1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Edward D. Johnson (SBN 189475) wjohnson@mayerbrown.com Rena Chng (SBN 209665) rchng@mayerbrown.com Jason A. Wrubleski (SBN 251766) jwrubleski@mayerbrown.com MAYER BROWN LLP Two Palo Alto Square, Suite 300 3000 El Camino Real Palo Alto, CA 94306-2112 Telephone: (650) 331-2000 Facsimile: (650) 331-2060 Attorneys for Plaintiffs KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V. and U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION				
12	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
13	WESTERN DIVISION				
14					
15	KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS CASE NO				
16	KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS CASE NO				
17	ELECTRONICS N.V. and U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION, COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT				
18	Plaintiffs, DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL				
19	V.				
20	HD MEDIA, INC., HOP PHAM, EVON PHAM, and DOES 1-10,				
21					
22	Defendants.				
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
	COMPLAIN	T			

Plaintiffs Koninklijke Philips Electronics N.V. and U.S. Philips Corp. ("U.S. Philips," and collectively "Philips") allege upon knowledge as to themselves and their own actions, and upon information and belief as to all other matters, against Defendants HD Media, Inc. (HD Media), Hop Pham, Evon Pham (together with Hop Pham, "the Phams") and Does 1-25 (collectively, "Defendants") as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the United States Patent Act (Title 35 of the United States Code). This Court has subject matter jurisdiction of this action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).
- 2. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(c) and 1400(b) because, among other things, one or more of the acts of infringement complained of took place in this District and because Defendants purposefully engaged in acts of infringement in this District.

THE PARTIES

- 3. Plaintiff Koninklijke Philips Electronics N.V. is a Dutch corporation with its principal place of business in Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- 4. Plaintiff U.S. Philips is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 1251 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York.
- 5. Defendant HD Media is a California corporation with its principal place of business at 13451 Brooks Drive, Baldwin Park, California. HD Media is in the business of making, selling, and offering to sell Digital Versatile Discs ("DVDs") in the United Sates.
- 6. Defendant Hop Pham is the owner and general manager of HD Media, Inc. In those capacities, Hop Pham controls the day-to-day operations of HD Media. Previously, this Court has found "that Hop Pham personally directed HD [Media]'s infringement" of the same patents that are at issue in this litigation.

- 7. Defendant Evon Pham is the wife of Hop Pham and a general manager of HD Media. In the latter capacity, Evon Pham controls the day-to-day operations of HD Media.
- 8. In concert with each other, HD Media and the Phams without license or authority make, use, offer to sell, sell, or import into the United States—within this District and elsewhere—DVDs that infringe the patents at issue in this litigation.
- 9. Does 1-25 are either entities or individuals, whose identities are unknown to Philips at this time, who are residents of or doing business in this and/or other judicial districts, are subject to the jurisdiction of this Court, and are liable to Philips for the infringement and breach at issue, either independently or as alter egos of Hop Pham, Evon Pham, or HD Media, including but not limited to any relatives of Hop Pham or Evon Pham working in concert with them. Philips will amend this Complaint to include the names of such individuals or entities when such individuals or entities are identified.

THE PATENTS-IN-SUIT

- 10. United States Patent No. 5,790,512 ("the '512 Patent"), entitled "Optical Information Carrier," was duly and legally issued on August 4, 1998. U.S. Philips is the owner by assignment of all right, title and interest in the '512 Patent. A copy of the '512 Patent is attached as Exhibit 1.
- 11. United States Patent No. 5,745,641 ("the '641 Patent"), entitled "Full-Motion Video Disc with Reference Information for Slow-Motion or Freeze Playback," was duly and legally issued on April 28, 1998. U.S. Philips is the owner by assignment of all right, title and interest in the '641 Patent. A copy of the '641 Patent is attached as Exhibit 2.
- 12. The '512 Patent and the '641 Patent are collectively referred to as the "Patents-in-Suit."

