ORIGINAI	Case3:11-cv-06	6662-MEJ	Docu	ıment1 Fi	led12	/28/11 Page1 c	of 7
♦ JS 44 (Rev. 12/07) (CAND Rev.		•		COVER SI			(/WMV
The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the by local rules of court. This form	n, approved by the Judicial (	Conference of the Un	ited State	ment the filing and s s in September 197	service of 4, is requi	pleadings or other papers as r red for the use of the Clerk o	required by law, except as provide of Court for the purpose of initiating
the civil docket sheet (SEE INS)  I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	TRUCTIONS ON PAGE T	WO OF THE FORM	.)	DEFENDAN			
RENESAS ELECTRONIC ELECTRONICS AMERIC		d RENESAS		HSM PORT	FOLIO	LLC, TECHNOLOGY PI ALLIACENSE LTD.	ROPERTIES
(b) County of Residence (EXCER	of First Listed Plaintiff Ja T IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA			NOTE: IN I	(	rst Listed Defendant IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES IDEMNATION CASES, USE T	Santa Clara S ONLY) HE LOCATION OF THE
(c) Attorney's (Firm Nan	ne. Address, and Telephone	Number)		Attorneys (If Kn		, <b>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </b>	
RACHEL KREVANS (CAMORRISON & FOERST) 425 Market Street San Francisco, CA 94105	A SBN 116421) ER	ram	m m f		M	ej A =	
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP	OF PR	NCIPAL PARTY	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
1 U.S. Government X	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government N	ot a Party)	Citi	(For Diversity Ca	ses Only) PTF	DEF  1 Incorporated or Princ of Business In Tl	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF ipal Place 4 4
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship o	f Parties in Item III)	Citi	zen of Another State	<u> </u>	2 Incorporated and Prin of Business In A	
				zen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3	3 Foreign Nation	6 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT CONTRACT		y) DRTS		FORFEITURE/PI	ENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
110 Insurance   120 Marine   130 Marine   130 Miller Act   140 Negotiable Instrument   150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment   151 Medicare Act   152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (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 Coudemnation	PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury  CIVIL RIGHTS	PERSONAL IN.  362 Personal Inju Med. Malpra 365 Personal Inju 365 Personal Inju 368 Asbestos Per Injury Produc Liability PERSONAL PROF 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lenc 380 Other Person Property Dan 385 Property Dan Product Liab PRISONEL PETITION 510 Motions to V	ry— Cotice Fy— Cotice I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	730 Labor/Mgmt.l & Disclosure 740 Railway Labo 790 Other Labor I	Seizure II USC 881 andards Relations Reporting Act out Act Litigation	422 Appeal 28 USC 158     423 Withdrawal	400 State Reapportionment 410 Antirust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Information
220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 444 Welfare 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 440 Other Civil Rights	Sentence Habeas Corpus:  530 General  535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & 550 Civil Rights  555 Prison Condi	Other	791 Empl. Ret. In Security Act  IMMIGRAT  462 Naturalization A  463 Habeas Corpt. Alien Detaine  465 Other Immigr	ION Application us —	FEDERAL TAX SUITS  1870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)  1871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	Act 990Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X"  I Original 2 Remo	_	anded from4	4 Reinsta Reoper	Actions  Transited or 5 ano	sferred fro		Appeal to District 7 Judge from Magistrate Judgment
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Brief description of o	338, 2201-2202 cause:	_		urisdictie	nal statutes unless diversit	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	Declaratory judgm  CHECK IF THIS  UNDER F.R.C.P. 2	IS A CLASS ACTI		DEMAND \$		CHECK YES	S only if demanded in complaint
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY	PLEASE REFER	TO CIVIL V.R. 3 ELATED CASE".	-12 CON	CERNING REQ	UIREME		

