

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, DALLAS DIVISION 28 2005

JOHN R. GAMMINO

Plaintiff

CIVIL ACTION NO.

٧.

3-05.CV-0850K

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

Deputy

SOUTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE,

L.P. and

SWBT Texas, LLC

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Defendants

## COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, John R. Gammino, ("Mr. Gammino") by his attorneys, Flamm, Boroff & Bacine, P.C., makes this Complaint against Defendant Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P. and SWBT Texas, LLC.

### **PARTIES**

- 1. Plaintiff, John R. Gammino, is an adult individual and a resident of the State of Florida and operates his patent licensing business out of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
- 2. Defendant, SWBT Texas, LLC is general partner of Defendant, Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P. and SWBT Texas, LLC's registered agent David C. Welsch has an address at One Bell Plaza, Room 2900, Dallas, Texas 75202.
- 3. Defendant, Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P. is a limited partnership and its registered agent David C. Welsch has an address at One Bell

COMPLAINT

Page 1

Plaza, Room 2900, Dallas, Texas 75202. SBC Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, Southwestern Bell Telecommunications, Inc., SW Bell Texas, Inc. are assumed names of Defendant, Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 4. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338, in that the claims in this action arise under the Patent Act of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §101 et seq.
- 5. Venue in the Northern District of Texas. Dallas Division is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1400(b) in that this is a civil action for patent infringement and Defendant either (i) resides in this judicial district, (ii) committed acts of infringement in this judicial district, and/or (iii) has a regular and established place of business in this judicial district.

#### **BACKGROUND FACTS AND INVENTION**

- 6. Plaintiff filed an action against Defendant, Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P. (in the Defendant's assumed name Southwestern Bell Telephone Company) in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania (the "Pennsylvania case") and the complaint against the Defendant was dismissed for lack of personal jurisdiction by order dated March 29, 2005. This complaint is a continuation of the claims made in the Pennsylvania case.
- 7. In this country, there had been a major problem of people making fraudulent international telephone calls on payphones and other devices. That fraud led to losses of billions of dollars to telecommunications companies.

- 8. The international pay phone fraud escalated in the early 1990s after the FCC, pursuant to new federal law, prohibited the blocking of access codes that permit the consumer to reach the operator service provider of the consumer's choice. Once the access codes were unblocked in payphones and at certain other locations, the fraudulent use of payphones for international calls skyrocketed. At certain payphone sites, losses due to international calls were reaching an average of \$1,500 per month per phone. Fortunately, Mr. Gammino invented a solution that prevents that fraud.
- 9. In 1991, the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (the "Port Authority") had massive fraud problems with international calls on payphones, particularly at the Port Authority Bus Terminal in New York City. The Port Authority brought in major phone companies to solve the problem. Those companies, including AT&T and New York Telephone (now Verizon), could not solve the Port Authority's fraud problem and reported to the Port Authority that a solution to the international fraud problem was "not technically possible."
- 10. In 1991, John Gammino was hired by the Port Authority to try and do what no one else could do - stop the fraud.
- 11. Mr. Gammino virtually eliminated international payphone fraud at the Bus Terminal. The solution invented by Mr. Gammino comprises an algorithm that can distinguish international calls from other types of calls and can selectively block international calls (the "Solution").

12. The Port Authority recognized Mr. Gammino's Solution when it said that the pay phone fraud problem was virtually eliminated at the Bus Terminal due to the technological changes that Mr. Gammino implemented.

### **PATENTS**

- 13. Mr. Gammino filed for patent protection for the Solution, which ultimately resulted in U.S. Patent No. 5,809,125 ("the '125 Patent") being duly and legally issued to Mr. Gammino on September 15, 1998, and U.S. Patent No. 5,812,650 ("the '650 Patent") being duly and legally issued to Mr. Gammino on September 22, 1998 (collectively, the "Gammino Patents"). Copies of the Gammino Patents are attached hereto, made a part hereof, and marked as Exhibits "A" and "B", respectively. Hereinafter, for the time period after September 15, 1998, the Solution shall be referred to as the "Patented Solution."
- 14. The '125 Patent and '650 Patent relate to methods and apparatus for preventing potentially fraudulent international telephone calls.
- 15. A telephone call is initiated by dialing a sequence of digits. Each dialing sequence is made up of a "plurality" of dialing signals. A plurality is a set of two or more signals. For example, someone might dial "101-0288-011-41-21-619-0670" to attempt an international call using AT&T as the carrier (AT&T's code is 0288). For this example in that call, the first plurality (or set) could be 101 which is an access code to provide access to carriers, the second plurality could be 0288 which is a code identifying AT&T as the carrier desired, and the third plurality could be 011 which is a code that indicates that the call is a direct