BACKGROUND AND RELEVANT FACTS

Overview

- 13. Philips administers a worldwide program that licenses manufacturers to use Philips' patented technology in the production of DVDs. This Court previously has found that "[s]ince [Philips'] Patents[-in-Suit] are fundamental to DVD technology, they are necessarily infringed by anyone who makes, uses, offers for sale, or imports a DVD without a license from Philips."
- 14. In 2007, this Court permanently enjoined defendants HD Media and Hop Pham from "making, using, offering for sale or selling in the United States, or importing into the United States, DVDs in violation of the Patents-in-Suit without an express license from Philips for the Patents-in-Suit to do so." Today, in direct violation of that injunction, Defendants are making and selling DVDs without a license from Philips.
- 15. In September of 2008, Philips terminated HD Media's license to the Patents-in-Suit. HD Media had breached that license by (a) its failure to pay royalties owed and (b) its and Hop Pham's failures to remit payment on a promissory note reflecting damages awarded in earlier infringement litigation.
- 16. Despite the termination of HD Media's license, Defendants continue to replicate DVDs. This is an action by Philips against Defendants for infringement of the Patents-in-Suit, and against HD Media and Hop Pham for breach of the promissory note.

Judge Klausner's 2007 Injunction Against HD Media And Hop Pham

17. On September 14, 2006, Philips filed an amended complaint in this Court against HD Media and Hop Pham, among others, in the lawsuit captioned *Koninklijke Philips Electronics N.V., et al. v. Poso Media LLC, et al.*, Case No. 06 CV-2354 RGK (CWx) (the "2007 Patent Case"). Philips' amended complaint brought claims against HD Media and Hop Pham for infringing the Patents-in-Suit

and sought damages and a permanent injunction to enjoin HD Media and Hop Pham from further infringement.

- 18. On April 12, 2007, this Court ruled on summary judgment that HD Media had willfully infringed the Patents-in-Suit and that Hop Pham had induced HD Media's willful infringement. This Court permanently enjoined HD Media and Hop Pham from making, using, offering for sale or selling in the United States, or importing into the United States, DVDs without an express license from Philips.
- 19. Shortly after this Court granted Philips summary judgment and issued the permanent injunction against HD Media and Hop Pham, the parties agreed to settle the 2007 Patent Case.
- 20. In a Stipulation of Dismissal filed on May 17, 2007, HD Media and Hop Pham stipulated:
 - (a) That they were liable for infringing the Patents-in-Suit by, among other things, making and selling DVDs without a license;
 - (b) That they are permanently enjoined from making, selling, or offering for sale in the United States DVDs without an express license from Philips; and
 - (c) That any violation of that injunction shall be civil contempt, and that in any contempt order to enforce this injunction, Philips may be awarded treble damages for willful infringement and all attorneys' fees and costs.

A copy of the Order and Stipulation of Dismissal is attached hereto as Exhibit 3.

HD Media's Breaches Of The Philips License Agreements

21. After conclusion of the 2007 Patent Case, Philips entered into two license agreements with HD Media effective May 1, 2007: (1) the DVD Video Disc and DVD ROM Disc Patent License Agreement ("DVD Agreement") (attached as Exhibit 4) and accompanying side letter ("DVD Side Letter") (a redacted copy of which is attached as Exhibit 5); and (2) the Patent License

- Agreement for the Use of AC-3 Technology in the Manufacture of DVD Video
 Discs ("AC-3 Agreement") (attached as Exhibit 6) and accompanying side letter
 ("AC-3 Side Letter") (a redacted copy of which is attached as Exhibit 7)
 (collectively, the "License Agreements").
 - 22. The Patents-in-Suit were among the patents licensed to HD Media under the License Agreements.
 - 23. The License Agreements granted HD Media a non-exclusive, non-transferable license to manufacture DVDs in the United States. Exhibit 5 § 15(d); Exhibit 7 § 14(d).
 - 24. The License Agreements also granted HD Media a non-exclusive, non-transferable license to sell or otherwise dispose of DVDs subject to certain terms set forth in the License Agreements. Exhibit 5 § 15(d); Exhibit 7 § 14(d).
 - 25. In consideration for the rights granted to it under the License Agreements, HD Media agreed to pay Philips royalties on all DVDs sold by them. Exhibit 4 § 4.2; Exhibit 6 § 3.1. Specifically, HD Media agreed, on a quarterly basis, to (1) submit timely, accurate royalty reports that set forth the number of DVDs sold and the amount of royalties owed on the sale of such DVDs, and (2) pay the royalties owed. Exhibit 4 § 4.3; Exhibit 6 § 3.2.
 - 26. Also in consideration for the rights granted to HD Media under the License Agreements, HD Media executed a Promissory Note (attached as Exhibit 8) pursuant to which they agreed to pay Philips \$200,000 in ten (10) monthly installments of \$20,000 each starting June 1, 2007. Exhibit 8; Exhibit 5 § 3(b); Exhibit 7 § 3(b). This note represented royalties owed on DVDs manufactured before the execution of the License Agreements.
 - 27. HD Media repeatedly breached its contractual obligations to Philips under the License Agreements by failing to submit timely royalty reports, failing to submit timely payment for the royalties owed, and failing to submit complete

9

6

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17 18

20

21

22

19

23

24 25

26

27 28 payments for the royalties owed. Each and every such instance reflects a clear breach of the unambiguous provisions of the License Agreements.

