

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION**

MINERVA INDUSTRIES, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

1. MOTOROLA, INC.;
2. NOKIA INC.;
3. ALLTEL COMMUNICATIONS, INC.;
4. AT&T MOBILITY, LLC;
5. DOBSON CELLULAR SYSTEMS, INC.  
(d/b/a CELLULAR ONE);
6. HELIO LLC;
7. HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY;
8. METROPCS WIRELESS, INC.;
9. SPRINT SPECTRUM L.P.;
10. NEXTEL OF TEXAS, INC.;
11. NEXTEL SOUTH CORP.;
12. NEXTEL OF NEW YORK, INC.;
13. NEXTEL COMMUNICATIONS OF THE  
MID-ATLANTIC, INC.;
14. NEXTEL OF CALIFORNIA, INC.;
15. NEXTEL WEST CORP.;
16. T-MOBILE USA, INC.;
17. TRACFONE WIRELESS, INC.;
18. CELLCO PARTNERSHIP (d/b/a  
VERIZON WIRELESS);
19. VIRGIN MOBILE USA, LP;
20. HTC AMERICA, INC.;
21. KYOCERA WIRELESS CORP.;
22. LG ELECTRONICS MOBILECOMM  
U.S.A., INC.;
23. PALM, INC.;
24. PANTECH WIRELESS, INC.;
25. SANYO NORTH AMERICA  
CORPORATION;
26. UTSTARCOM, INC.;
27. SONY ERICSSON MOBILE  
COMMUNICATIONS (USA), INC.;
29. SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
AMERICA LLC; and
30. RESEARCH IN MOTION  
CORPORATION;

**Civil Action No: 2:07-cv-229 (CE)**

**The Honorable Charles Everingham,  
IV, United States Magistrate Judge**

**JURY**

Defendants.

---

**CONSOLIDATED COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

This is an action for patent infringement in which Minerva Industries, Inc. (“Minerva”) makes the following allegations against Motorola, Inc., Nokia Inc., Alltel Communications, Inc., AT&T Mobility, LLC, Dobson Cellular Systems (d/b/a Cellular One), HELIO LLC, Hewlett-Packard Company, MetroPCS Wireless, Inc., Sprint Spectrum L.P., Nextel of Texas, Inc., Nextel South Corp., Nextel of New York, Inc., Nextel Communications of the Mid-Atlantic, Inc., Nextel of California, Inc., Nextel West Corp., T-Mobile USA, Inc., TracFone Wireless, Inc., Cellco Partnership (d/b/a Verizon Wireless), Virgin Mobil USA, LP, HTC America, Inc., Kyocera Wireless Corp., LG Electronics MobileComm U.S.A., Inc., Palm, Inc., Pantech Wireless, Inc., Sanyo North America Corporation, UTStarcom, Inc., Sony Ericsson Mobile Communications (USA), Inc., Samsung Telecommunications America LLC, and Research In Motion Corporation (collectively, the “Defendants”).

**PARTIES**

1. Plaintiff Minerva Industries, Inc. (“Minerva”) is a California corporation with its principal place of business at 255 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 2004, Los Angeles, California 90012.

2. On information and belief, defendant Motorola, Inc. (“Motorola”) is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 1303 East Algonquin Road, Schaumburg, Illinois 60196-4010.

3. On information and belief, defendant Nokia Inc. (“Nokia”) is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 6000 Connection Drive, #18-931, Irving, Texas.

4. On information and belief, defendant Alltel Communications, Inc. (“Alltel”) is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at One Allied Drive, Little Rock, Arkansas 72203.

5. On information and belief, defendant AT&T Mobility, LLC (“AT&T”), formerly named Cingular Wireless, LLC, is a Delaware limited liability company and a wholly-owned subsidiary of AT&T, Inc., with its principal place of business at 5565 Glenridge Connector, Atlanta, Georgia 30342.

6. On information and belief, defendant Dobson Cellular Systems, Inc., doing business as Cellular One (“Cellular One”), is an Oklahoma corporation, with its principal place of business at 14201 Wireless Way, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73134.

