Case 2:09-cv-13079-PDB-VMM Document 1 Filed 08/05/09 Page 1 of 7

SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07)

CIVIL COVER SHEET County in which action arose _

The JS 44 civil cover sheet 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 local rules of court. 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 initiating

he civil docket sheet. (SEE IN	STRUCTIONS ON THE REVER	SE OF THE FORM.)									
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS							
Exel North America, Inc.				Graco Inc. Graco Minnesota Inc.							
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff Wa	yne County, MI		County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE							
(EX	CEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CAS	ES)									
						VOLVE		HON CASES, CO.	o me boom.		
7.5				Attorneys (If Know	vn)						
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Stephen D. Winter	Address, and Telephone Number)		Attoricys (ir Kilowii)							
Winter PLC, 901 Livernois Str	eet, Ferndale, MI 48220										
(248) 298-0333 II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)	III. C	TIZENSHIP OI	F PR	INCI	PAI	L PARTIES(I	Place an "X" in (One Box fo	or Plaintiff
				(For Diversity Cases On	ıly) PTF	DEI	F		and One Box f	for Defenda PTF	ant) DEF
U.S. Government Plaintiff	▼ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government No.) (U.S. Government N	ot a Party)	Citiz	en of This State			1	Incorporated or Prinof Business In This		□ 4	□ 4
☐ 2 U.S. Government	☐ 4 Diversity		Citiz	en of Another State	D 2	2 0	2	Incorporated and P		5	5
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship	of Parties in Item III)	O'.'	C. L'aut affa			2	Foreign Nation		□ 6	□ 6
				en or Subject of a preign Country	O 3	, ,		Poteign Nation			
IV. NATURE OF SUI			I r	ORFEITURE/PENAL/	TV T	1	BANK	KRUPTCY	OTHE	R STATU	TES_
CONTRACT	TOR' PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJUF		10 Agriculture	$\overline{}$			1 28 USC 158	☐ 400 State F		
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	☐ 310 Airplane	362 Personal Injury	- 06	20 Other Food & Drug	0	☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157			☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking		
☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability	Med. Malpractic 365 Personal Injury		25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 8	881			ES.1 900005	☐ 450 Comm	nerce	6
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	Product Liabilit	y 🗆 6	30 Liquor Laws 40 R.R. & Truck		PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights			☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and		
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act	Slander 330 Federal Employers'	368 Asbestos Person Injury Product	0 6	50 Airline Regs.		3 830 F	atent		Corrup	ot Organiza	itions
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	Liability PERSONAL PROPEI		60 Occupational Safety/Health	l l	□ 840 1	rader	mark	☐ 480 Consu ☐ 490 Cable		
Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)		370 Other Fraud		90 Other		000	Y I Y C	SECUPITY	810 Select		
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits		371 Truth in Lendin380 Other Personal		LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards	;	□ 861 I		SECURITY 1395ff)	Excha	nge	
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle	Property Damag		Act				Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g))	□ 875 Custo	mer Challe C 3410	enge
☐ 190 Other Contract☐ 195 Contract Product Liability		 385 Property Damag Product Liability 	_	720 Labor/Mgmt. Relatio 730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporti	ing	□ 864 5	SSID	Title XVI	☐ 890 Other	Statutory	
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury	PRISONER PETITIO	INS IT	& Disclosure Act 740 Railway Labor Act	-	□ 865 I		L TAX SUITS	□ 891 Agric □ 892 Econo		ization Act
REAL PROPERTY ☐ 210 Land Condemnation	CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting	☐ 510 Motions to Vac	ate 🗆 1	790 Other Labor Litigation	on [□ 870′	Taxes	(U.S. Plaintiff	☐ 893 Envir	ronmental l sy Allocation	
☐ 220 Foreclosure	442 Employment	Sentence Habeas Corpus:	0.	791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act				fendant) -Third Party	☐ 894 Energ		
☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment☐ 240 Torts to Land☐	Accommodations	☐ 530 General		Samuel Sa		2	26 US	SC 7609	Act 900Appea	of Fee D	etermination
☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 444 Welfare ☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	535 Death Penalty540 Mandamus & C	Other 🗆		2 Naturalization Application			Under	Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access		
290 All Other Real Floperty	Employment	550 Civil Rights	J.	463 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detaince					to Jus		y of
	☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other	555 Prison Condition	, a	465 Other Immigration					State	Statutes	
	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights			Actions							
										Anneal	to District
	e an "X" in One Box Only) Removed from	Remanded from	□ 4 Re			erred fr		☐ 6 Multidist		Judge fi Magistr	rom
	State Court	Appellate Court	Re	opened	(specif	r distric fy)		Litigation		Judgme	nt
	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta 28 U.S.C. 2201-2202	tute under which you	are filing	(Do not cite jurisdi	ictiona	ıl statu	tes u	nless diversity):			
VI. CAUSE OF ACT	Brief description of ca Declaratory Judgment	nuse: of patent non-infring	ement.								
VII. REQUESTED II COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER F.R.C.P.	IS A CLASS ACTION 23	ON	DEMAND \$				CHECK YES only URY DEMAND			
VIII. RELATED CA	SE(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE				DC	CKE	ET NUMBER			
		SIGNATURE OF	ATTORNE	Y OF RECORD							
DATE August 4, 2009	MARC	λ									
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		100						7			
	AMOUNT	APPLYING IFF)	JUE	OGE			MAG. JU	UDGE		

PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 83.11

1.	Is this a case that has been previously dismissed?	Yes
If yes,	give the following information:	∑ No
Court:		
Case N	O.;	
Judge:		
2.	Other than stated above, are there any pending or previously discontinued or dismissed companion cases in this or any other court, including state court? (Companion cases are matters in which it appears substantially similar evidence will be offered or the same or related parties are present and the cases arise out of the same transaction or occurrence.)	Yes No
If yes,	give the following information:	
Court:		
Case N	lo.:	
Judge:		
Notes :		
Notes .		