- 28. HD Media and Hop Pham also repeatedly breached their contractual obligations to Philips under the Promissory Note. At no point since June 1, 2007 has HD Media or Hop Pham made a single timely payment due under the Promissory Note.
- Each of HD Media's and Hop Pham's failures to make a full and timely payment under the Promissory Note also constitutes a breach of the License Agreements. Exhibit 5 § 3; Exhibit 7 § 3.

Termination Of The License Agreements And Defendants' Infringement Of The Patents-in-Suit

- Because of Defendants' breaches, Philips notified Defendants on August 6, 2008, that they were not in full compliance with their obligations under the License Agreements. Specifically, Philips notified Defendants that they had not remitted full payment for royalties accrued during the first quarter of 2008, and that they had failed to make full and timely payments under the Promissory Note.
- 31. Defendants failed to cure their breaches within the 30 days' period provided by the License Agreements, and Philips terminated the License Agreements, notifying HD Media and Hop Pham of the termination by letter dated September 10, 2008. Exhibit 4 § 10.2; Exhibit 6 § 6.2.
- 32. Defendants continue, after termination of the License Agreements, to make, offer to sell, and sell DVDs. These unlicensed DVDs infringe the Patents-in-Suit.
- HD Media and Hop Pham have stipulated that any unlicensed manufacture of DVDs after termination of the License Agreements constitutes infringement of the Patents-in-Suit. Exhibit 5 § 14. HD Media and Hop Pham have also "stipulate[d] to the entry of a temporary restraining order and/or a preliminary

injunction" if Philips presents evidence to a court that HD Media made DVDs or CDs after termination of the License Agreements. Exhibit 5 § 14; Exhibit 7 § 13.

34. Philips now seeks damages to compensate for harm suffered as a direct result of Defendants' infringement and breach, and injunctive relief to prevent Defendants from inflicting further harm on Philips by, among other things, manufacturing and selling unlicensed DVDs that infringe the Patents-in-Suit.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

First Claim for Relief: Infringement of the '512 Patent

Against All Defendants

- 35. Philips re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 34 hereof as if set forth herein in full.
- 36. Defendants, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271, have been and currently are infringing, contributorily infringing or inducing others to infringe one or more claims of the '512 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, by without license or authority making, using, offering to sell, selling or importing into the United States—within this district and elsewhere—DVDs that infringe upon the '512 Patent.
 - 37. Defendants' acts of infringement include the following:
- (a) Defendants have been and currently are without license or authority making, using, offering to sell, selling or importing into the United States—within this District and elsewhere—DVDs that infringe the '512 Patent.
- (b) The Phams have knowingly and willfully aided and abetted or actively induced HD Media, Inc. to without license or authority make, use, offer to sell, sell or import into the United States—within this District and elsewhere—DVDs that infringe upon the '512 Patent;
- (c) The Phams have knowingly and willfully aided and abetted or actively induced HD Media to infringe or induce others to infringe one or more claims of the '512 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, by without

1

8 9

7

11 12

10

13 14

15 16

18

17

19 20

21 22

23

24

25 26 27

28

license or authority making, using, offering to sell, selling, or importing into the United States—within this District and elsewhere—DVDs that infringe upon the '512 Patent.

- (d) The Phams have specifically and willfully directed family members as well as other officers, agents, distributors, customers or employees of themselves or HD Media to infringe one or more claims of the '512 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, by without license or authority making, using, offering to sell, selling, or importing into the United States—within this District and elsewhere—DVDs that infringe upon the '512 Patent.
- Each Defendant had actual knowledge of the '512 Patent. Moreover, Hop Pham and HD Media have stipulated that the '512 Patent is valid and infringed by the unlicensed manufacture of DVDs. Defendants have no reasonable basis for a good faith conclusion: (1) that their conduct described above avoided infringement of the '512 Patent; or (2) that the '512 Patent was invalid. Defendants' conduct, therefore, constitutes willful infringement.
- 39. Philips has suffered damage and irreparable harm as a result of Defendants' infringement of the '512 Patent, and will continue to suffer damage and irreparable harm from Defendants' continuing infringement until Defendants are enjoined therefrom by the Court.