X

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

AN FRANCISCO/OAKLAND

EUREKA

IX. DIVISIONAL ASSIGNMENT (CIVIL L.R. 3-2) (PLACE AND "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY)

12/28/2011

1 RACHEL KREVANS (CA SBN 116421) RKrevans@mofo.com 2 JOHN K. BLAKE, JR. (CA SBN 262906) JBlake@mofo.com MICHAEL P. KNIFFEN (CA SBN 263877) 3 MKniffen@mofo.com MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 4 425 Market Street 5 San Francisco, California 94105-2482 Telephone: 415.268.7000 Facsimile: 415.268.7522 6 7 Attorneys for Plaintiffs RENESAS ELECTRONICS CORPORATION and RENESAS ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC. 8 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 11 12 RENESAS ELECTRONICS CORPORATION, **COMPLAINT FOR** and DECLARATORY JUDGMENT 14 RENESAS ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., OF PATENT NON-INFRINGEMENT AND 15 Plaintiffs, INVALIDITY 16 JURY TRIAL DEMANDED v. 17 HSM PORTFOLIO LLC, 18 TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED LLC, 19 and 20 ALLIACENSE LTD., 21 Defendants. 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

se3:11-cv-06662-MEJ Document1 Filed12/28/11 Page2 of 7

1	Plaintiffs Renesas Electronics Corporation ("REL") and Renesas Electronics America,
2	Inc. ("REA," and collectively with REL, "Renesas") bring this action against Defendants HSM
3	Portfolio LLC ("HSM"), Technology Properties Limited, LLC ("TPL"), and Alliacense Ltd.
4	("Alliacense," and collectively with HSM and TPL, "Defendants") and complain as follows:
5	THE NATURE OF THE ACTION
6	1. U.S. Patent no. 5,030,853 ("the '853 Patent"), entitled "High Speed Logic and
7	Memory Family Using Ring Segment Buffer," issued on July 9, 1991 to named inventor Albert
8	W. Vinal. A reexamination certificate for the '853 Patent issued on February 16, 1993, and a
9	second reexamination certificate for the '853 Patent issued on July 20, 2010.
10	2. U.S. Patent no. 5,391,949 ("the '949 Patent"), entitled "Differential Latching
11	Inverter Circuit," issued on February 21, 1995 to named inventor Albert W. Vinal.
12	3. HSM and TPL, through Alliacense, assert that they are assignees and own all
13	rights in the '853 and '949 Patents.
14	4. As a result of Defendants' communications to Renesas of their intention to pursue
15	claims of infringement of the '853 and '949 Patents against Renesas, Renesas is under the
16	reasonable apprehension of imminent suit by Defendants. Renesas does not infringe and has not
17	infringed '853 and '949 Patents, which are invalid. Renesas brings this action to obtain
18	declaratory judgments of non-infringement and invalidity of the '853 and '949 Patents.
19	THE PARTIES
20	5. REL is a corporation organized under the laws of Japan, with its registered head
21	office at 1753 Shimonumabe, Nakahara-Ku, Kawasaki, Kanagawa 211-8668, Japan, and its
22	principal place of business at Nippon Bldg., 2-6-2, Ote-machi, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-0004,
23	Japan.
24	6. REA is a corporation organized under the laws of California, with its principal
25	place of business at 2880 Scott Boulevard Santa Clara, California 95050-2554.
26	7. Upon information and belief, HSM is a Delaware limited liability company with
27	its principal place of business located at 20883 Stevens Creek Blvd., Suite 100, Cupertino,
28	California 95014