7. On information and belief, defendant HELIO LLC (“HELIO”) is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 10960 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 700, Los Angeles, California 90024.

8. On information and belief, defendant Hewlett-Packard Company (“HP”) is a California corporation with its principal place of business at 3000 Hanover Street, Palo Alto, California 94304.

9. On information and belief, defendant MetroPCS Wireless, Inc. (“MetroPCS”) is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 8144 Walnut Hill Lane, Suite 800, Dallas, Texas 75231-4345.

10. On information and belief, defendant Sprint Spectrum L.P. (“Sprint”) is a Delaware limited partnership with its principal place of business at 2001 Edmund Halley Dr., Reston, Virginia 20191.

11. On information and belief, defendant Nextel of Texas, Inc. (“Nextel Texas”) is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 8911 N. Capital of Texas Highway, Austin, Texas 78759-7247.

12. On information and belief, defendant Nextel South Corp. (“Nextel South”) is a Georgia corporation with its principal place of business at 6575 The Corners Parkway, Norcross, Georgia 30092-3325.

13. On information and belief, defendant Nextel of New York, Inc. (“Nextel New York”) is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 565 Taxter Road, Suite 450, Elmsford, New York 10523-2300.

14. On information and belief, defendant Nextel Communications of the Mid-Atlantic, Inc. (“Nextel Mid-Atlantic”) is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 2001 Edmund Halley Dr., Reston, Virginia 20191.

15. On information and belief, defendant Nextel of California, Inc. (“Nextel California”) is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 1255 Treat Blvd., Suite 800, Walnut Creek, California 94597-7982.

16. On information and belief, defendant Nextel West Corp. (“Nextel West”) is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 2001 Edmund Halley Dr., Reston, Virginia 20191.

17. On information and belief, defendant T-Mobile USA, Inc. (“T-Mobile”) is a Delaware corporation, with its principal place of business at 12920 SE 38<sup>th</sup> Street, Bellevue, Washington 98006.

18. On information and belief, defendant TracFone Wireless, Inc. (“TracFone”) is a Delaware corporation, with its principal place of business at 9700 NW 112<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Medley, Florida 33178.

19. On information and belief, defendant Cellco Partnership, doing business as Verizon Wireless (“Verizon”), is a Delaware general partnership with its principle place of business 1 Verizon Way, Basking Ridge, New Jersey 07920-1025.

20. On information and belief, defendant Virgin Mobile USA, LP (“Virgin”) is a Delaware limited partnership, with its principal place of business at 10 Independence Boulevard, Warren, New Jersey 07059.

21. On information and belief, defendant HTC America, Inc. (“HTC”) is a Texas corporation with its principal place of business at 13920 SE Eastgate Way, Suite 400, Bellevue, Washington 98005.

22. On information and belief, defendant Kyocera Wireless Corp. (“Kyocera”) is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 10300 Campus Point Drive, San Diego, California 92121-1511.

23. On information and belief, LG Electronics MobileComm U.S.A., Inc. (“LG”) is a California corporation with its principal place of business at 10225 Willow Creek Road, San Diego, California 92131.

24. On information and belief, defendant Palm, Inc. (“Palm”) is a Delaware corporation, with its principal place of business at 950 West Maude Avenue, Sunnyvale, California 94085.

25. On information and belief, defendant Pantech Wireless, Inc. (“Pantech”) is a California corporation with its principal place of business located at 11240 Warland Drive, Cypress, California 90630.

26. On information and belief, defendant Sanyo North America Corporation, (“Sanyo”) is a Delaware corporation, with its principal place of business at 2055 Sanyo Avenue, San Diego, California 92154.

27. On information and belief, defendant UTStarcom, Inc. (“UTStarcom”) is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 1275 Harbor Bay Parkway, Suite 100, Alameda, California 94502-6553.

28. On information and belief, defendant Sony Ericsson Mobile Communications (USA), Inc. (“Sony Ericsson”) is a Delaware corporation, with its principal place of business located at 7001 Development Drive, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27709.

29. On information and belief, defendant Samsung Telecommunications America LLC (“Samsung”) is a Delaware limited liability company with its principal place of business at 1301 Lookout Drive, Richardson, Texas 75082.

