11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

VS.

1	Kit M. Stetina (SBN 82,977)
2	Kit M. Stetina (SBN 82,977) Stephen Z. Vegh (SBN 174,713) STETINA BRUNDA GARRED & BRUCKER
	STETINA BRUNDA GARRED & BRUCKER
3	75 Enterprise, Suite 250 Aliso Viejo, CA 92656 Email: litigate@stetinalaw.com Tel: (949) 855-1246 Fax: (949) 855-6371
_	Aliso Viejo, CA 92656
4	Email: litigate@stetinalaw.com
5	Tel: (949) 855-1246
	Fax: (949) 855-6371
6	
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff SPY OPTIC, INC.
	SPY OPTIC, INC.
8	

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SPY OPTIC, INC., a California corporation,

Plaintiff

PEPPER'S PERFORMANCE EYEWEAR, INC., a Pennsylvania corporation; and DOES 1 through 5, inclusive

Defendants

Case No. 07CV1160 JLS (JMAx)

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NOS. D534,573 AND D552,665

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

### FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, Spy Optic, Inc., for its First Amended Complaint against Pepper's Performance Eyewear, Inc. states and alleges as follows:

#### **PARTIES**

1. Plaintiff, Spy Optic, Inc. (hereinafter "Spy Optic" or "Plaintiff") is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the state of California, and having a principal place of business at 2070 Las Palmas Drive, Carlsbad, California

Case No. 07CV1160 JLS (JMAx)

1

2

12 13

14

11

15 16

17

18 19

21

20

22 23

24 25

26 27 28

92009.

- Upon information and belief, Defendant Pepper's Performance Eyewear, 2. inc. (hereinafter "Pepper's") is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the state of Pennsylvania, and having a principal place of business at 3001 Pulawski Way, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219.
- The true names and capacities of the Defendants named herein as DOES 1 through 5, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, are unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues said Defendants by said fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of the Defendants designated herein as DOE is legally responsible for the events and happenings hereinafter alleged and legally caused injury and damages proximately thereby to Plaintiff as herein alleged. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend the Complaint when the true names and capacities of said DOE Defendants have been ascertained. Pepper's and DOES 1 through 10 are hereinafter collectively referred to as "Defendants."
- Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each of the Defendants participated in and is in some manner responsible for the acts described in this Complaint and any damages resulting therefrom.
- Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each of 5. the Defendants has acted in concert and participation with each other concerning each of the claims in this Complaint.
- Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each of 6. the Defendants were empowered to act as the agent, servant and/or employees of each of the other Defendants, and that all the acts alleged to have been done by each of them were authorized, approved, and/or ratified by each of the other Defendants.

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

This action, as hereinafter more fully appears, arises under the patent 7. laws of the United States of America (35 U.S.C. §§ 1 et seq.), and is for patent infringement. Jurisdiction for all counts is based upon 28 U.S.C. 21§1331, 1338(a)

4

5

6 7

8

9

10 11 12

13 14

> 15 16 17

19

18

20 21

22

23 24

25 26

27 28

and (b).

Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. §§1391(b) and (c) as Defendants have committed acts of infringement in this judicial district.

## **BACKGROUND OF THE CONTROVERSY**

- Plaintiff is the owner of all right, title and interest in and to United States 9. Design Patent No. D534,573 entitled "Sunglass" (hereinafter "the '573 patent"). A true and correct copy of the '573 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 1. The '573 patent was duly and lawfully issued on January 2, 2007 and is presently valid and in full effect.
- Plaintiff is the owner of all right, title and interest in and to United States 10. Design Patent No. D552,665 entitled "Sunglass" (hereinafter "the '665 patent"). A true and correct copy of the '665 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 2. The '655 patent was duly and lawfully issued on October 9, 2007 and is presently valid and in full effect.
- Upon information and belief, Defendants have been and are infringing 11. the '573 and/or '665 patents within this district and elsewhere in the United States by making, using, selling, importing, distributing and/or offering for sale products that infringe the claims of the '573 and/or '665 patent. A photocopy of Defendants' products are attached hereto as Exhibits 3 and 4.
- Upon information and belief, by the acts of patent infringement herein 12. complained of, the Defendants have made substantial profits to which they are not equitably entitled.
- By reason of the aforementioned acts of the Defendants, the Plaintiff has 13. suffered great detriment in a sum which exceeds this Court's jurisdictional amount, but which cannot be ascertained at this time.
- Upon information and belief, Defendants continue to infringe Plaintiff's 14. '573 and/or '665 patents, and will continue to infringe Plaintiff's '573 and/or '665 patents, and will continue to infringe Plaintiff's '573 and/or '665 patents to Plaintiff's

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

///

///

///

///

111

irreparable harm, unless enjoined by this Court.

Upon information and belief, Defendants' were aware of the '573 and/or 15. '665 patents and the past and continuing infringement of the '573 and/or '665 patents by Defendants is willful, entitling Plaintiff to enhanced damages.

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against the Defendants as follows:

- A judgment that Defendants have infringed the patents-in-suit. A.
- A judgment that Defendants' infringement of the patents-in-suit has been В. willful.
- A preliminary and permanent injunction, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §283, C. enjoining Defendants, and all persons in active concert or participation with them, from any further acts of infringement of the patents-in-suit.
- An order, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 21284, awarding Plaintiff damages D. adequate to compensate Plaintiff for Defendants' infringement of the patents-in-suit, in an amount to be determined at trial, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty.
- An order, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §284, trebling all damages awarded to E. Plaintiff based on Defendants' willful infringement of the patents-in-suit.
- An order, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §285, finding that this is an exceptional F. case and awarding to Plaintiff its reasonable attorneys' fees incurred in this action.

26 /// 27 ///

28

G.	That Plaintiff have such other and further relief that the court may deem
	just and proper.

Dated: October 9, 2007

STETINA BRUNDA GARRED & BRUCKER

By:

Attorneys for Plaintiff SPY OPTIC, INC.

STETINA BRUNDA GARRED & BRUCKER
75 ENTERPRISE, SUITE 250
ALISO VIEJO, CALIFORNÍA 92656
PHONE: (949) 855-1246; FACSIMILE: (949) 855-6371

## DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, Spy Optic, Inc., hereby demands a jury trial in this action.

Dated: October 9, 2007

STETINA BRUNDA GARRED & BRUCKER

By:

Kit M. Stetina

Attorneys for Plaintiff SPY OPTIC, INC.

T:\client Documents\spyno\294f\Complaint.DJ.First.Amended.doc