1	8.	Upon information and belief, TPL is a California corporation with its principal
2	place of busi	ness located at 20883 Stevens Creek Blvd., Suite 100, Cupertino, California 95014.
3	9.	Upon information and belief, Alliacense is a Delaware limited liability company
4	with its princ	cipal place of business located at 20883 Stevens Creek Blvd., Suite 100, Cupertino,
5	California 9:	5014.
6		<u>JURISDICTION</u>
7	10.	This action arises under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§ 1 et seq.
8	11.	This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
9	§ 1331 (fede	ral question); 28 U.S.C. § 1338(a) (any Act of Congress relating to patents or
10	trademarks);	28 U.S.C. § 2201 (declaratory judgment); and 28 U.S.C. § 2202 (further relief based
11	on declarator	ry judgment).
12	12.	This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants in that upon information and
13	belief Defen	dants maintain their principal places of business within this District and regularly
14	conduct busi	ness activities within California and this District.
15		VENUE AND INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT
	13.	VENUE AND INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT  Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c) and 28
16	13. U.S.C. § 140	Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c) and 28
15 16 17 18		Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c) and 28
16 17 18	U.S.C. § 140	Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c) and 28 00(b).
16 17 18 19	U.S.C. § 140	Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c) and 28 00(b).  Because this action is an Intellectual Property Action within the meaning of Civil
16 17	U.S.C. § 140	Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c) and 28 00(b).  Because this action is an Intellectual Property Action within the meaning of Civil the action is to be assigned on a district-wide basis.
16 17 18 19 20 21	U.S.C. § 140 14. L. R. 3-2(c),	Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c) and 28 00(b).  Because this action is an Intellectual Property Action within the meaning of Civil the action is to be assigned on a district-wide basis.  GENERAL ALLEGATIONS
116 117 118 119 20 21 22	U.S.C. § 140 14. L. R. 3-2(c), 15. indicated that	Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c) and 28 00(b).  Because this action is an Intellectual Property Action within the meaning of Civil the action is to be assigned on a district-wide basis.  GENERAL ALLEGATIONS  In August 2011, Renesas was contacted by Mr. Mac Leckrone. Mr. Leckrone
16 17 18 19 20	U.S.C. § 140 14. L. R. 3-2(c), 15. indicated that Renesas that	Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c) and 28 00(b).  Because this action is an Intellectual Property Action within the meaning of Civil the action is to be assigned on a district-wide basis.  GENERAL ALLEGATIONS  In August 2011, Renesas was contacted by Mr. Mac Leckrone. Mr. Leckrone at the works for Alliacense, a "TPL Group Enterprise." Mr. Leckrone informed
116 117 118 119 20 21 22 23	U.S.C. § 140 14. L. R. 3-2(c), 15. indicated that Renesas that	Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c) and 28 00(b).  Because this action is an Intellectual Property Action within the meaning of Civil the action is to be assigned on a district-wide basis.  GENERAL ALLEGATIONS  In August 2011, Renesas was contacted by Mr. Mac Leckrone. Mr. Leckrone at he works for Alliacense, a "TPL Group Enterprise." Mr. Leckrone informed the represented Defendants and wished to discuss Renesas's licensing of the '853 and
116 117 118 119 220 221 222 223 224 225	U.S.C. § 140 14. L. R. 3-2(c), 15. indicated that Renesas that '949 Patents 16.	Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c) and 28 00(b).  Because this action is an Intellectual Property Action within the meaning of Civil the action is to be assigned on a district-wide basis.  GENERAL ALLEGATIONS  In August 2011, Renesas was contacted by Mr. Mac Leckrone. Mr. Leckrone at the works for Alliacense, a "TPL Group Enterprise." Mr. Leckrone informed the represented Defendants and wished to discuss Renesas's licensing of the '853 and from Defendants, which Defendants stated they believed Renesas infringes.
116 117 118 119 220 221 22 23	U.S.C. § 140 14. L. R. 3-2(c), 15. indicated that Renesas that '949 Patents 16. and meeting	Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c) and 28 00(b).  Because this action is an Intellectual Property Action within the meaning of Civil the action is to be assigned on a district-wide basis.  GENERAL ALLEGATIONS  In August 2011, Renesas was contacted by Mr. Mac Leckrone. Mr. Leckrone at he works for Alliacense, a "TPL Group Enterprise." Mr. Leckrone informed the represented Defendants and wished to discuss Renesas's licensing of the '853 and from Defendants, which Defendants stated they believed Renesas infringes.  Correspondence, including detailed claim charts and reverse engineering reports,

	1
2	2
	3
4	4
	5
(	6
,	7
;	8
	9
1	0
1	1
12	2
1.	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	6
2	7