30. On information and belief, defendant Research In Motion Corporation (“RIM”) is a Delaware corporation, with its principal place of business at 122 West John Carpenter Parkway, Suite 430, Irving, Texas 75039.

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

31. This action arises under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

32. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. §§1391 (b) and (c) and 1400(b). On information and belief, each Defendant has a regular and established place of business in this district, has transacted business in this district, and/or has committed and/or induced acts of patent infringement in this district.

33. On information and belief, Defendants are subject to this Court's specific and general personal jurisdiction pursuant to due process and/or the Texas Long Arm Statute, due at least to their substantial business in this forum, including: (i) at least a portion of the infringements alleged herein; and (ii) regularly doing or soliciting business, engaging in other persistent courses of conduct, and/or deriving substantial revenue from goods and services provided to individuals in Texas and in this judicial district.

**COUNT I**

**INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,681,120**

**(Against All Defendants)**

34. Minerva is owner by assignment of United States Patent No. 6,681,120 (the "'120 Patent") entitled "Mobile Entertainment and Communication Device." The '120 Patent issued on January 20, 2004. A true and correct copy of the '120 Patent is attached as Exhibit A.

35. Ki Il Kim is listed as the inventor on the '120 Patent.

36. Defendant Motorola has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant

Motorola is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. Motorola has had actual notice of the '120 Patent since January 21, 2004.

37. Defendant Nokia has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Nokia is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. Nokia has had actual notice of the '120 Patent since at least January 20, 2004.

38. Defendant Alltel has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Alltel is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.

39. Defendant AT&T has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant AT&T is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.

40. Defendant Cellular One has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Cellular One is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.



41. Defendant HELIO has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant HELIO is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. HELIO has had actual notice of the '120 Patent since at least July 19, 2006.

42. Defendant HP has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant HP is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.

43. Defendant MetroPCS has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant MetroPCS is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.

44. Defendant Sprint has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Sprint is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.

45. Defendant Nextel Texas has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120

Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Nextel Texas is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.

46. Defendant Nextel South has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Nextel South is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.

47. Defendant Nextel New York has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Nextel New York is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.

48. Defendant Nextel Mid-Atlantic has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Nextel Mid-Atlantic is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.

49. Defendant Nextel California has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States

by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Nextel California is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.

50. Defendant Nextel West has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Nextel West is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.

51. Defendant T-Mobile has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant T-Mobile is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.

52. Defendant TracFone has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant TracFone is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.

53. Defendant Verizon has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication

devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Verizon is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.

54. Defendant Virgin has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Virgin is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.

55. Defendant HTC has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant HTC is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. HTC has had actual notice of the '120 Patent since at least October 18, 2006.

56. Defendant Kyocera has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Kyocera is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. Kyocera has had actual notice of the '120 Patent since at least October 18, 2006.

57. Defendant LG has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant LG is thus

liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. LG has had actual notice of the '120 Patent since at least January 20, 2004.

58. Defendant Palm has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Palm is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. Palm has had actual notice of the '120 Patent since at least January 21, 2004

59. Defendant Pantech has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Pantech is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. Pantech has had actual notice of the '120 patent since at least July 16, 2004.

60. Defendant Sanyo has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Sanyo is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. Sanyo has had actual notice of the '120 Patent since at least January 20, 2004.

61. Defendant UTStarcom has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication

devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant UTStarcom is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. UTStarcom has had actual notice of the '120 Patent since at least July 19, 2006.

62. Defendant Sony Ericsson Mobile has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Sony Ericsson Mobile is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. Sony Ericsson has had actual notice of the '120 Patent since at least January 20, 2004.

63. Defendant Samsung has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Samsung is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. Samsung has had actual notice of the '120 Patent since at least March 9, 2004.

64. Defendant RIM has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '120 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant RIM is thus liable for infringement of the '120 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. RIM has had actual notice of the '120 Patent since at least October 18, 2006.

65. Defendants have actively induced and are actively inducing infringement of the '120 Patent and are liable for contributory infringement of the '120 Patent.