Second Claim for Relief: Infringement of the '641 Patent

Against All Defendants

- Philips re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 40. 39 hereof as if set forth herein in full.
- 41. Defendants, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271, have been and currently are infringing, contributorily infringing or inducing others to infringe one or more claims of the '641 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, by without license or authority making, using, offering to sell, selling or importing into

the United States—within this district and elsewhere—DVDs that infringe upon the '512 Patent.

- 42. Defendants' acts of infringement include the following:
- (a) Defendants have been and currently are without license or authority making, using, offering to sell, selling or importing into the United States—within this District and elsewhere—DVDs that infringe the '641 Patent.
- (b) The Phams have knowingly and willfully aided and abetted or actively induced HD Media to without license or authority make, use, offer to sell, sell or import into the United States—within this District and elsewhere—DVDs that infringe upon the '641 Patent;
- (c) The Phams have knowingly and willfully aided and abetted or actively induced HD Media to infringe or induce others to infringe one or more claims of the '641 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, by without license or authority making, using, offering to sell, selling, or importing into the United States—within this District and elsewhere—DVDs that infringe upon the '641 Patent.
- (d) The Phams have specifically and willfully directed family members as well as other officers, agents, distributors, customers or employees of themselves or HD Media to infringe one or more claims of the '641 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, by without license or authority making, using, offering to sell, selling, or importing into the United States—within this District and elsewhere—DVDs that infringe upon the '641 Patent.
- 43. Each Defendant had actual knowledge of the '641 Patent. Moreover, Hop Pham and HD Media have stipulated that the '641 Patent is valid and infringed by the unlicensed manufacture of DVDs. Defendants have no reasonable basis for a good faith conclusion: (1) that its conduct described above avoided infringement of the '641 Patent; or (2) that the '641 Patent was invalid. Defendants' conduct, therefore, constitutes willful infringement.

JURY DEMAND Plaintiffs hereby demand a jury trial for this action. Dated: February 26, 2009 MAYER BROWN LLP By: Edward D. Johnson Attorneys for Plaintiffs KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V. and U.S. PHILIPS CORP. -11-

COMPLAINT

Case 2:09-cv-01381-RG W Document 1	Filed 02/26/09
UNITED STATES I CENTRAL DISTRIC	
KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V. and U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION PLAINTIFF(S) V.	CV09-01381 JFW (RZX)
HD MEDIA, INC., HOP PHAM, EVON PHAM, and DOES 1-10, DEFENDANT(S).	SUMMONS
TO: DEFENDANT(S): <u>HD Media, Inc.; Hop Pham;</u>	and Evon Pham
must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached 🗹	2 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer lward D. Johnson, whose address is 300, Palo Alto, CA 94306-2112. If you fail to do so,
	Clerk, U.S. District Court
FEB 2 6 2009 Dated:	By: Deputy Clerk
[Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United State 60 days by Rule 12(a)(3)].	es agency, or is an officer or employee of the United States. Allowed