28

- 17. On December 14, Mr. Leckrone emailed Renesas, writing that "I have been advised by TPL and its litigation counsel that, unless there is significant concrete progress toward final resolution prior to year end, that the litigation schedule could not withstand any further delay." In other words, it is Defendants' position that if Renesas does not agree to license the '853 and '949 Patents by the end of 2011, Defendants will sue Renesas for infringement of the '853 and '949 Patents, either before year's end or immediately in January.
- 18. Accordingly, Renesas is under the reasonable apprehension of imminent suit by Defendants.
- 19. Renesas does not infringe and has not infringed, either directly, contributorily, or by inducement, any valid and enforceable claim of the '853 and '949 Patents, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

## FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

## (Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '853 Patent)

- 20. Renesas realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 19, inclusive, as though fully set forth in this paragraph.
- 21. Renesas does not infringe and has not infringed, either directly, contributorily, or by inducement, any valid and enforceable claim of the '853 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.
- 22. There is an actual controversy, within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, between Renesas and Defendants concerning the non-infringement of the '853 Patent.
- 23. Renesas is entitled to a declaratory judgment that it does not infringe and has not infringed, either directly, contributorily, or by inducement, any valid and enforceable claim of the '853 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

## SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

## (Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '949 Patent)

24. Renesas realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 23, inclusive, as though fully set forth in this paragraph.

1	25.	Renesas does not infringe and has not infringed, either directly, contributorily, or
2	by induceme	nt, any valid and enforceable claim of the '949 Patent, either literally or under the
3	doctrine of e	quivalents.
4	26.	There is an actual controversy, within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202
5	between Ren	esas and Defendants concerning the non-infringement of the '949 Patent.
6	27.	Renesas is entitled to a declaratory judgment that it does not infringe and has not
7	infringed, eit	her directly, contributorily, or by inducement, any valid and enforceable claim of the
8	'949 Patent,	either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.
9		THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF
10		(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of the '853 Patent)
11	28.	Renesas realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 27,
12	inclusive, as	though fully set forth in this paragraph.
13	29.	The '853 Patent is invalid for failure to comply with the requirements of Title 35
14	of the U.S. C	ode, including at least one or more of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, 112, 133, 200, et
15	seq., and 301	et seq.
16	30.	Renesas is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the claims of the '853 Patent are
17	invalid.	
18		FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF
19		(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of the '949 Patent)
20	31.	Renesas realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 30,
21	inclusive, as	though fully set forth in this paragraph.
22	32.	The '949 Patent is invalid for failure to comply with the requirements of Title 35
23	of the U.S. C	ode, including at least one or more of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, 112, 133, 200, et
24	seq., and 301	et seq.
25	33.	Renesas is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the claims of the '949 Patent are
26	invalid.	
27		
28		

1	<u>P</u>	RAYER FOR RELIEF
2	Wherefore, Renesas prays for	judgment against Defendants, as follows:
3	A. For a declaration that I	Renesas does not infringe and has not infringed, either
4	directly, contributorily, or by inducen	nent, any valid and enforceable claim of the '853 Patent,
5	either literally or under the doctrine o	f equivalents;
6	B. For a declaration that I	Renesas does not infringe and has not infringed, either
7	directly, contributorily, or by inducen	nent, any valid and enforceable claim of the '949 Patent,
8	either literally or under the doctrine o	f equivalents.
9	C. For a declaration that t	he '853 Patent is invalid;
10	D. For a declaration that t	he '949 Patent is invalid;
11	E. For an order awarding	Renesas its costs; and
12	F. For such other relief as	s this Court deems just and proper.
13	<u>DEN</u>	IAND FOR JURY TRIAL
14	Renesas demands a trial by ju	ry on all issues so triable in this action.
15		
16		
17		
18		
19	Dated: December 28, 2011	RACHEL KREVANS JOHN K. BLAKE, JR.
20		MICHAEL P. KNIFFEN
21		MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
22		
23		By: Michael P. Kniffen
24		Attorneys for Plaintiffs
25		RENESAS ELECTRONICS CORPORATION and
26		RENESAS ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.
27		AMERICA, INC.
28		