66. On information and belief, at least after the filing of the original Complaint, the Defendants have infringed and continue to willfully infringe the '120 Patent.

67. As a result of these Defendants' infringement of the '120 Patent, Minerva has suffered monetary damages in an amount not yet determined, and will continue to suffer damages in the future unless Defendants' infringing activities are enjoined by this Court.

68. Unless a permanent injunction is issued enjoining these Defendants and their agents, servants, employees, attorneys, representatives, affiliates, and all others acting on their behalf from infringing the '120 Patent, Minerva will be greatly and irreparably harmed.

## **COUNT II**

### **INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,321,783**

#### **(Against All Defendants)**

69. Minerva is owner by assignment of United States Patent No. 7,321,783 (the "783 Patent") entitled "Mobile Entertainment and Communication Device." The '783 Patent issued on January 22, 2008 from United States Patent Application No. 10/719,363 (the "'363 Application"). A true and correct copy of the '783 Patent is attached as Exhibit B.

70. Ki Il Kim is listed as the inventor on the '783 Patent.

71. The '363 Application, from which the '783 Patent issued, was a Continuation Application of the application that issued as the '120 Patent.

72. Defendant Motorola has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Motorola is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. Motorola has had actual notice of the '363 Application, which issued as the '783 Patent, since October 18, 2006.

73. Defendant Nokia has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Nokia is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. Nokia has had actual notice of the '363 Application, which issued as the '783 Patent, since at least October 18, 2006.

74. Defendant Alltel has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Alltel is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.

75. Defendant AT&T has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant AT&T is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. AT&T has had actual notice of the '363 Application, which issued as the '783 Patent, since at least March 23, 2007.

76. Defendant Cellular One has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Cellular One is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.



77. Defendant HELIO has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant HELIO is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. HELIO has had actual notice of the '363 Application, which issued as the '783 Patent, since at least October 18, 2006.

78. Defendant HP has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant HP is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.

79. Defendant MetroPCS has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant MetroPCS is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.

80. Defendant Sprint has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Sprint is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. Sprint has had actual notice of the '363 Application, which issued as the '783 Patent, since at least March 23, 2007.

81. Defendant Nextel Texas has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Nextel Texas is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. Nextel Texas has had actual notice of the '363 Application, which issued as the '783 Patent, since at least March 23, 2007.

82. Defendant Nextel South has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Nextel South is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. Nextel South has had actual notice of the '363 Application, which issued as the '783 Patent, since at least March 23, 2007.

83. Defendant Nextel New York has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Nextel New York is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. Nextel New York has had actual notice of the '363 Application, which issued as the '783 Patent, since at least March 23, 2007.

84. Defendant Nextel Mid-Atlantic has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States

by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Nextel Mid-Atlantic is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. Nextel Mid-Atlantic has had actual notice of the '363 Application, which issued as the '783 Patent, since at least March 23, 2007.

85. Defendant Nextel California has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Nextel California is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. Nextel California has had actual notice of the '363 Application, which issued as the '783 Patent, since at least March 23, 2007.

86. Defendant Nextel West has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Nextel West is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. Nextel West has had actual notice of the '363 Application, which issued as the '783 Patent, since at least March 23, 2007.

87. Defendant T-Mobile has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant T-Mobile is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.

88. Defendant TracFone has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant TracFone is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.

89. Defendant Verizon has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Verizon is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. Verizon has had actual notice of the '363 Application, which issued as the '783 Patent, since at least March 23, 2007.

90. Defendant Virgin has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Virgin is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.

91. Defendant HTC has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant HTC is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. HTC has had actual notice of the '363 Application, which issued as the '783 Patent, since at least October 18, 2006.

92. Defendant Kyocera has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Kyocera is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. Kyocera has had actual notice of the '363 Application, which issued as the '783 Patent, since at least October 18, 2006.

93. Defendant LG has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant LG is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. LG has had actual notice of the '363 Application, which issued as the '783 Patent, since at least October 18, 2006.

94. Defendant Palm has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Palm is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. Palm has had actual notice of the '363 Application, which issued as the '783 Patent, since at least October 31, 2006.

