PLAINTIFF'S ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, Tyler Technologies, Inc. ("Tyler") files this Original Complaint against Defendant, Virtual Impact Productions, Inc. ("VIP"), and for its causes of action would show the Court the matters set forth below.

The Parties

- 1. Tyler is a corporation formed under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its principal place of business located at 5949 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400, Dallas, Texas 75225.
- 2. VIP is a Florida corporation having a principal place of business at 607 St. Andrews Drive, Sarasota, Florida 34243.

Jurisdiction and Venue

3. This case is an action for declaratory judgment pursuant to Title 28, United States Code, § \$2201-2202 and Title 35, United States Code, § 101 *et seq.*, as to non-infringement of alleged patent rights and an action for declaratory judgment for related state law causes of action, some of which necessarily depend on resolution of a substantial question of federal patent law. In addition, the Court has jurisdiction over this case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1) because the matter in controversy exceeds \$75,000.00, exclusive of interests and costs, and is between

/1

citizens of different States. In sum, the Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § § 1331, 1332, 1338, 2201, and, to the extent necessary, 1367.

4. Venue is proper within this judicial district and division under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred in Dallas County.

Background Facts

- 5. Tyler designs, develops and markets software products for use by local governments.
- 6. Tyler received a letter from VIP dated September 7, 2006. A true and correct copy of the September 7, 2006 letter is attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and is incorporated herein by reference for all purposes.
- 7. In the letter, VIP accuses Tyler of infringing its patent for a "virtual school environment" by "aggressively marketing the proprietary technology Virtual." Exhibit A at 1. VIP states that it is the owner of U.S. Patent No. 6,505,031 (the "031 Patent"). *Id.*
- 8. VIP further asserts that "Tyler has severely damaged the patent of Virtual" through Tyler's application of the virtual school environment "as is protected in United States Patent 6,505,031." Exhibit A at 2 (emphasis in original). VIP alleges that it "is damaged because it cannot exclusively market its patent." Id. VIP also states that it will suffer "negative tax consequences in the loss of exclusivity of the patent to Virtual." *Id.*

Request For Declaratory Judgment

9. By virtue of VIP's actions, including threats of litigation, accusations of infringement, and allegations of damages suffered, a reasonable apprehension exists on Tyler's behalf that Tyler will be wrongfully sued by VIP for infringement of the '031 Patent. An actual

controversy therefore exists between the parties with respect to whether Tyler's actions, if any, infringe any valid claim of the '031 Patent.

- 10. Tyler requests a declaration that its actions do not infringe the '031 Patent.
- 11. By virtue of VIP's actions, including threats of litigation, accusations of unspecified contract and/or tort violations, and allegations of damages suffered, a reasonable apprehension exists on Tyler's behalf that Tyler will be wrongfully sued by VIP. An actual controversy therefore exists between the parties.
- 12. Tyler requests a declaration that it has not damaged VIP by any state law cause of action.

Prayer

WHEREFORE, Tyler prays:

- (a) that the Court declare that Tyler's actions do not infringe the '031 Patent;
- (b) that the Court declare that Tyler's actions do not support any state law causes of action by VIP based in tort and/or contract;
 - (c) that Tyler be awarded its costs of court;
 - (d) that Tyler be awarded its attorneys' fees; and
- (e) that Tyler be awarded its such other and further relief as this Court shall deem just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

HUGHES & LUCE, L.L.P.

John W. Patton Texas Bar No. 00798422 Megan K. Dredla Texas Bar No. 24050530 1717 Main Street, Suite 2800 Dallas, Texas 75201 (214) 939-5500 (Office) (214) 939-6100 (Fax) pattoni@hughesluce.com megan.dredla@hughesluce.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF TYLER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

OCALA, FLORIDA 34470

TELEPHONE (352) 867-0766 FAX (352) 351-9217 ALSO ADMITTED IN NORTH CAROLINA FLORIDA BOARD CERTIFIED CRIMINAL TRIAL ATTORNEY

September 7, 2006

FEDERAL EXPRESS AND
CERTIFIED MAIL RETURN
RECEIPT REQUESTED

John S. Marr, Jr. President and CEO Tyler Technologies, Inc. 5949 Sherry Lane Suite 1400 Dallas, TX 75225

Dear Mr. Marr:

This firm represents the interests of Virtual Impact Productions, Inc., Michelle Robinson and Robert Slider (herein collectively referenced as "Virtual"), in the sale of its United States Patent <u>6,505,031</u>, a system for providing a "virtual school environment". Of course, this term need not be defined in that Tyler Technologies, Inc., (herein "Tyler") knows precisely the meaning and application of this term.