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

EXEL NORTH AMERICA, INC.	
Plaintiff,	Civil Action No.
v.	
GRACO INC.	COMPLAINT
and	
GRACO MINNESOTA INC.	
Defendants.	

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF PATENT NON-INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff, Exel North America, Inc. ("Exel"), for its Complaint against Defendants, Graco Inc. ("Graco") and Graco Minnesota Inc. ("Graco Minnesota"), alleges as follows:

THE PARTIES

- 1. Exel is an Illinois corporation with its principal place of business at 45001 5 Mile Road, Plymouth, Michigan 48170.
- 2. On information and belief, Graco is a Minnesota corporation with its principal place of business at $88 11^{th}$ Avenue Northeast, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413.
- 3. On information and belief, Graco Minnesota is a Minnesota corporation with its principal place of business at $88 11^{th}$ Avenue Northeast, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413. On information and belief, Graco Minnesota is a wholly owned subsidiary of Graco.

- 4. Graco Minnesota is the owner of record of U.S. Patent No. 6,896,152 ("the '152 patent"). A copy of the '152 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit A.
 - 5. Graco has held itself out to be the owner of the '152 patent.
- 6. Defendants have jointly enforced, in federal district court, at least one U.S. patent owned by Graco Minnesota.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 7. This action for declaratory relief arises under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2202 and the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§ 1, et seq.
- 8. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).
- 9. Graco conducts a continuous and systematic part of its general business within Michigan, including in this district, utilizing at least ten distributors within this district and through company representatives who are resident within this district, and this Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants.
- 10. On information and belief, Graco receives average annual revenues of more than three million dollars through sales in Michigan.
- 11. Exel's declaratory claims arise out of or relate to Defendants' actions in this district which Defendants' purposefully directed at this district.
 - 12. Venue in this district is proper under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and (c).

BASIS FOR THIS ACTION

13. On May 24, 2005, the United States Patent and Trademark Office issued the '152 patent for an electronic plural component proportioner.

- 14. Graco considers that its Xtreme Mix product, or portions thereof, is covered by one or more claims of the '152 patent.
- 15. Graco's operation manuals for its Xtreme Mix products which it distributes to its Michigan customers are marked with the '152 patent number.
- 16. On April 17, 2009, Graco, through its Corporate Intellectual Property Counsel, sent a letter to Exel at its headquarters in Plymouth, Michigan, identifying and including a copy of the '152 patent, stating that Graco owns the '152 patent, identifying the PU3000 as "your product," asserting that the PU3000 "appears to be a copy of the Xtreme Mix product being sold by Graco," and urging Exel to seek legal counsel from its attorney.
- 17. On June 30, Exel, by counsel, sent a letter to Graco stating its belief that the PU3000 does not infringe any claim of the '152 patent and that, if Exel did not receive a response from Graco by July 30, 2009, Exel would consider Graco's non-response as an affirmative indication by Graco that the PU3000 is not covered by the '152 patent.
- 18. On July 16, 2009, Graco sent an email to Exel's counsel stating that Graco does not concede that Exel's product is not covered by the '152 patent.
- 19. Exel does not infringe the '152 patent and it has the right to make, use, import, sell and/or offer for sale its products without license from Defendants.
- 20. Exel intends to make, use, import, sell or offer for sale the PU3000 in the United States and has undertaken substantial steps in preparation for such activity.
 - 21. The PU3000 does not infringe, directly or indirectly, any claim of the '152 patent.

22. As a result of Defendants' assertions and actions, an actual controversy exists as to whether Exel can proceed in making, using, importing, selling and/or offering for sale the PU3000 without infringing the '152 patent.

CLAIM FOR RELIEF

COUNT I: NON-INFRINGEMENT

- 23. Exel repeats, realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1-22 as though fully set forth herein.
 - 24. The PU3000 does not infringe, directly or indirectly, any claim of the '152 patent.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands:

- i. Declaratory relief stating that:
 - (a) The '152 patent is not infringed by Exel;
- (b) The manufacture, use, import, sale or offer for sale of the PU3000 does not infringe, directly or indirectly, any claim of the '152 patent; and
- with Graco or Graco Minnesota, including any licensees, are permanently enjoined from initiating patent infringement litigation against Exel based on the '152 patent, or initiating patent infringement litigation against any of Exel's customers, dealers, agents, distributors, manufacturers or suppliers based on the '152 patent, or threatening Exel or any of Exel's customers, dealers, agents, distributors, manufacturers or suppliers with patent litigation based upon the '152 patent, or charging Exel or any of Exel's customers, dealers, agents, distributors, manufacturers or suppliers either verbally or in writing with infringement of the '152 patent;

- ii. Costs, expenses and reasonable attorneys' fees; and
- iii. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

JURY DEMAND

25. Plaintiff Exel demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Dated: August 4, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen D. Winter (Bar No. P27342)

WINTER, PLC

901 Livernois Street

Ferndale, MI 48220

(248) 298-0333

winter@winterplc.com

Attorney for Plaintiff Exel North America

Of Counsel:

Douglas V. Rigler
Jeffrey R. Snay
YOUNG & THOMPSON
209 Madison Street
Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 521-2297
drigler@young-thompson.com
jsnay@young-thompson.com