95. Defendant Pantech has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant

Pantech is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. Pantech has had actual notice of the '363 Application, which issued as the '783 Patent, since at least December 14, 2006.

96. Defendant Sanyo has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Sanyo is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. Sanyo has had actual notice of the '363 Application, which issued as the '783 Patent, since at least November 4, 2004.

97. Defendant UTStarcom has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant UTStarcom is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. UTStarcom has had actual notice of the '363 Application, which issued as the '783 Patent, since at least October 18, 2006.

98. Defendant Sony Ericsson Mobile has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Sony Ericsson Mobile is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. Sony Ericsson has had actual notice of the '363 Application, which issued as the '783 Patent, since at least October 18, 2006.

99. Defendant Samsung has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant Samsung is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. Samsung has had actual notice of the '363 Application, which issued as the '783 Patent, since at least October 18, 2006.

100. Defendant RIM has been and now is directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States by, among other things, making, using, offering to sell, or selling mobile entertainment and communication devices covered by one or more claims of the '783 Patent to the injury of Minerva. Defendant RIM is thus liable for infringement of the '783 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. RIM has had actual notice of the '363 Application, which issued as the '783 Patent, since October 18, 2006.

101. Defendants have actively induced and are actively inducing infringement of the '783 Patent and are liable for contributory infringement of the '783 Patent.

102. On information and belief, at least after the filing of the original Complaint, the Defendants have infringed and continue to willfully infringe the '783 Patent.

103. As a result of these Defendants' infringement of the '783 Patent, Minerva has suffered monetary damages in an amount not yet determined, and will continue to suffer damages in the future unless Defendants' infringing activities are enjoined by this Court.

104. Unless a permanent injunction is issued enjoining these Defendants and their agents, servants, employees, attorneys, representatives, affiliates, and all others acting on their behalf from infringing the '783 Patent, Minerva will be greatly and irreparably harmed.

///

///

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Minerva respectfully requests that this Court enter:

**On Count I**

1. A judgment in favor of Minerva that Defendants Motorola, Inc., Nokia Inc., Alltel Communications, Inc., AT&T Mobility, LLC, Dobson Cellular Systems (d/b/a Cellular One), HELIO LLC, Hewlett-Packard Company, MetroPCS Wireless, Inc., Sprint Spectrum L.P., Nextel of Texas, Inc., Nextel South Corp., Nextel of New York, Inc., Nextel Communications of the Mid-Atlantic, Inc., Nextel of California, Inc., Nextel West Corp., T-Mobile USA, Inc., TracFone Wireless, Inc., Cellco Partnership (d/b/a Verizon Wireless), Virgin Mobil USA, LP, HTC America, Inc., Kyocera Wireless Corp., LG Electronics MobileComm U.S.A., Inc., Palm, Inc., Pantech Wireless, Inc., Sanyo North America Corporation, UTStarcom, Inc., Sony Ericsson Mobile Communications (USA), Inc., Samsung Telecommunications America LLC, and Research In Motion Corporation have infringed, directly, and/or indirectly, by way of inducing and/or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent, and that such infringement was willful;

2. A permanent injunction enjoining Defendants Motorola, Inc., Nokia Inc., Alltel Communications, Inc., AT&T Mobility, LLC, Dobson Cellular Systems (d/b/a Cellular One), HELIO LLC, Hewlett-Packard Company, MetroPCS Wireless, Inc., Sprint Spectrum L.P., Nextel of Texas, Inc., Nextel South Corp., Nextel of New York, Inc., Nextel Communications of the Mid-Atlantic, Inc., Nextel of California, Inc., Nextel West Corp., T-Mobile USA, Inc., TracFone Wireless, Inc., Cellco Partnership (d/b/a Verizon Wireless), Virgin Mobil USA, LP, HTC America, Inc., Kyocera Wireless Corp., LG Electronics MobileComm U.S.A., Inc., Palm, Inc., Pantech Wireless, Inc., Sanyo North America Corporation, UTStarcom, Inc., Sony Ericsson Mobile Communications (USA), Inc., Samsung Telecommunications America LLC, and Research In Motion Corporation and their officers, directors, agents, servants, affiliates, employees, divisions, branches, subsidiaries, parents, and all others acting in concert or privity



with any of them from infringement, inducing the infringement of, or contributing to the infringement of the '120 Patent.