COMPLAINT

dialed international call. As additional examples, the plurality of dialing signals are further shown in the following formulas (X is a "don't care" value):

101 <u>First</u> plurality of dialing signals	XXXX <u>Second</u> plurality of dialing signals	011 <u>Third</u> plurality of dialing signals
950	XXXX	011
First plurality	Second plurality	Third plurality
of dialing signals	of dialing signals	of dialing signals
1-800	XXX-XXXX	011
First plurality	Second plurality	Third plurality
of dialing signals	of dialing signals	of dialing signals

As an example, in at least one of the claims of the '125 or '650 Patents a call is blocked, if inter alia, the first plurality of dialing signals are determined to be predetermined signals and the third plurality of dialing signals are determined to be predetermined signals used for international dialing.

#### COUNT I

## PATENT INFRINGEMENT OF UNITED STATES **PATENT NO. 5,809,125**

- 16. The averments in paragraphs 1 through 15 above are incorporated herein by reference.
- 17. Texas, L.L.C., as general partner of Defendant, SWBT Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P., is jointly and severally liable for all acts and obligations of Defendant, Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P. In this complaint, "Defendants" mean both SWBT Texas, L.L.C. and Defendant, Southwestern Bell

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> "Don't care" value means that, for purposes of determining whether to block a call, it does not matter what the value is in that position. Of course, a caller and a carrier like AT&T care about the "don't care" values for other purposes, such as identifying the carrier.

Telephone, L.P. acting on their own behalf, on behalf of the other defendant or with the other defendant acting on their behalf.

- 18. Defendants have used and continue to use Mr. Gammino's Patented Solution to prevent fraudulent international telephone calls, resulting in millions of dollars in savings.
- 19. Defendants offer the Patented Solution for a profit and collects revenues from others in connection with the deployment of the Patented Solution in payphones and other devices.
- 20. Defendants are using the methods in the claims of '125 Patent and '650 Patent in its payphones, network switches, PBX lines, Centrex lines, Business Exchange lines and other lines.
- 21. Defendants infringed the '125 Patent and '650 Patent by selling its international call blocking service without a license from Mr. Gammino.
- 22. As a result of the foregoing conduct, Defendants infringe one or more of the claims of the '125 Patent under 35 U.S.C. §271(a) and has caused Mr. Gammino damages as a direct and proximate result thereby. Defendants are jointly and severally liable to Mr. Gammino for all damages suffered by Mr. Gammino as a result of the infringement of the '125 Patent including lost income, profits, and/or royalties, the elimination and/or reduction of business opportunities, market erosion, and other damages.
- 23. Based upon Defendants' data concerning the number of its public lines and the fact that those lines have international call blocking, Mr. Gammino's damages for Defendants' infringement of both the '125 Patent and '650 Patent

include, but are not limited to, the loss of greater than \$22.83 million to date in royalty fees resulting from Defendants' use of the Patented Solution in public lines ("Public Line Use Damages"). Mr. Gammino's damages further include the loss of millions of dollars in royalty fees resulting from Defendants' use of the Patented Solution in some portion of its business lines and residential lines.

#### COUNT II

# PATENT INFRINGEMENT OF UNITED **STATES PATENT NO. 5,812,650**

- 24. The averments in paragraphs 1 through and including 23 above are incorporated herein by reference.
- 25. The actions of Defendants as set forth above constitute infringements of one or more of the claims of the '650 Patent under 35 U.S.C. §271(a) and have caused Mr. Gammino damages as a direct and proximate result thereby. Defendants are jointly and severally liable to Mr. Gammino for all damages suffered by Mr. Gammino as a result of the infringement of the '650 Patent including lost income, profits, and/or royalties, the elimination and/or reduction of business opportunities, market erosion, the Public Line Use Damages, and other damages.

