Case5:08-cv-05742-JW Document1-1 Filed12/23/08 Page1 of 9 COPY Kevin P.B. Johnson (Bar No. 177129) 1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART ÓLIVER & HEDGES, LLP 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 560 ORGNAL FLED Redwood Shores, California 94065-2139 Telephone: (650) 801-5000 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100 DFC 2 3 2008 kevinjohnson@quinnemanuel.com 5 Richard W. Wieking Clerk, U. . District Court Northern District of California Attorneys for Plaintiffs SONY COMPUTER ENTERTAINMENT AMERICA INC. and 6 San Jose SONY ELECTRONICS INC. 7 See Signature Page For Complete List of Represented Parties (L.R. 3-4) 8 9 10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 12 13 SONY COMPUTER ENTERTAINMENT CASE NO. AMERICA INC., SONY ELECTRONICS 14 INC., TOSHIBA AMERICA INFORMATION SYSTEMS, INC, COMPLAINT FOR DECL 15 HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY, AND JUDGMENT LENOVO (UNITED STATES) INC. 16 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** 17 Plaintiffs, 18 VS. WI-LAN, INC., 19 20 Defendant. 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

COMPLAINT

Plaintiffs Sony Computer Entertainment America Inc., Sony Electronics Inc. (collectively "Sony"), Toshiba America Information Systems, Inc. ("TAIS"), Hewlett-Packard Company ("HP"), and Lenovo (United States) Inc. ("Lenovo") (all collectively "Plaintiffs") for their Complaint against Wi-LAN, Inc. ("Wi-LAN") hereby demand a jury trial and allege as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This is an action for declaratory judgment of non-infringement, invalidity, and unenforceability of United States Patent No. 6,549,759 (the "759 Patent") pursuant to the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-02, and the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 100 et seq., and for such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

2. This action includes patent-based declaratory judgment claims arising in connection with conduct at least partially occurring in or directed to Santa Clara County. This action is related to another action pending in the San Jose Division, *Intel Corporation v. Wi-LAN, Inc.*, Case No. 5:08-cv-04555-JW.

PARTIES

- 3. Plaintiff Sony Computer Entertainment America Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Delaware and having its principal place of business at 919 East Hillsdale Boulevard., Foster City, CA 94404, and is doing business in this District.
- 4. Plaintiff Sony Electronics Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware and having its principal place of business at 16450 West Bernardo Drive, San Diego, CA 92127, and is doing business in this District.
- 5. Plaintiff Toshiba America Information Systems, Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California and having its principal place of business at 9740 Irvine Boulevard, Irvine, California 92618, and is doing business in this District.
- 6. Plaintiff Hewlett-Packard Company is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware and having its principal place of business at 3000 Hanover Street, Palo Alto, California 94304, and is doing business in this District.

/. Plaintiff Lenovo (United States) Inc. is a corporation organized and	existing unde
the laws of the State of Delaware and having a principal place of business at 1009	Think Place,
Bldg. 500, Box 29, Morrisville, North Carolina 27560, and is doing business in this	s District.

- 8. On information and belief, defendant Wi-LAN, Inc., is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Canada and having its principal place of business at 11 Holland Avenue, Suite 608, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- As alleged herein, Wi-LAN has engaged in various acts in and directed to
 California.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 10. This Court has exclusive subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338(a), 1367, 2201, and 2202, and the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1, et seq. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400.
- 11. Wi-LAN purports to be the owner of all rights, title, and interest in and to the '759 Patent. Wi-LAN has made statements and representations threatening to assert the '759 Patent against Plaintiffs' products with certain wireless capabilities. Furthermore, Wi-LAN has confirmed its ability and willingness to file suit. Plaintiffs have not infringed and do not infringe, either directly or indirectly, any valid and enforceable claim of the '759 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, nor is it aware of any infringement of the '759 Patent. A substantial controversy exists between the parties which is of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant declaratory relief.
- 12. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Wi-LAN. Wi-LAN has conducted business in and directed to California, including pertaining to the '759 Patent, and has engaged in various acts in and directed to California. Additionally, inventors and former assignees of the '759 Patent, and attorneys responsible for the prosecution of the '759 Patent, are believed to be located in California. Wi-LAN is in the business of asserting patent infringement claims and suing companies for patent infringement. In connection with that business, Wi-LAN has targeted and met with companies in Santa Clara County.

