

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

GOLDEN BRIDGE TECHNOLOGY, INC.,)	
)	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>)	CA No.
)	
vs.)	
)	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES CO., LTD.,)	
)	
<i>Defendant.</i>)	
)	
)	
)	

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

For its Complaint against Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd. (“Defendant” or “Huawei”), Plaintiff Golden Bridge Technology, Inc. (“Plaintiff” or “GBT”) alleges as follows:

THE PARTIES

1. Plaintiff GBT is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of New Jersey, with its principal place of business at 198 Brighton Avenue, Long Branch, New Jersey 07740. GBT is the owner, by assignment, of all right, title and interest to U.S. Patent No. 6,574,267 B1 (“the ‘267 patent”) (later reexamined and issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,574,267 C1 (“the Re ‘267 patent”). The ‘267 patent and the Re ‘267 patent are collectively referred to as the “Patent-in-Suit.”

2. Defendant Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd. ("Huawei China") is a Chinese company, with its principal place of business at Bantian, Longgang District, Shenzhen 518129 P.R. China.

NATURE OF THE ACTION

3. In this civil action, Plaintiff seeks damages against Defendant for acts of patent infringement in violation of the Patent Act of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§ 1 et seq.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction of such federal question claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

5. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(c) and 1400(b), in that the acts and transactions complained of herein were conceived, carried out, made effective, or had effect within the State of Delaware and within this district, among other places. On information and belief, Defendant conducts business activities in this judicial district including regularly doing or soliciting business, engaging in conduct and/or deriving substantial revenue from goods and services provided to consumers in the State of Delaware and in this district.

6. On information and belief, this Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant. Defendant conducts continuous and systematic business in Delaware and in this district by offering to sell and/or selling mobile devices in this State in this district.

GENERAL OVERVIEW OF CELLULAR TELECOMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS AND THE RELATION TO THE PATENT-IN-SUIT

7. At the highest level of operation, a cellular telecommunications system comprises, at least, a mobile station and a base station.

8. Mobile stations, also known as mobile devices, include cell phones, handsets, smart phones, electronic readers, laptop cards, and other portable devices which enable a user to place and receive calls, send text and multimedia messages, or download or transmit files, media, or other data, among other communication activities.

9. Base stations, typically located on towers, are dispersed throughout geographic locations. The mobile stations must communicate with the base stations before the mobile station is allowed access to the cellular network.

10. In 2008, the standards setting organization known as the Third Generation Partnership Project (“3GPP”) developed a fourth generation (“4G”) standard known as the Long Term Evolution Standard (“LTE”). The 4G LTE standard further expands the usability of mobile devices, beyond the capabilities of the third generation of wireless network standards, also known as “3G”, by expanding the potential number of simultaneous users and increasing the speeds at which communication and data access occurs.

11. Currently, all 4G networks and devices claiming to be LTE compliant must comply with the standard as articulated by 3GPP.

12. On March 22, 1999, GBT filed the ‘267 patent application and on June 3, 2003, the United States Patent & Trademark Office duly and legally issued United States Letters Patent No. 6,574,267 B1 entitled “RACH-RAMP-UP ACKNOWLEDGEMENT” (“the ‘267 patent”). A true and correct copy of the ‘267 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference.

13. On December 15, 2009, after a full and fair re-examination of the ‘267 patent, the United States Patent & Trademark Office duly and legally issued an *Ex Parte* Reexamination Certificate Number 6,574,267 C1 entitled “RACH-RAMP-UP ACKNOWLEDGEMENT”. A true and correct copy of the *Ex Parte* Reexamination Certificate Number 6,574,267 C1 (“the Re ‘267 patent”) is attached hereto as Exhibit B. The Patent-in-Suit claims certain aspects of the 4G LTE standards required and articulated by 3GPP.

14. The Patent-in-Suit is directed toward methods and processes which are used by mobile stations to establish communication between mobile stations and base stations over a wireless communication network. The 4G LTE Standard, as promulgated by 3GPP, reads on claims of the Patent-in-Suit. Accordingly, 4G LTE compliant devices, and the use of such devices, infringe the Patent-in-Suit.