#### COUNT III

## INDUCEMENT TO INFRINGE OF UNITED **STATES PATENT NO. 5,809,125**

26. The averments set forth in paragraphs 1 through 25 above are incorporated herein by reference.

27. The actions of Defendants as set forth above constitute an active inducement to infringe the '125 Patent under 35 U.S.C. §271(b) and have caused Mr. Gammino damages as a direct and proximate result thereby. Defendants are jointly and severally liable to Mr. Gammino for all damages suffered by Mr. Gammino as a result of the infringement of the '125 Patent including lost income, profits, and/or royalties, the elimination and/or reduction of business opportunities, market erosion, the Public Line Use Damages, and other damages.

#### **COUNT IV**

# INDUCEMENT TO INFRINGE OF UNITED STATES **PATENT NO. 5,812,650**

- 28. The averments set forth in paragraphs 1 through 27 above are incorporated herein by reference.
- 29. The actions of Defendants as set forth above constitute an active inducement to infringe the '650 Patent under 35 U.S.C. §271(b) and have caused Mr. Gammino damages as a direct result and proximate result thereby. Defendants are jointly and severally liable to Mr. Gammino for all damages suffered by Mr. Gammino as a result of the infringement of the '650 Patent including lost income, profits, and/or royalties, the elimination and/or reduction of business opportunities, market erosion, the Public Line Use Damages, and other damages.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff John R. Gammino prays:

that Defendants be adjudged to have infringed United States (a) Letters Patent No. 5,809,125:

- that Defendants be adjudged to have infringed United States (b) Letters Patent No. 5,812,650;
- (c) that Defendants, its respective officers, agents, servants, employees and attorneys, and those persons in active concert or participation with them who receive actual notice of the Order, be preliminarily and permanently enjoined from infringing United States Letters Patent No. 5,809,125;
- that Defendants, its respective officers, agents, servants, (d) employees and attorneys, and those persons in active concert or participation with them who receive actual notice of the Order, be preliminarily and permanently enjoined from infringing United States Letters Patent No. 5,812,650;
- that Defendants account for damages to John R. Gammino (e) for its infringement of United States Letters Patent No. 5,809,125;
- (f) that Defendants account for damages to John R. Gammino for its infringement of United States Letters Patent No. 5,812,650;
- (g) that the damages in this judgment be trebled in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §284 for the willful and deliberate infringement of United States Letters Patent No. 5,809,125:
- (h) that the damages in this judgment be trebled in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §284 for the willful and deliberate infringement of United States Letters Patent No. 5,812,650;
- (i) that John R. Gammino be awarded punitive and exemplary damages against Defendants:

- (j) that an assessment be awarded to plaintiff of interest on the damages so computed;
- (k) that the Court declare this case exceptional and award John R. Gammino his reasonable attorney fees and costs pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §285; and
- (I) that John R. Gammino receive such other and further relief as this Honorable Court shall deem just and proper.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Respectfully submitted,

Michael G. Oddo

TBA No. 15192100

HENRY ODDO AUSTIN & FLETCHER

a Professional Corporation

1700 Pacific Avenue

**Suite 2700** 

Dallas, Texas 75201

Telephone: (214) 658-1915 Facsimile: (214) 658-1919 E-mail: mgoddo@hoaf.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF,

**JOHN R. GAMMINO** 

# **OF COUNSEL:**

# FLAMM, BOROFF & BACINE, PC

William M. Mullineaux Richard J. Joyce Robert J. Krandel 925 Harvest Drive, Suite 220 Blue Bell, PA 19422 215.239.6000 Attorneys for Plaintiff John R. Gammino

COMPLAINT Page 11

200828 v1

▶J\$ 44 (Rev. 11/04)