14/2740839.3

15

12

13

16 17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

THE PATENT

The '759 Patent is titled "Asymmetric Adaptive Modulation in a Wireless 13. Communication System," and bears an issuance date of April 15, 2003. A copy of the '759 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

COUNT I

(Declaration of Noninfringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,549,759)

- Plaintiffs repeat and reallege the allegations in paragraphs 1-13 as though fully set 14. forth herein.
- 15. Plaintiffs have not infringed and do not infringe, directly or indirectly, any valid and enforceable claim of the '759 Patent.
- 16. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment.
- A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate so that Plaintiffs may ascertain 17. their rights regarding the '759 Patent.

COUNT II

(Declaration of Invalidity of U.S. Patent No. 6,549,759)

- 18. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege the allegations in paragraphs 1-17 as though fully set forth herein.
- 19. The '759 Patent is invalid for failure to meet the conditions of patentability and/or otherwise comply with one or more of 35 U.S.C. §§ 100 et seq., 101, 102, 103, 112 and 132.
- 20. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment.
- A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate so that Plaintiffs may ascertain 21. their rights regarding the '759 Patent.

COUNT III

(Declaration of Unenforceability of U.S. Patent No. 6,549,759)

- 22. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege the allegations in paragraphs 1-21 as though fully set forth herein.
- 23. On information and belief, individuals subject to the duty of candor under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 ("Applicants") engaged in inequitable conduct by withholding or misstating material information with intent to deceive the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") in connection with prosecuting the '759 Patent, rendering the '759 Patent unenforceable.
- 24. On information and belief, during prosecution of the '759 Patent, Applicants were aware of prior art that they knew was material to patentability, including prior public disclosures material to patentability that they deliberately failed to properly disclose to the USPTO with intent to deceive.
- 25. For example, on or around July 7, 2000, a document titled "Media Access Control Layer Proposal for the 802.16.1 Air Interface Specification" was submitted to the 802.16 MAC Subgroup by Glen Sater, of Motorola, and Kenneth L. Stanwood, of Ensemble Corporation. Kenneth L. Stanwood is a named inventor on the '759 Patent. A copy of this document is attached hereto as Exhibit 2.
- 26. Applicants' public disclosures, including those described above, were material to the patentability of the application that issued as the '759 Patent. On information and belief, during prosecution of the application that issued as the '759 Patent, with intent to deceive the USPTO, Applicants failed to disclose these public disclosures to the USPTO. Under Wi-LAN's improper and incorrect apparent applications of the '759 Patent's claims, these disclosures constitute prior art that renders the claims of the '759 Patent invalid under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and/or 103.
- 27. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment.

