using the HDMI interface of the Accused Instrumentalities, which when used to stream high-bandwidth content constitutes infringement of the '304 patent.[16] In response, consumers acquire, configure, and operate

---

[15] *See, e.g.*, https://www.hisensebroadband.com/html/products/broadcast%20stb/; https://www.hisensebroadband.com/html/products/broadcast%20stb/20240809_466.html; https://www.hisense-usa.com/support/75r6030-75-4k-uhd-hisense-roku-tv-with-hdr-2020; https://www.hisensebroadband.com/html/products/dongle/20240809_467.html;

[16] *See, e.g.*, https://www.hisensebroadband.com/html/products/broadcast%20stb/20240809_466.html; https://www.hisense-usa.com/support/75r6030-75-4k-uhd-hisense-roku-tv-with-hdr-2020; https://www.hisensebroadband.com/html/products/dongle/20240809_467.html;

the Hisense devices (e.g., Hisense's devices compatible with HDCP such as Hisense's 4K TVs (e.g., Hisense 75R6030)) in an infringing manner.

115. On information and belief, Hisense contributorily infringes the '304 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(c) by importing, selling, and/or offering to sell within the United States the '304 patent Accused Instrumentalities (or components thereof) that constitute a material part of the claimed invention and are not staple articles of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use. For example, the HDCP-related components of the Accused Instrumentalities are material, have no substantial non-infringing uses, and are known by Hisense to be especially made or adapted for use in a manner that infringes the '304 patent.

116. As a result of Hisense's direct and indirect infringement of the '304 patent, VideoLabs is entitled to monetary damages in an amount adequate to compensate for Hisense's infringement, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty for the use made of the invention by Hisense, together with interest and costs as fixed by the Court.

117. On information and belief, despite having knowledge of the '304 patent and knowledge that it is directly and/or indirectly infringing one or more claims of the '304 patent, Hisense has nevertheless continued its infringing conduct and disregarded an objectively high likelihood of infringement. Hisense's infringing activities relative to the '304 patent have been, and continue to be, willful, wanton, malicious, deliberate, consciously wrongful, and an egregious case of misconduct beyond typical infringement such that VideoLabs is entitled to enhanced damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 up to three times the amount found or assessed.

118. Hisense's acts of direct and indirect infringement have caused and continue to cause damage to VideoLabs. VideoLabs is entitled to damages in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §§ 271, 281, and 284 sustained as a result of Hisense's wrongful acts in an amount to be proven at trial.

THIRD COUNT

(INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,769,238)

119. VideoLabs incorporates by reference the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

120. VL is the assignee and lawful owner of all right, title, and interest in and to the '238 patent. The '238 patent is valid and enforceable.

121. On information and belief, Hisense has directly infringed claim 1 of the '238 patent by, among other things, having made, used, sold, offered for sale, and/or imported into the United States products that embody one or more of the inventions claimed in the '238 patent, including but not limited to the '238 patent Accused Instrumentalities, including Hisense devices configured to support the H.264 standard (e.g., televisions, projectors, set top boxes, and dongles), including, for example, the Hisense U8H as well as all reasonably similar products, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

122. The '238 patent Accused Instrumentalities satisfy all claim limitations of claim 1 of the '238 patent. A claim chart comparing independent claim 1 of the '238 patent to representative Accused Instrumentalities is attached as Exhibit H.

123. By having made, used, offered for sale, sold and/or imported into the United States the '238 patent Accused Instrumentalities, Hisense has injured VideoLabs and is liable for infringement of the '238 patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

124. Hisense has been on notice of its infringement since at least December 27, 2022 when VideoLabs wrote to David Gold, President of Hisense USA Corporation, a subsidiary of Hisense Co. Ltd. and specifically informed Hisense of its infringement of the '238 patent.

125. Hisense of course knows how its products operate, and on information and belief, upon

receiving notice of the ’238 patent, began investigating the ’238 patent and its infringement. On information and belief, Hisense either knowingly infringed the ’238 patent or was willfully blind to its infringement — including by ignoring VideoLabs’ communications and continuing to act in wanton disregard of VideoLabs’ patent rights.