CV-01A (12'07) SUMMONS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check be KONINKLIJKE PHILIP and U.S. PHILIPS CORI		D)	DEFENDANTS HD MEDIA, INC., HOP F	PHAM, EVON PHAM, and	d DOES 1-25				
(b) Attorneys (Firm Name, Aryourself, provide same.) Edward D. Johnson (SBN MAYER BROWN LLP Tel.: (650) 331-2000	ddress and Telephone Number. If y 189475) Two Palo Alto Squa 3000 El Camino Re- Palo Alto, CA 9430	are, Suite 300	Attorneys (If Known)						
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTIO	N (Place an X in one box only.) 2 3 Federal Question (U.S.		ENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PAR an X in one box for plaintiff and c		es Only				
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendar	Government Not a Party it □ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citiz		nis State 🗆 1	☐ 1 Incorporated or of Business in th	Principal Place				
	of Parties in Item III)	Citizen or Su	ubject of a Foreign Country 🛚 3	of Business in A □ 3 Foreign Nation	Chother State □ 6 □ 6				
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in or	ie box only.)								
Image: Proceeding Proce									
V. REQUESTED IN COMPL CLASS ACTION under F.R.G	AINT: JURY DEMAND: 50								
			MONEY DEMANDED IN C						
	VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a brief statement of cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.) 35 U.S.C. s 271: PATENT INFRINGEMENT								
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place	e an X in one box only.)								
OTHER STATUTES □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt	CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of	PERSONAL INJU □ 310 Airplane □ 315 Airplane Pro Liability □ 320 Assault, Libe Slander	PROPERTY □ 370 Other Fraud □ 371 Truth in Lending □ 380 Other Personal	□ 530 General	LABOR □ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act □ 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations □ 730 Labor/Mgmt.				
nation Under Equal Access to Justice □ 950 Constitutionality of	Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loan (Excl. Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land	□ 330 Fed. Employ Liability □ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehic Product Liab □ 360 Other Person Injury □ 362 Personal Inju Med Malprac □ 365 Personal Inju Product Liab □ 368 Asbestos Per Injury Product Liability ■ MMIGRATIO □ 462 Naturalizatio Application □ 463 Habeas Corp Alien Detain	385 Property Damage Product Liability BANKRUPTCY 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/Accommodations 444 Welfare 445 American with Disabilities - Employment 446 American with Disabilities - Other Other Civil 440 Other Civil 410 Rights	Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition FORFETTURE / PENALTY 610 Agriculture	Reporting & Disclosure Act 740 Railway Labor Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 871 IRS-Third Party 26				
□ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 810 Selective Service □ 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange □ 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Act □ 892 Economic Stabilization Act □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 894 Energy Allocation Act □ 895 Freedom of Info. Act □ 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice	Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loan (Excl. Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability	Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehice 355 Motor Vehice 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury Med Malpract 365 Personal Injury Product Liability BMIGRATIOI 462 Naturalization Application 463 Habeas Corp Alien Detains	385 Property Damage Product Liability BANKRUPTCY 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/Accommodations 444 Welfare 445 American with Disabilities - Employment 446 American with Disabilities - Other Other Civil 440 Other Civil 410 Rights	□ 540 Mandamus/ Other □ 550 Civil Rights □ 555 Prison Condition FORFEITURE/ PENALTY □ 610 Agriculture □ 620 Other Food & Drug □ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 □ 630 Liquor Laws □ 640 R.R. & Truck □ 650 Airline Regs □ 660 Occupational Safety /Health	Reporting & Disclosure Act 740 Railway Labor Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)				

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

CV-71 (05/08) CIVIL COVER SHEET Page 1 of 2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII(a). IDENTICAL CASES: Has If yes, list case number(s):	s this action been pr	eviously filed in this court a	nd dismissed, remanded or closed? ♥No □ Yes					
VIII(b). RELATED CASES: Have any cases been previously filed in this court that are related to the present case? ☐ No ☐ Yes If yes, list case number(s): 06-2354 RGK (CWx); also 05-6445, 06-8787, 05-8943, 06-2468, 06-3382, 06-3588, 06-5942, 06-6382, 06-6592, 06-6773, 07-4788								
Civil cases are deemed related if a previously filed case and the present case: Check all boxes that apply) A. Arise from the same or closely related transactions, happenings, or events; or B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or C. For other reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or D. Involve the same patent, trademark or copyright, and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.								
IX. VENUE: (When completing the	following informat	tion, use an additional sheet	if necessary.)					
			if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides. f this box is checked, go to item (b).					
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country					
			KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V The Netherlands U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION Delaware					
			e if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. If this box is checked, go to item (c).					
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country					
HD MEDIA, INC. is doing busi HOP PHAM and EVON PHAM		_						
(c) List the County in this District; Note: In land condemnation c			if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose. Ived.					
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country					
ALL CLAIMS arose in the Cour	nty of Los Angele	rs						
* Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernar Note: In land condemnation cases, us			San Luis Obispo Counties					
X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY (OR PRO PER):	A/I	Date February 26, 2009					
Notice to Counsel/Parties: The or other papers as required by lav	te CV-71 (JS-44) C v. This form, appro-	ved by the Judicial Conferen	emation contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings ce of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed sting the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)					
Key to Statistical codes relating to So	icial Security Cases							
Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of	of Cause of Action					
861	HIA	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))						
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)						
863	DIWC All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))							
863	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))							
864	SSID All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.							

All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42

RSI

U.S.C. (g))