14/2740839.3

- []	·				
1	28. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate so that Plaintiffs may ascertain				
2	their rights regarding the '759 Patent.				
3	PRAYER FOR RELIEF				
4	WHEREFORE, plaintiffs Sony Computer Entertainment America Inc., Sony				
5	Electronics Inc., Toshiba America Information Systems, Inc., Hewlett-Packard Company, and				
6	Lenovo (United States) Inc. respectfully request that judgment be entered in their favor and prays				
7	that the Court grant the following relief:				
8	A. A declaration that each of the Plaintiffs has not infringed, either directly or				
9	indirectly, any valid and enforceable claim of the '759 Patent;				
10	B. A declaration that the claims of the '759 Patent are invalid;				
11	C. A declaration that the '759 Patent is unenforceable;				
12	D. An order declaring that Plaintiffs are prevailing parties and that this is an				
13	exceptional case, awarding Plaintiffs their costs, expenses, disbursements and reasonable				
14	attorneys' fees under 35 U.S.C. § 285 and all other applicable statutes, rules and common law; and				
15	E. Such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.				
16					
17	JURY DEMAND				
18	Plaintiffs Sony Computer Entertainment America Inc., Sony Electronics Inc., Toshiba				
19	America Information Systems, Inc., Hewlett-Packard Company, and Lenovo (United States) Inc.,				
20	hereby demand a trial by jury on all issues and claims so triable.				
21					
22	DATED: December 23, 2008 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIVER &				
23	HEDGES, LLP (AB # 253115)				
24	By Kein PB Johnsu				
25	Kevin P.B. Johnson Attorneys for Plaintiffs SONY COMPUTER				
26	ENTERTAINMENT AMERICA INC. and SONY ELECTRONICS INC.				
27					
28					
	-6-				

1	DATED: December 23, 2008 Foley & Lardner LLP
2	$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$
3	By Rept (Ray No. 255 555)
4	George C. Best (Bar No. 255,555) FOLEY & LARDNER LLP 975 Page Mill Road
5	Palo Alto, CA 94304-1013
6	Telephone: (650) 856-3700 Facsimile: (650) 856-3710 gbest@foley.com
7	John J. Feldhaus (to be admitted pro hac vice)
8	jfeldhaus@foley.com Pavan K. Agarwal (to be admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>)
9	Pagarwal@foley.com
10	FOLEY & LARDNER LLP 3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500 Washington, D.C. 20007
11 12	Washington, D.C. 20007 Telephone: (202) 672-5300 Facsimile: (202) 672-5399
13	Attorneys for Plaintiff TOSHIBA AMERICA
14	INFORMATION SYSTEMS, INC.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24 25	
26	
27	
28	
,	-7-
	PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

51314/2740839.3

1	DATED: December 23, 2008	Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
2		12:117
3		Michael J. Lyons (State Bar No. 202284)
4		MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 2 Palo Alto Square
5		3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700 Palo Alto, CA 94306-2122
6		Telephone: (650) 843-7507 Facsimile: (650) 843-4001
7		mlyons@morganlewis.com
8		David J. Levy (to be admitted pro hac vice) MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
9		1000 Louisiana Street, Ste 4200 Houston, TX 77002
10		Telephone: (713) 890-5170 Facsimile: (713) 890-5001
11		dlevy@morganlewis.com
12		Rick L. Rambo (to be admitted pro hac vice) MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
13		1000 Louisiana Street, Ste 4200
14	, v	Houston, TX 77002 Telephone: (713) 890-5175
15		Facsimile: (713) 890-5001 rrambo@morganlewis.com
16		Attorneys for Plaintiff HEWLETT-PACKARD
17		COMPANY
18		
19		•
20	·	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26	·	
27		
28		
- 1	pp. (6,400222.)	•

51314/2740839.3

DB1/62429737.1

1	DATED: December 23, 2008	Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP
2		
3		By / Fred I. Williams (to be admitted pro hac vice)
4	•	fwilliams@akingump.com 300 West 6th Street, Suite 2100
5		Austin, TX 78701-3911 Telephone: 512.499.6200
6		Fax: 512.499.6290
7		Ira R. Hatton (to be admitted pro hac vice) ihatton@akingump.com
8		1111 Louisiana St., 44th Floor Houston, TX 77002-5200
9		Telephone: 713.220.5800 Fax: 713.236.0822
10		Eric J. Klein (to be admitted pro hac vice)
11		eklein@akingump.com 1700 Pacific Avenue Suite 4100
12		Dallas, TX 75201-4675 Telephone: 214.969.2800
13		Fax: 214.969.4343
14		Attorneys for Plaintiff LENOVO (UNITED STATES) INC.
15	·	
16		
17		
18		
19		
. 20	·	
21		
22		
23		
24	·	
25		
26		
27		
28		
3		-8-