

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

SAINT-GOBAIN CORPORATION,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	Civil Action No. 1:04cv0387
	)	
v.	)	Hon. Wendell A. Miles
	)	Senior U.S. District Judge
GEMTRON CORPORATION,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT,  
UNFAIR COMPETITION, AND ANTITRUST VIOLATION**

Plaintiff Saint-Gobain Corporation (“Saint-Gobain”) files this amended complaint for declaratory judgment, unfair competition, and antitrust violation against defendant Gemtron Corporation (“Gemtron”) and in support thereof alleges as follows:

The Parties

1. Plaintiff Saint-Gobain is a Pennsylvania corporation with a principal place of business in Valley Forge, Pennsylvania.
2. Defendant Gemtron is a Tennessee corporation with a principal place of business in Holland, Michigan. Gemtron is registered to do business in Michigan.

Jurisdiction and Venue

3. Subject matter jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, 15 U.S.C. §§ 2, 15, 26, and 1125(a), and the Michigan common law.
4. Venue in this district is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c).

Patents in Suit

5. United States patent 6,422,673 (“the ‘673 patent”) entitled REFRIGERATOR COMPARTMENT HOUSING VERTICALLY ADJUSTABLE SHELVES, EACH FORMED FROM A PIECE OF TEMPERED GLASS SNAPPED-FASTENED TO AN INJECTION MOLDED FRAME to Craig Bienick of Jenison, Michigan issued on July 23, 2002 to defendant Gemtron (exhibit A hereto).

6. United States patent 6,679,573 (“the ‘573 patent”) entitled REFRIGERATOR SHELF to Craig Bienick of Jenison, Michigan issued on January 20, 2004 to defendant Gemtron (exhibit B hereto).

Actual Controversy

7. Defendant Gemtron, through its patent counsel, has vigorously asserted infringement of the ‘673 and ‘573 patents against plaintiff Saint-Gobain and has threatened a suit for injunctive relief (35 U.S.C. § 283), treble damages (35 U.S.C. § 284) and recovery of attorney fees (35 U.S.C. § 285).

8. Plaintiff Saint-Gobain does not infringe the ‘673 or ‘573 patents.

9. The ‘673 and ‘573 patents, to the extent asserted by defendant Gemtron against plaintiff Saint-Gobain, are invalid.

10. An actual controversy exists between plaintiff Saint-Gobain and defendant Gemtron as to the infringement and validity of the ‘673 and ‘573 patents as asserted by defendant Gemtron against plaintiff Saint-Gobain.

Unfair Competition

11. On information and belief, defendant Gemtron has unfairly competed with plaintiff Saint-Gobain by, without any good faith basis therefor, threatening customers and prospective customers of plaintiff Saint-Gobain with patent infringement.

12. On information and belief, plaintiff Saint-Gobain has been damaged by defendant Gemtron's aforesaid unfair competition.

Monopolization

13. Gemtron asserts infringement of the '673 and '573 patents directed to a glass-in-frame refrigerator shelf as distinguished from an encapsulated shelf.

14. Gemtron further asserts that the sales of Saint-Gobain's accused glass-in-frame shelves caused Gemtron to lose sales of its encapsulated shelves. Thus, Gemtron asserts that the refrigerator shelf market includes both encapsulated and glass-in-frame shelves. Gemtron has monopoly power in this market.

15. Gemtron's assertion of infringement is baseless and was not brought in good faith. More particularly, Gemtron's infringement assertion is (a) objectively baseless in that no reasonable litigant could realistically expect to win on the merits and (b) subjectively baseless in that it was not brought or pursued out of a desire to obtain a justifiable legal remedy. Rather, Gemtron's purpose has been to further monopolize the refrigerator shelf market and to eliminate Saint-Gobain as a competitor in this market.

16. Gemtron's conduct constitutes unlawful monopolization of the refrigerator shelf market or an unlawful attempt to monopolize this market.

17. Saint-Gobain has been damaged by Gemtron's aforesaid monopolization and attempted monopolization.

Relief Requested

WHEREFORE, plaintiff Saint-Gobain respectfully requests:

- A. a declaration that the '673 and '573 patents are not infringed;
- B. a declaration that the '673 and '573 patents as asserted by defendant Gemtron against plaintiff Saint-Gobain are invalid;
- C. an injunction against defendant Gemtron's aforesaid unfair competition, monopolization, and attempted monopolization;
- D. its damages as a result of defendant Gemtron's unfair competition, monopolization, and attempted monopolization, including treble damages;
- G. its attorneys fees;
- H. its costs (rule 54(d), Fed. R. Civ. P.); and
- I. such other relief as is proper and appropriate under the circumstances.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 4, 2006

By: /s/ Mark Pendery  
Mark S. Pendery (P57683)  
RHOADES McKEE  
161 Ottawa Avenue, NW, Suite 600  
Grand Rapids, MI 49503  
(616) 235-3500

Arthur I. Neustadt  
Jean-Paul Lavalleye  
Barry J. Herman  
OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
1940 Duke Street  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 413-3000

*Attorneys for Plaintiff  
Saint-Gobain Corporation*