126. Despite becoming aware of or willfully blinding itself to its infringement of the ’238 patent, Hisense continued to engage in and escalate its infringing activities by continuing to develop, advertise, make available, and use the ’238 patent Accused Instrumentalities. On information and belief, Hisense made no attempts to design around the ’238 patent or otherwise stop its infringing behavior prior to the expiration of the ’238 patent.

127. Hisense’s infringement of the ’238 patent therefore has been willful.

128. Hisense also indirectly infringed the ’238 patent by inducing others to infringe and contributing to the infringement of others, including third-party users of the ’238 patent Accused Instrumentalities in this District and throughout the United States. As described above, on information and belief, Hisense has known about the ’238 patent since at least August 22, 2023.

129. On information and belief, Hisense has actively induced the infringement of the ’238 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) by actively inducing the infringement of the ’238 patent Accused Instrumentalities by third parties in the United States. Hisense knew or was willfully blind to the fact that its conduct would induce these third parties to act in a manner that infringed the ’238 patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

130. Hisense actively encouraged third parties to directly infringe the ’238 patent by, for example, marketing the ’238 patent Accused Instrumentalities and infringing functionalities to consumers; working with consumers to implement, and/or operate the ’238 patent Accused Instrumentalities and infringing functionalities; fully supporting and managing consumers’

continuing use of the '238 patent Accused Instrumentalities and infringing functionalities; and providing technical assistance to consumers during their continued use of the '238 patent Accused Instrumentalities and infringing functionalities.[17]

131. For example, Hisense induced third parties to infringe the '238 patent by encouraging and instructing them to, e.g., use the '238 patent Accused Instrumentalities to stream audiovisual content. As an example, Hisense encourages its users to operate the Accused Instrumentalities to Strem content from a "wide selection" and "stream your favorite video" and touted that the Accused Instrumentalities could stream containers including H.264 data.[18]

132. Hisense actively and intentionally encouraged others to infringe the '238 patent. *See, e.g.*, *Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd.*, 545 U.S. 913, 936 (2005) (advertising or instructing an infringing use "show an affirmative intent that the product be used to infringe."); *Barry v. Medtronic, Inc.,* 914 F.3d 1310, 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2019) (advertising to customers and instructing them on how to engage in an infringing use satisfied the intent requirement); *Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC v. Toyota Motor North America.,* No. 13-cv-365, 2014 WL2892285, *7 (W.D. Tex. May 12, 2014) (intent satisfied where defendant provided "technical support and services, as well as detailed explanations, instructions and information as to arrangements, applications and uses" of accused products).

---

[17] *See, e.g.*, https://www.hisense-usa.com/televisions/65u8h-hisense-65-mini-led-uled-4k-smart-google-tv-2022; https://assets.hisense-usa.com/assets/ProductDownloads/449/72dc8476c7/65U8H-QSG.pdf; https://assets.hisense-usa.com/assets/ProductDownloads/449/aa9666a84e/U8H-User-manual-1.pdf; https://assets.hisense-usa.com/assets/ProductDownloads/449/a280fec8f7/65U8H_spec.-sheet_release.pdf.

[18] https://assets.hisense-usa.com/assets/ProductDownloads/449/a280fec8f7/65U8H_spec.-sheet_release.pdf; https://assets.hisense-usa.com/assets/ProductDownloads/449/aa9666a84e/U8H-User-manual-1.pdf.

133. Additionally, the ’238 patent Accused Instrumentalities during their normal and intended operation of streaming audiovisual content having H.264 data, infringed the ’238 patent without any additional specific action of end users. By instructing and encouraging others to stream content, Hisense thus actively and intentionally encouraged others to infringe the ’238 patent.

134. In response to Hisense’s instructions and encouragement, consumers infringed the ’238 patent via the ’238 patent Accused Instrumentalities.