3. A judgment and order requiring Defendants Motorola, Inc., Nokia Inc., Alltel Communications, Inc., AT&T Mobility, LLC, Dobson Cellular Systems (d/b/a Cellular One), HELIO LLC, Hewlett-Packard Company, MetroPCS Wireless, Inc., Sprint Spectrum L.P., Nextel of Texas, Inc., Nextel South Corp., Nextel of New York, Inc., Nextel Communications of the Mid-Atlantic, Inc., Nextel of California, Inc., Nextel West Corp., T-Mobile USA, Inc., TracFone Wireless, Inc., Cellco Partnership (d/b/a Verizon Wireless), Virgin Mobil USA, LP, HTC America, Inc., Kyocera Wireless Corp., LG Electronics MobileComm U.S.A., Inc., Palm, Inc., Pantech Wireless, Inc., Sanyo North America Corporation, UTStarcom, Inc., Sony Ericsson Mobile Communications (USA), Inc., Samsung Telecommunications America LLC, and Research In Motion Corporation to pay Minerva its damages, costs, expenses, and prejudgment and post-judgment interest for Defendants' infringement of the '120 Patent as provided under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

4. An award to Minerva for enhanced damages resulting from the knowing, deliberate, and willful nature of Defendants' prohibited conduct with notice being made at least as early as the date of the filing of the original Complaint, as provided under 35 U.S.C. § 284;

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

6. Any and all other relief to which Minerva may show itself to be entitled.

### **On Count II**

7. A judgment in favor of Minerva that Defendants Motorola, Inc., Nokia Inc., Alltel Communications, Inc., AT&T Mobility, LLC, Dobson Cellular Systems (d/b/a Cellular One), HELIO LLC, Hewlett-Packard Company, MetroPCS Wireless, Inc., Sprint Spectrum L.P., Nextel of Texas, Inc., Nextel South Corp., Nextel of New York, Inc., Nextel Communications of the Mid-Atlantic, Inc., Nextel of California, Inc., Nextel West Corp., T-Mobile USA, Inc., TracFone Wireless, Inc., Cellco Partnership (d/b/a Verizon Wireless), Virgin Mobil USA, LP,

HTC America, Inc., Kyocera Wireless Corp., LG Electronics MobileComm U.S.A., Inc., Palm, Inc., Pantech Wireless, Inc., Sanyo North America Corporation, UTStarcom, Inc., Sony Ericsson Mobile Communications (USA), Inc., Samsung Telecommunications America LLC, and Research In Motion Corporation have infringed, directly, and/or indirectly, by way of inducing and/or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent, and that such infringement was willful;

8. A permanent injunction enjoining Defendants Motorola, Inc., Nokia Inc., Alltel Communications, Inc., AT&T Mobility, LLC, Dobson Cellular Systems (d/b/a Cellular One), HELIO LLC, Hewlett-Packard Company, MetroPCS Wireless, Inc., Sprint Spectrum L.P., Nextel of Texas, Inc., Nextel South Corp., Nextel of New York, Inc., Nextel Communications of the Mid-Atlantic, Inc., Nextel of California, Inc., Nextel West Corp., T-Mobile USA, Inc., TracFone Wireless, Inc., Cellco Partnership (d/b/a Verizon Wireless), Virgin Mobil USA, LP, HTC America, Inc., Kyocera Wireless Corp., LG Electronics MobileComm U.S.A., Inc., Palm, Inc., Pantech Wireless, Inc., Sanyo North America Corporation, UTStarcom, Inc., Sony Ericsson Mobile Communications (USA), Inc., Samsung Telecommunications America LLC, and Research In Motion Corporation and their officers, directors, agents, servants, affiliates, employees, divisions, branches, subsidiaries, parents, and all others acting in concert or privity with any of them from infringement, inducing the infringement of, or contributing to the infringement of the '783 Patent.