**DEFENDANT HUAWEI AND ITS
UNAUTHORIZED USE OF THE PATENT-IN-SUIT**

15. Huawei is a leading telecom solutions provider. Its products are deployed in over 100 countries and serve two billion users worldwide.

16. Huawei makes, sells, offers for sale and/or imports certain mobile stations which are configured to allow connection to 4G LTE compliant wireless networks. Those mobile stations manufactured by Huawei that are configured to allow connection to 4G LTE compliant wireless networks include but are not limited to the MEDIAPAD 10 FHD.

**FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF AGAINST HUAWEI FOR
INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,574,267 C1**

1-16. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 - 16 of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

17. Plaintiff GBT is the owner by assignment of the entire right, title, and interest, including the right to enforce the Patent-in-Suit.

18. Huawei has directly and indirectly infringed, and continues to directly and indirectly infringe the Patent-in-Suit by making, using, selling, and offering for sale in or importing into the United States mobile station devices used within LTE compliant 4G wireless communication networks, which embody or otherwise practice one or more of the claims of the Patent-in-Suit. These mobile devices include but are not limited to the MEDIAPAD 10 FHD. Upon information and belief, Huawei markets and sells its 4G LTE compliant mobile station devices to end users, either directly or through distributors, and such end users use the mobile station devices in direct infringement of the patent in suit. Upon information and belief, Huawei markets and distributes its 4G LTE compliant mobile station devices based upon their 4G LTE compliant characteristics, Huawei's 4G LTE compliant mobile station devices are especially designed to operate in a manner that infringes the Patent-in-Suit, and Huawei's 4G LTE compliant mobile

station devices lack a substantial non-infringing use. In light of the foregoing, Huawei has knowingly and intentionally directly infringed, induced infringement, and/or contributorily infringed the Patent-in-Suit.

19. As a direct and proximate result of Huawei's activities directly infringing, inducing and/or contributing to infringement of the Patent-in-Suit pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), (b) and/or (c), respectively, Plaintiff has been and continues to be damaged in an amount yet to be determined.

20. Huawei has had actual notice of the Patent-in-Suit owned by GBT and its infringement of the Patent-in-Suit since at least March 21, 2011, when Huawei entered into a Stipulation to Extend Time to Respond to Complaint in a prior action alleging infringement of the Patent-in-Suit.

21. Huawei has not had, nor does it have a reasonable basis for believing that it had or has the right to engage in the acts complained of herein.

22. Huawei's direct and indirect infringement has been willful and deliberate, making this an exceptional case and justifying the award of treble damages pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284 and attorneys' fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by a jury of twelve pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as to all issues in this lawsuit.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendant as follows:

1. For a judicial determination and declaration that Defendant has directly and indirectly infringed and continues to so infringe the Patent-in-Suit by making, using, importing,

offering for sale, and/or selling mobile devices that are used to connect to LTE compliant 4G wireless networks in the United States;

2. For a judicial determination and decree that Defendant's infringement of the Patent-in-Suit is willful;

3. For damages resulting from Defendant's past and present infringement of the Patent-in-Suit and the trebling of such damages because of the willful and deliberate nature of its infringement;

4. For a declaration that this is an exceptional case under 35 U.S.C. § 285 and for an award of attorneys' fees and costs in this action;

5. For an assessment of prejudgment interest; and

6. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper under the circumstances.

DATED: April 13, 2012

MCCARTER & ENGLISH, LLP

/s/ Michael P. Kelly

Michael P. Kelly (DE #2295)

Daniel M. Silver (DE #4758)

Renaissance Centre

405 N. King Street 8th Floor

Wilmington, DE 19801

Tel: (302) 984-6300

Fax: (302) 984-6399

mkelly@mccarter.com

dsilver@mccarter.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff
Golden Bridge Technology, Inc.*