135. On information and belief, Hisense contributorily infringed the ’238 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(c) by having imported, sold, and/or offered to sell within the United States the ’238 patent Accused Instrumentalities (or components thereof) that constitute a material part of the claimed invention and are not staple articles of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use. For example, the video and audio codecs of the Accused Instrumentalities are material, have no substantial non-infringing uses, and are known by Hisense to be especially made or adapted for use in a manner that infringed the ’238 patent.

136. As a result of Hisense’s direct and indirect infringement of the ’238 patent, VideoLabs is entitled to monetary damages in an amount adequate to compensate for Hisense’s infringement, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty for the use made of the invention by Hisense, together with interest and costs as fixed by the Court.

137. On information and belief, despite having knowledge of the ’238 patent and knowledge that it has directly and/or indirectly infringed the ’238 patent, Hisense nevertheless continued its infringing conduct and disregarded an objectively high likelihood of infringement prior to the expiration of the ’238 patent. Hisense’s infringing activities relative to the ’238 patent have been willful, wanton, malicious, deliberate, consciously wrongful, and an egregious case of misconduct beyond typical infringement such that VideoLabs is entitled to enhanced damages under

35 U.S.C. § 284 up to three times the amount found or assessed.

138. Hisense's acts of direct and indirect infringement have caused damage to VideoLabs. VideoLabs is entitled to damages in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §§ 271, 281, and 284 sustained as a result of Hisense's wrongful acts in an amount to be proven at trial.

FOURTH COUNT

(INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,970,059)

139. VideoLabs incorporates by reference the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

140. VL is the assignee and lawful owner of all right, title, and interest in and to the '059 patent. The '059 patent is valid and enforceable.

141. On information and belief, Hisense has directly infringed one or more claims of the '059 patent, including at least claim 1 of the '059 patent by, among other things, having made, used, sold, offered for sale, and/or imported into the United States products that embody one or more of the inventions claimed in the '059 patent, including but not limited to the '059 patent Accused Instrumentalities, including Hisense devices configured to support the H.264 standard (e.g., televisions, projectors, set top boxes, and dongles), including, for example, the Hisense U8H, as well as all reasonably similar products, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

142. The '059 patent Accused Instrumentalities satisfy all claim limitations of one or more claims of the '059 patent. A claim chart comparing exemplary independent claim 1 of the '059 patent to representative Accused Instrumentalities is attached as Exhibit I.

143. By having made, used, offered for sale, sold and/or imported into the United States the '059 patent Accused Instrumentalities, Hisense has injured VideoLabs and is liable for infringement of the '059 patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

144. Hisense has been on notice of its infringement since at least December 27, 2022, when VideoLabs wrote to David Gold, President of Hisense USA Corporation, a subsidiary of Hisense Co. Ltd. and specifically informed Hisense of its infringement of the '059 patent.

145. Hisense of course knows how its products operate, and on information and belief, upon receiving notice of the '059 patent, began investigating the '059 patent and its infringement. On information and belief, Hisense either knowingly infringed the '059 patent or was willfully blind to its infringement — including by ignoring VideoLabs' communications and continuing to act in wanton disregard of VideoLabs' patent rights.

146. Despite becoming aware of or willfully blinding itself to its infringement of the '059 patent, Hisense engaged in and escalated its infringing activities by developing, advertising, making available, and using the '059 patent Accused Instrumentalities prior to the expiration of the '059 patent. On information and belief, Hisense has made no attempts to design around the '059 patent or otherwise stop its infringing behavior prior to the expiration of the '059 patent.

147. Hisense's infringement of the '059 patent therefore has been willful.

148. Hisense also indirectly infringed the '059 patent by inducing others to infringe and contributing to the infringement of others, including third-party users of the '059 patent Accused Instrumentalities in this District and throughout the United States. As described above, on information and belief, Hisense has known about the '059 patent since at least December 27, 2022.