## **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS 44 civil over shee and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by focart. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of including the trail blocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

	ating the Milliocket sile	et. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS OF	THE REVERSE OF THE FO	KM)			
<b>Ual</b>	PLAINTIFFS John R. Gammino		DEFENDANTS	DEFENDANTS			
			Southwestern Bell 7	Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P. and SWBT Texas, LLC			
(b)	•	of First Listed Plaintiff KCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	Indian River County, F	County of Residence of	of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)	ONII VI	
	(E)	CEFT IN 0.5. FLAINTIFF CA	RECF	NOTE. INLAN	D CONDEMNATION CASES, US INVOLVED.		
(c)	Attorney's (Firm Name,	Address, and Telephone Number		Andreys (InKnown)			
.,	Michael G. Oddo. H Avenue, Suite 2700	Address, and Telephone Number Jenry Oddo Austin & Fleo Dallas, Texas 75201 (21	other, P.C., 1700 Pac	ECT COURT	3-05 CV-	0850K	
II. B	ASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)	. CITIZENSHIP OF P		(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
<b>1</b>	U S. Government Plaintiff	<b>⊠</b> 3 Federal Question (U.S Government)	Not a Party)		TF DEF 1 Incorporated or Pr of Business In Thi	•	
<b>□</b> 2	U.S Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity  (Indicate Citizenshi	p of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2 Incorporated and F of Business In A	<u>-</u>	
				Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6	
	NATURE OF SUIT						
	CONTRACT	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJURY	FORFEITURE/PENALTY 610 Agriculture	BANKRUPTCY  422 Appeal 28 USC 158	□ 400 State Reapportionment	
120   130   130   140   150   150   150   151   152   152   153   150   195   195   196	Marine Miller Act Negotiable Instrument Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment Medicare Act Recovery of Defaulted fudent Loans Excl. Veterans) Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits Stockholders' Suits Other Contract Contract Product Liability Franchise EALPROPERTY Land Condemnation Foreclosure Rent Lease & Ejectment Torts to Land Tort Product Liability All Other Real Property	□ 310 Airplane □ 315 Airplane Product     Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel &     Slander □ 330 Federal Employers'     Liability □ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Product     Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal     Injury □ 341 Voting □ 442 Employment □ 443 Housing/     Accommodations □ 444 Welfare □ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -     Employment	□ 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice □ 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability □ 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY □ 370 Other Fraud □ 371 Truth in Lending □ 380 Other Personal Property Damage □ 385 Property Damage Product Liability □ 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus: □ 530 General □ 535 Death Penalty □ 540 Mandamus & Other □ 550 Civil Rights □ 555 Prison Condition	G20 Other Food & Drug G25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 G30 Liquor Laws G40 R.R. & Truck G50 Airline Regs. G60 Occupational Safety/Health G90 Other T10 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Mgmt Relations 730 Labor/Mgmt Reporting & Disclosure Act 740 Railway Labor Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	423 Withdrawal	410 Antitrust   430 Banks and Banking   450 Commerce   460 Deportation   470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations   480 Consumer Credit   490 Cable/Sat TV   810 Selective Service   850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange   875 Customer Challenge   12 USC 3410   890 Other Statutory Actions   891 Agricultural Acts   892 Economic Stabilization Act   893 Environmental Matters   894 Energy Allocation Act   895 Freedom of Information Act   900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice   950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
Proceeding Proceding Proceeding Proceeding Proceeding Proceeding Proceeding Proceding Proceeding Proceeding Proceeding Proceeding Proceeding Proceding Proceding Proceding Proceding Proceding Proceeding Proceding Proceeding Proceding Proc							
Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity)  VI. CAUSE OF ACTION  Brief description of cause: 35 U.S.C. §101 et seq.; patent infringement							
	REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER F.R C.P.	IS A CLASS ACTION 23	DEMAND \$ 22,830,000	)+ CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	ıf demanded ın complaint:	
VIII.	RELATED CASI IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE	<del>*************************************</del>		SIGNATURE OF ATTOR	RNEY OF/RECORD	01		
	28, 2005 FFICE USE ONLY		1-	-11 Jul	e do		
REC	CEIPT #	AMOUNT	APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JU	DGE	