

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

Jean-Marc Zimmerman (JZ 7743)  
Law Offices of Jean-Marc Zimmerman LLC  
226 St. Paul Street  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
Tel: (908) 654-8000  
Fax: (908) 654-7207  
jmzimmerman@lawofficesjmz.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Content Extraction and Transmission LLC

CONTENT EXTRACTION AND  
TRANSMISSION LLC,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
EXECUTIVE TECHNOLOGIES, INC. D/B/A  
SEARCHEXPRESS,  
  
Defendant.

Case No.

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT  
INFRINGEMENT

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, Content Extraction and Transmission LLC, a limited liability company (hereinafter referred to as "CET"), demands a jury trial and complains against the defendant as follows:

**THE PARTIES**

1. CET is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the State of New Jersey, with its principal place of business at New Jersey.

2. Upon information and belief, Executive Technologies, Inc. d/b/a SearchExpress (hereinafter referred to as "Defendant" or "SearchExpress") is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Alabama, having a place of business at 5346 Stadium Trace Parkway, Birmingham, Alabama 35244.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

3. This action arises under the patent laws of the United States of America, Title 35 of the United States Code. This Court has jurisdiction of this action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

4. On information and belief, Defendant is doing business and committing infringements in this judicial district and are subject to personal jurisdiction in this judicial district.

5. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400(b).

**CLAIM FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

6. Plaintiff, CET, repeats and incorporates herein the entirety of the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 5 above.

7. On November 2, 1993, U.S. Patent No. 5,258,855 (hereinafter referred to as “the ‘855 patent”) was duly and legally issued to System X, L.P. for an invention entitled “Information Processing Methodology.” A copy of the ‘855 patent is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit 1.

8. On November 29, 1994, U.S. Patent No. 5,369,508 (hereinafter referred to as “the ‘508 patent”) was duly and legally issued to System X, L.P. for an invention entitled “Information Processing Methodology.” A copy of the ‘508 patent is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit 2.

9. On April 29, 1997, U.S. Patent No. 5,625,465 (hereinafter referred to as “the ‘465 patent”) was duly and legally issued to International Patent Holdings, Ltd. for an invention entitled “Information Processing Methodology.” A copy of the ‘465 patent is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit 3.

10. On June 16, 1998, U.S. Patent No. 5,768,416 (hereinafter referred to as “the ‘416 patent”) was duly and legally issued to Millennium for an invention entitled “Information Processing Methodology.” A copy of the ‘416 patent is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit 4.

1 11. On July 25, 2000, U.S. Patent No. 6,094,505 (hereinafter referred to as “the ‘505  
2 patent”) was duly and legally issued to Millennium for an invention entitled “Information  
3 Processing Methodology.” A copy of the ‘505 patent is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit 5.

4 12. On August 21, 2007, U.S. Patent No. 7,259,887 (hereinafter referred to as “the ‘887  
5 patent”) was duly and legally issued to Millennium for an invention entitled “Information  
6 Processing Methodology.” A copy of the ‘887 patent is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit 6.

7 13. On January 6, 2009, U.S. Patent No. 7,474,434 (hereinafter referred to as “the ‘434  
8 patent”) was duly and legally issued to Millennium for an invention entitled “Information  
9 Processing Methodology.” A copy of the ‘434 patent is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit 7.

10 14. CET is the owner by way of assignment of all right, title and interest in and to the  
11 ‘855, ‘508, ‘465, ‘416, ‘505, ‘887 and ‘434 patents.  
12

13 **COUNT ONE**

14 15. Plaintiff, CET, repeats and incorporates herein the entirety of the allegations  
15 contained in paragraphs 1 through 14 above.

16 16. SearchExpress has and still is infringing, actively inducing the infringement of and  
17 contributorily infringing in this judicial district, the ‘855 patent by, among other things, importing,  
18 making, using, offering for sale, and/or selling computer hardware, software and systems, including  
19 but not limited to its Document Imaging and Document Management products, in which  
20 information from a hard copy document is extracted and transmitted to an application program in a  
21 manner defined by the claims of the ‘855 patent without permission from CET and will continue to  
22 do so unless enjoined by this Court.  
23

24 17. Plaintiff, CET, has been damaged by such infringing activities by the Defendant of  
25 the ‘855 patent and will be irreparably harmed unless such infringing activities are enjoined by this  
26 Court.  
27  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**COUNT TWO**

18. Plaintiff, CET, repeats and incorporates herein the entirety of the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 15 above.

19. SearchExpress has and still is infringing, actively inducing the infringement of and contributorily infringing in this judicial district, the ‘508 patent by, among other things, importing, making, using, offering for sale, and/or selling computer hardware, software and systems, including but not limited to its Document Imaging and Document Management products, in which information from a hard copy document is extracted and transmitted to an application program in a manner defined by the claims of the ‘508 patent without permission from CET and will continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court.