149. On information and belief, Hisense has actively induced the infringement of the '059 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) by actively inducing the infringement of the '059 patent Accused Instrumentalities by third parties in the United States. Hisense knew or was willfully blind to the fact that its conduct would induce these third parties to act in a manner that infringes the '059 patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

150. Hisense actively encouraged third parties to directly infringe the '059 patent by, for example, marketing the '059 patent Accused Instrumentalities and infringing functionalities to consumers; working with consumers to implement, and/or operate the '059 patent Accused Instrumentalities and infringing functionalities; fully supporting and managing consumers' continuing use of the '059 patent Accused Instrumentalities and infringing functionalities; and providing technical assistance to consumers during their continued use of the '059 patent Accused Instrumentalities and infringing functionalities.[19]

151. For example, Hisense induced third parties to infringe the '238 patent by encouraging and instructing them to, e.g., use the '059 patent Accused Instrumentalities to stream audiovisual content. As an example, Hisense encourages its users to operate the Accused Instrumentalities to Strem content from a "wide selection" and "stream your favorite video" and touted that the Accused Instrumentalities could stream containers including H.264 data.[20]

152. Hisense actively and intentionally encouraged others to infringe the '059 patent. *See, e.g.*, *Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd.*, 545 U.S. 913, 936 (2005) (advertising or instructing an infringing use "show an affirmative intent that the product be used to infringe."); *Barry v. Medtronic, Inc.,* 914 F.3d 1310, 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2019) (advertising to customers and instructing them on how to engage in an infringing use satisfied the intent requirement); *Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC v. Toyota Motor North America.,* No. 13-cv-365, 2014 WL2892285, *7 (W.D. Tex. May 12,

[19] *See, e.g.*, https://www.hisense-usa.com/televisions/65u8h-hisense-65-mini-led-uled-4k-smart-google-tv-2022; https://assets.hisense-usa.com/assets/ProductDownloads/449/72dc8476c7/65U8H-QSG.pdf; https://assets.hisense-usa.com/assets/ProductDownloads/449/aa9666a84e/U8H-User-manual-1.pdf; https://assets.hisense-usa.com/assets/ProductDownloads/449/a280fec8f7/65U8H_spec.-sheet_release.pdf.

[20] https://assets.hisense-usa.com/assets/ProductDownloads/449/a280fec8f7/65U8H_spec.-sheet_release.pdf; https://assets.hisense-usa.com/assets/ProductDownloads/449/aa9666a84e/U8H-User-manual-1.pdf.

2014) (intent satisfied where defendant provided "technical support and services, as well as detailed explanations, instructions and information as to arrangements, applications and uses" of accused products).

153. Additionally, the '059 patent Accused Instrumentalities during their normal and intended operation of streaming audiovisual content having H.264 data, infringed the '059 patent without any additional specific action of end users. By instructing and encouraging others to stream content, Hisense thus actively and intentionally encouraged others to infringe the '059 patent.

154. In response to Hisense's instructions and encouragement, consumers infringed the '059 patent via the '059 patent Accused Instrumentalities.

155. On information and belief, Hisense contributorily infringed the '059 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(c) by having imported, sold, and/or offered to sell within the United States the '059 patent Accused Instrumentalities (or components thereof) that constitute a material part of the claimed invention and are not staple articles of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use. For example, the video and audio codecs of the Accused Instrumentalities are material, have no substantial non-infringing uses, and are known by Hisense to be especially made or adapted for use in a manner that infringed the '059 patent.

156. As a result of Hisense's direct and indirect infringement of the '059 patent, VideoLabs is entitled to monetary damages in an amount adequate to compensate for Hisense's infringement, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty for the use made of the invention by Hisense, together with interest and costs as fixed by the Court.

157. On information and belief, despite having knowledge of the '059 patent and knowledge that it directly and/or indirectly infringed one or more claims of the '059 patent, Hisense has nevertheless continued its infringing conduct and disregarded an objectively high likelihood of

infringement. Hisense's infringing activities relative to the '059 patent have been willful, wanton, malicious, deliberate, consciously wrongful, and an egregious case of misconduct beyond typical infringement such that VideoLabs is entitled to enhanced damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 up to three times the amount found or assessed.