9. A judgment and order requiring Defendants Motorola, Inc., Nokia Inc., Alltel Communications, Inc., AT&T Mobility, LLC, Dobson Cellular Systems (d/b/a Cellular One), HELIO LLC, Hewlett-Packard Company, MetroPCS Wireless, Inc., Sprint Spectrum L.P., Nextel of Texas, Inc., Nextel South Corp., Nextel of New York, Inc., Nextel Communications of the Mid-Atlantic, Inc., Nextel of California, Inc., Nextel West Corp., T-Mobile USA, Inc., TracFone Wireless, Inc., Cellco Partnership (d/b/a Verizon Wireless), Virgin Mobil USA, LP, HTC America, Inc., Kyocera Wireless Corp., LG Electronics MobileComm U.S.A., Inc., Palm, Inc., Pantech Wireless, Inc., Sanyo North America Corporation, UTStarcom, Inc., Sony Ericsson

Mobile Communications (USA), Inc., Samsung Telecommunications America LLC, and Research In Motion Corporation to pay Minerva its damages, costs, expenses, and prejudgment and post-judgment interest for Defendants' infringement of the '783 Patent as provided under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

10. An award to Minerva for enhanced damages resulting from the knowing, deliberate, and willful nature of Defendants' prohibited conduct with notice being made at least as early as the date of the filing of the original Complaint, as provided under 35 U.S.C. § 284;

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

12. Any and all other relief to which Minerva may show itself to be entitled.

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff, under Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, requests a trial by jury of any issues so triable by right.

By: /s/ Marc A. Fenster

Marc A. Fenster, CA SB # 181067

E-mail: [mfenster@raklaw.com](mailto:mfenster@raklaw.com)

David R. Gabor, *pro hac vice*

CA SB # 145729

E-mail: [dgabor@raklaw.com](mailto:dgabor@raklaw.com)

Irene Y. Lee, *pro hac vice*

CA SB # 213625

E-mail: [ilee@raklaw.com](mailto:ilee@raklaw.com)

Eric B. Carlson, *pro hac vice*

CA SB # 193401

E-mail: [ecarlson@raklaw.com](mailto:ecarlson@raklaw.com)

Robert E. Satterthwaite, *pro hac vice*

CA SB # 223767

E-mail: [rsatterthwaite@raklaw.com](mailto:rsatterthwaite@raklaw.com)

RUSS, AUGUST & KABAT

12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12<sup>th</sup> Floor

Los Angeles, California 90025

Telephone: 310/826-7474

Facsimile: 310/826-6991

Otis W. Carroll, Attorney-In-Charge

TX SB # 03895700

E-mail: [otiscarroll@icklaw.com](mailto:otiscarroll@icklaw.com)

Collin M. Maloney, TX SB # 00794219

E-mail: [cmaloney@icklaw.com](mailto:cmaloney@icklaw.com)

IRELAND CARROLL & KELLEY, P.C.

6101 South Broadway, Suite 500

P.O. Box 7879

Tyler, Texas 75711

Telephone: 903/561-1600

Facsimile: 903/581-1071

S. Calvin Capshaw, TX SB # 03783900

[ccapshaw@capshawlaw.com](mailto:ccapshaw@capshawlaw.com)

Elizabeth L. DeRieux, TX SB # 05770585

[ederieux@capshawlaw.com](mailto:ederieux@capshawlaw.com)

N. Claire Abernathy, TX SB # 24053063

[chenry@capshawlaw.com](mailto:chenry@capshawlaw.com)

Jedidiah J. Rollins, TX SB # 24056650

[jrollins@capshawlaw.com](mailto:jrollins@capshawlaw.com)

CAPSHAW DERIEUX, LLP

1127 Judson Road, Suite 220

Longview, Texas 75601

Telephone: 903/236-9800

Facsimile: 903/236-8787

Franklin Jones Jr., TX SB # 00000055

[maizieh@millerfirm.com](mailto:maizieh@millerfirm.com)

JONES & JONES, INC., P.C.

201 West Houston Street

P.O. Drawer 1249

Marshall, Texas 65671-1249

Telephone: 903/938-4395

Facsimile: 903/938-3360

Attorneys for Plaintiff Minerva Industries, Inc.