Virtual was deeply concerned and dismayed to learn from the firm brokering the sale of the referenced exclusive patent, that Virtual Impact Productions, Inc., is not only listed as a partner with Tyler upon the website of Tyler, but that Tyler is aggressively marketing the proprietary technology Virtual. An immediate investigation was launched and has revealed this "partnership" has no basis in law or fact. No one from Virtual has made any such agreement or alliance much less had any contact with your company. By what right, license, title, or interest does Tyler advertise such claim to the stockholders, governmental entities, and other institutions? This representation is false and is the corporate fingerprint of Tyler's long trail of misdeeds which continue to damage the interests of Virtual.

Tyler acquired Mazik USA, a company which attempted but failed to come to any agreement with Virtual regarding the purchase or the use in any way shape or form of the patent of Virtual. Notwithstanding their warranties in the 8-K, Mazik USA could not sell



to Tyler that which it did not possess. In short, even the most cursory review of the facts surrounding Tyler's application of the "virtual school environment" clearly establishes that Tyler has severely damaged the patent of Virtual. Tyler has "virtually hijacked" the virtual school environment of Virtual and its interest as is protected in United States Patent 6,505,031. There is no excuse as to why this situation could not have been totally avoided had due diligence been exercised before acquiring Mazik USA. What could be more transparent than the evidentiary fact that your website contains a link to the patent of Virtual? Who is responsible for such a debacle that is daily damaging the interests of Virtual?

Virtual is damaged because it cannot exclusively market its patent and cannot fulfill its legal obligations to the firm brokering the patent. This fails to even take into account the negative tax consequences in the loss of exclusivity of the patent to Virtual. Tyler has at best been negligent in its due diligence which is the direct and proximate cause of the mounting damages to Virtual. This calls for the immediate attention of Tyler if it expects to avoid dire consequences.

Virtual demands that Tyler contact this law firm within three (3) business days of the receipt of this letter and coordinate a meeting to discuss and resolve our mutual concerns. Should you fail to contact this office, Virtual will exercise any legal, administrative, or regulatory option in order to redress this outrage.

I trust our position upon this matter is clear.

Sincerely

Charles R. Holloman, PA

cc: Glenn A. Smith

Executive Vice President Tyler Technologies, Inc.

5949 Sherry Lane

Suite 1400

Dallas, TX 75225

JS 44 (Rev 11/04)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

ricet 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 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 the civil

dock Site: (SEE INSTRUCT)	ONS ON THE REVERSE OF	THE FURIN.)		_		
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	(a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS		
TYLER TECH	CHNOLOGIES, INC.			VIRTUAL IMPACT PRODUCTIONS, INC		
				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.		
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Teleptione Numb FD 5 2006 Attorneys (If Known) JOHN W. PATTON, MEGAN K. DREDLA Hughes & Luce, LLP 1717 Main Street, Suite 2800, Dallas, TX 7\$20CLERK, US DISTRICT COURT (214) 939-5500 BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) Attorneys (If Known) 3 - 0 6 C V 1 6 9 3 - P						
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff						
☐ 1 U.S. Government ☑ 3 Federal Question Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party)			c	(For Div/ersity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF Citizen of This State □ 1 □ 1 Incorporated or Principal Place □ 4 □ 4 of Business In This State		
☐ 2 U.S. Governmer Defendant					2 2 Incorporated and F of Business In A	
			С	itizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 3 Foreign Nation	☐ 6 ☐ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT (P	ace an "X" in One Box Only)	RTS	.t	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
110 Insurance 120 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 Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land	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 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations	PERSONAL INJU 362 Personal Injury Med Malpractir 365 Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROF 370 Other Praud 371 Truth in Lending Roperty Dama 385 Property Dama Property Dama Product Liability PRISONER PETITI 510 Motions to Vaca Sentence Habeas Corpt 530 General	JRY - cce - yy ynal PERTY g ge ge y IONS	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 690 Other 100 December 1	422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 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 USC 7609	400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 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 875 Customer Challenge 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 Act
245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 444 Welfare ☐ 445 Amer w/Disabilities- Employment ☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities- Other ☐ 440 Other Civil Rights	535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & O 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition				900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" ☑ 1	□ 3	4		☐ 5 Transferred		Appeal to District ☐ 7 Judge from
- 0		nanded from sellate Court	Reinsta			Magistrate Judgment
Proceeding State Court Appellate Court Reopened (specify) Litigation Judgment Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 28 U.S C. §§ 2201-2202 and 35 U.S C. § 101, et seq. Brief description of cause: Declaratory judgment as to non-infringement of alleged patent rights and a declaratory judgment for related state law causes of action that necessarily depend on resolution of a substantial question of federal patent law and arise under patent law						
VII. REQUESTED IN	☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION DEMAND \$ Declaratory relief plus attorney's fees and costs. CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:					
COMPLAINT: VIII. RELATED CASE(S)	UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 JURY DEMAND ☐ Yes ☒ No (Constitution) UIDCE					
DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD						
09/15/06						
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY						
RECEIPT#	AMOUNT	APPLYING IFF		JUDGE	MAG	JUDGE