158. Hisense's acts of direct and indirect infringement have caused damage to VideoLabs. VideoLabs is entitled to damages in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §§ 271, 281, and 284 sustained as a result of Hisense's wrongful acts in an amount to be proven at trial.

FIFTH COUNT

(INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,605,794)

159. VideoLabs incorporates by reference the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

160. VL IP is the assignee and lawful owner of all right, title, and interest in and to the '794 patent. The '794 patent is valid and enforceable.

161. On information and belief, Hisense has directly infringed and continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the '794 patent, including at least claim 1 of the '794 patent by, among other things, making, using, selling, offering for sale, and/or importing into the United States products that embody one or more of the inventions claimed in the '794 patent, including but not limited to the '794 patent Accused Instrumentalities, including Hisense's user devices that include Roku's software, including the Roku Channel software, including "Hisense Roku TV models" (e.g., Hisense Roku TV 4K (65R6E4)), as well as all reasonably similar products, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

162. The '794 patent Accused Instrumentalities satisfy all claim limitations of one or more claims of the '794 patent. A claim chart comparing exemplary independent claim 1 of the '794 patent to representative Accused Instrumentalities is attached as Exhibit J.

163. By making, using, offering for sale, selling and/or importing into the United States the '794 patent Accused Instrumentalities, Hisense has injured VideoLabs and is liable for infringement of the '794 patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

164. Hisense has been on notice of its infringement since at least December 27, 2022 when VideoLabs wrote to David Gold, President of Hisense USA Corporation, a subsidiary of Hisense Co. Ltd. and specifically informed Hisense of its infringement of the '794 patent.

165. Hisense of course knows how its products operate, and on information and belief, upon receiving notice of the '794 patent, began investigating the '794 patent and its infringement. Hisense has been given further notice of its infringement of the '794 patent through the filing of the Complaint in this Action. On information and belief, Hisense is either knowingly infringing the '794 patent or is willfully blind to its infringement — including by ignoring VideoLabs' communications and continuing to act in wanton disregard of VideoLabs' patent rights.

166. Despite becoming aware of or willfully blinding itself to its infringement of the '794 patent, Hisense has nonetheless continued to engage in and has escalated its infringing activities by continuing to develop, advertise, make available, and use the '794 patent Accused Instrumentalities. On information and belief, Hisense has made no attempts to design around the '794 patent or otherwise stop its infringing behavior.

167. Hisense's infringement of the '794 patent therefore has been and remains willful.

168. Hisense also indirectly infringes the '794 patent by inducing others to infringe and contributing to the infringement of others, including third-party users of the '794 patent Accused Instrumentalities in this District and throughout the United States. As described above, on information and belief, Hisense has known about the '794 patent since at least December 27, 2022.

169. On information and belief, Hisense has actively induced the infringement of the '794

patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) by actively inducing the infringement of the '794 patent Accused Instrumentalities by third parties in the United States. Hisense knew or was willfully blind to the fact that its conduct would induce these third parties to act in a manner that infringes the '794 patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

170. Hisense actively and intentionally encouraged others to infringe the '238 patent. *See, e.g.*, *Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd.*, 545 U.S. 913, 936 (2005) (advertising or instructing an infringing use "show an affirmative intent that the product be used to infringe."); *Barry v. Medtronic, Inc.,* 914 F.3d 1310, 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2019) (advertising to customers and instructing them on how to engage in an infringing use satisfied the intent requirement); *Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC v. Toyota Motor North America.,* No. 13-cv-365, 2014 WL2892285, *7 (W.D. Tex. May 12, 2014) (intent satisfied where defendant provided "technical support and services, as well as detailed explanations, instructions and information as to arrangements, applications and uses" of accused products).

