

Plaintiff Innovative Automation LLC states its complaint against Defendant Acutrack, Inc., and alleges as follows:

THE PARTIES

- Plaintiff Innovative Automation LLC ("Plaintiff" or "Innovative Automation")
 is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the State of
 California, with its principal place of business at 606 North First Street, San Jose, California
 95112.
- 2. On information and belief, Defendant Acutrack, Inc. ("Acutrack") is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California, with its principal place of business at 350 Sonic Avenue, Livermore, California 94551.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 3. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs the above paragraphs of this Complaint, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 4. This action is for patent infringement pursuant to the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§ 1 et seq. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).
- 5. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because, on information and belief, Defendant does and has done substantial business in this judicial District, including (i) maintaining its principal place of business in this judicial District; (ii) committing acts of patent infringement and/or contributing to or inducing acts of patent infringement by others in this judicial District and elsewhere in California; and (iii) regularly doing business or soliciting business, engaging in other persistent courses of conduct, and/or deriving substantial revenue from products and/or services provided to persons in this District and in this State.
- 6. Venue is proper in this judicial District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400(b) because Defendant resides in this judicial District, and because a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claims occurred in this judicial District.

CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Infringement of United States Patent No. 7,174,362)

- 7. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs the above paragraphs of this Complaint, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 8. Plaintiff is the owner of all right, title, and interest in United States Patent No. 7,174,362, entitled "Method and System for Supplying Products from Pre-Stored Digital Data in Response to Demands Transmitted via Computer Network," duly and legally issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office on February 6, 2007 (the "'362 patent"). A true and correct copy of the '362 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- 9. The '362 patent generally describes and claims a computer-implemented method of digital data duplication. In the method of claim 1 of the '362 patent, a request is taken at one or more user interfaces and is transmitted through a network to a computer. The computer contains a module to create a task log based on incoming requests; a module for storing the necessary data; and a module to create a subset of the data, download that subset to an output device, and command the device to transfer the subset onto blank media. The request is assigned to an output device, and the duplication process is executed. Claims 2-8 of the '362 patent describe various other methods and a system of digital data duplication.
- 10. Defendant has infringed, and continues to infringe, literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, one or more claims of the '362 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by using the claimed method(s) of duplicating digital data while performing Defendant's digital media duplication services such as its optical media duplication services.
- 11. As a result of Defendant's infringing activities, Plaintiff has suffered damages in an amount not yet ascertained. Plaintiff is entitled to recover damages adequate to compensate it for the Defendant's infringing activities in an amount to be determined at trial, but in no event less than reasonable royalties, together with interest and costs.

12. Plaintiff reserves the right to allege, after discovery, that Defendant's infringement is willful and deliberate, entitling it to increased damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284, and to attorneys' fees incurred in prosecuting this action under 35 U.S.C. § 285.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests entry of judgment in its favor against Defendant as follows:

- a) For a declaration that Defendant has infringed, directly and/or indirectly, the '362 patent;
- b) For an award of damages adequate to compensate Plaintiff for Defendant's infringement of the '362 patent, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty, together with prejudgment and post-judgment interest and costs, in an amount according to proof;
- c) For an entry of a permanent injunction enjoining Defendant, and its respective officers, agents, employees, and those acting in privity, from further infringement, including contributory infringement and/or inducing infringement, of the '362 patent, or in the alternative, awarding a royalty for post-judgment infringement;
- d) For an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285 or as otherwise permitted by law; and
- e) For an award to Plaintiff of such other costs and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL 1 Pursuant to Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff respectfully 2 requests a trial by jury. 3 4 Respectfully submitted, 5 **GUTRIDE SAFIER LLP** Dated: July 12, 2011 6 7 Adam J. Gutride, Esq. Seth A. Safier, Esq. Todd Kennedy, Esq. 835 Douglass Street 10 San Francisco, California 94114 11 Telephone: (415) 789-6390 Facsimile: (415) 449-6469 12 Victoria L.H. Booke 13 Peter Ajlouny BOOKÉ & ÁJLOUNY LLP 14 606 North First Street San Jose, California 95112 15 Telephone: (408) 286-7000 Facsimile: (408) 286-7111 16 Attorneys for Plaintiff Innovative 17 Automation LLC 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

28