20. Plaintiff, CET, has been damaged by such infringing activities by the Defendant, of the ‘508 patent and will be irreparably harmed unless such infringing activities are enjoined by this Court.

**COUNT THREE**

21. Plaintiff, CET, repeats and incorporates herein the entirety of the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 20 above.

22. SearchExpress has and still is infringing, actively inducing the infringement of and contributorily infringing in this judicial district, the ‘465 patent by, among other things, importing, making, using, offering for sale, and/or selling computer hardware, software and systems, including but not limited to its Document Imaging and Document Management products, in which information from a hard copy document is extracted and transmitted to an application program in a manner defined by the claims of the ‘465 patent without permission from CET and will continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court.



1 manner defined by the claims of the ‘505 patent without permission from CET and will continue to  
2 do so unless enjoined by this Court.

3 29. Plaintiff, CET, has been damaged by such infringing activities by the Defendant, of  
4 the ‘505 patent and will be irreparably harmed unless such infringing activities are enjoined by this  
5 Court.

6 **COUNT SIX**

7 30. Plaintiff, CET, repeats and incorporates herein the entirety of the allegations  
8 contained in paragraphs 1 through 29 above.

9 31. SearchExpress has and still is infringing, actively inducing the infringement of and  
10 contributorily infringing in this judicial district, the ‘887 patent by, among other things, importing,  
11 making, using, offering for sale, and/or selling computer hardware, software and systems, including  
12 but not limited to its Document Imaging and Document Management products, in which  
13 information from a hard copy document is extracted and transmitted to an application program in a  
14 manner defined by the claims of the ‘887 patent without permission from CET and will continue to  
15 do so unless enjoined by this Court.  
16

17 32. Plaintiff, CET, has been damaged by such infringing activities by the Defendant, of  
18 the ‘887 patent and will be irreparably harmed unless such infringing activities are enjoined by this  
19 Court.  
20

21 **COUNT SEVEN**

22 33. Plaintiff, CET, repeats and incorporates herein the entirety of the allegations  
23 contained in paragraphs 1 through 32 above.

24 34. SearchExpress has and still is infringing, actively inducing the infringement of and  
25 contributorily infringing in this judicial district, the ‘434 patent by, among other things, importing,  
26 making, using, offering for sale, and/or selling computer hardware, software and systems, including  
27 but not limited to its Document Imaging and Document Management products, in which  
28

1 information from a hard copy document is extracted and transmitted to an application program in a  
2 manner defined by the claims of the '434 patent without permission from CET and will continue to  
3 do so unless enjoined by this Court.

4 35. Plaintiff, CET, has been damaged by such infringing activities by the Defendant, of  
5 the '434 patent and will be irreparably harmed unless such infringing activities are enjoined by this  
6 Court.

7  
8  
9 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

10 WHEREFORE, THE Plaintiff, CET prays for judgment against the Defendant  
11 SearchExpress on all the counts and for the following relief:

- 12 A. Declaration that the Plaintiff is the owner of the '855, '508, '465, '416, '505, '887  
13 and '434 patents and that the Plaintiff has the right to sue and to recover for  
14 infringement thereof;
- 15 B. Declaration that the '855, '508, '465, '416, '505 '887 and '434 patents are valid and  
16 enforceable;
- 17 C. Declaration that the Defendant has infringed, actively induced infringement of, and  
18 contributorily infringed '855, '508, '465, '416, '505, '887 and '434 patents;
- 19 D. A preliminary and permanent injunction against the Defendant, each of its officers,  
20 agents, servants, employees, and attorneys, all parent and subsidiary corporations,  
21 their assigns and successors in interest, and those persons acting in active concert or  
22 participation with them, including distributors and customers, enjoining them from  
23 continuing acts of infringement, active inducement of infringement, and contributory  
24 infringement of CET's '855, '508, '465, '416, '505, '887 and '434 patents;
- 25 E. An accounting for damages under 35 U.S.C. §284 for infringement of CET's '855,  
26 '508, '465, '416, '505, '887 and '434 patents by the Defendant and the award of  
27 damages so ascertained to the Plaintiff together with interest as provided by law;
- 28 F. Award of CET's costs and expenses; and

1 G. Such other and further relief as this Court may deem proper, just and equitable.

2

3

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

4

The Plaintiff, CET, demands a trial by jury of all issues properly triable by jury in this  
5 action.

5

6

By: /s/Jean-Marc Zimmerman

7

Jean-Marc Zimmerman (JZ 7743)  
Law Offices of Jean-Marc Zimmerman LLC  
226 St. Paul Street  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
Attorneys for Plaintiff Content Extraction  
and Transmission LLC

8

9

10

11

Dated: November 2, 2011  
Westfield, New Jersey

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28