171. Hisense actively encouraged and continues to actively encourage third parties to directly infringe the '794 patent by, for example, marketing the '794 patent Accused Instrumentalities and infringing functionalities to consumers; working with consumers to implement, install and/or operate the '794 patent Accused Instrumentalities and infringing functionalities; fully supporting and managing consumers' continuing use of the '794 patent Accused Instrumentalities and infringing functionalities; and providing technical assistance to consumers during their continued use of the '794 patent Accused Instrumentalities and infringing functionalities.[21]

172. For example, Hisense induces third parties to infringe the '794 patent by encouraging

[21] *See, e.g.*, https://www.hisense-usa.com/televisions (advertising Roku TVs); https://www.hisense-usa.com/televisions/32-a4-series-hisense-fhd-roku-tv-32a4nr;

them to use the Roku channel because "Roku TV makes it easy to watch what you love with Roku streaming bult in."[22]

173. On information and belief, Hisense contributorily infringes the '794 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(c) by importing, selling, and/or offering to sell within the United States the '794 patent Accused Instrumentalities (or components thereof) that constitute a material part of the claimed invention and are not staple articles of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use. For example, the Hisense software is material, has no substantial non-infringing uses, and is known by Hisense to be especially made or adapted for use in a manner that infringes the '794 patent.

174. As a result of Hisense's direct and indirect infringement of the '794 patent, VideoLabs is entitled to monetary damages in an amount adequate to compensate for Hisense's infringement, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty for the use made of the invention by Hisense, together with interest and costs as fixed by the Court.

175. On information and belief, despite having knowledge of the '794 patent and knowledge that it is directly and/or indirectly infringing one or more claims of the '794 patent, Hisense has nevertheless continued its infringing conduct and disregarded an objectively high likelihood of infringement. Hisense's infringing activities relative to the '794 patent have been, and continue to be, willful, wanton, malicious, deliberate, consciously wrongful, and an egregious case of misconduct beyond typical infringement such that VideoLabs is entitled to enhanced damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 up to three times the amount found or assessed.

176. Hisense's acts of direct and indirect infringement have caused and continue to cause damage to VideoLabs. VideoLabs is entitled to damages in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §§ 271, 281,

[22] https://www.hisense-usa.com/televisions/32-a4-series-hisense-fhd-roku-tv-32a4nr#ProductDetailsBox8.

and 284 sustained as a result of Hisense wrongful acts in an amount to be proven at trial.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

VideoLabs respectfully requests that the Court find in favor of VideoLabs and against Hisense, and the Court grant VideoLabs the following relief:

A. For judgment that Hisense is liable for infringement of one or more claims of the Asserted Patents, directly and/or indirectly, either literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents;

B. For judgment that Hisense has willfully infringed one or more claims of the Asserted Patents, directly and/or indirectly, either literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents;

C. For an accounting of all damages sustained by VideoLabs as the result of Hisense's acts of infringement, including compensatory damages in an amount according to proof, and in no event less than a reasonable royalty;

D. For a judgment and order requiring Hisense to pay VideoLabs' damages, costs, expenses, and pre- and post-judgment interest for its infringement of the Asserted Patents as provided under 35 U.S.C. § 284;

F. For a judgment and order finding that this is an exceptional case within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 285 and awarding to VideoLabs its reasonable attorneys' fees; and

G. For such other and further relief in law and in equity as the Court may deem just and proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Pursuant to Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, VideoLabs hereby demands a trial by jury of this action.

Dated: November 6, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ M. Elizabeth Day
M. Elizabeth Day (*admitted in EDTX*)
California Bar No. 177125
eday@bdiplaw.com
Marc Belloli (*admitted in EDTX*)
California Bar No. 244290
mbelloli@bdiplaw.com
Jerry D. Tice II
Texas State Bar No. 24093263
jtice@bdiplaw.com
BUNSOW DE MORY LLP
701 El Camino Real,
Redwood City, CA 94063
Tel: (650) 351-7248
Fax: (415) 426-4744

Attorneys for Plaintiffs
VIDEOLABS, INC. and
VL COLLECTIVE IP LLC