

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SHERMAN DIVISION

| | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| MAXIM INTEGRATED PRODUCTS, INC.,) | CASE NO.: |
| Plaintiff,) | |
| v.) | COMPLAINT FOR PATENT |
| WELLS FARGO & CO.,) | INFRINGEMENT |
| WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A. CO.,) | DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL |
| WELLS FARGO ADVISORS, LLC,) | |
| WELLS FARGO ADVISORS FINANCIAL) | |
| NETWORK, LLC.,) | |
| Defendants.) | |

Maxim Integrated Products, Inc. (“Maxim”) hereby alleges for its Complaint for patent infringement against defendants Wells Fargo & Co., Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., Wells Fargo Advisors, LLC, and Wells Fargo Advisors Financial Network, LLC (collectively, “Wells Fargo”) on personal knowledge as to its own actions and on information and belief as to the actions of others, as follows:

THE PARTIES

1. Plaintiff Maxim is a Delaware corporation with a place of business at 120 San Gabriel Drive, Sunnyvale, California 94086.
2. On information and belief, defendant Wells Fargo & Co. is a corporation existing and organized under the laws of Delaware and has its principal place of business at 420 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, California 94101. Wells Fargo & Co. is registered to do business in Texas, is doing business in the Eastern District of Texas, and can be served through its registered agent for service, Corporation Service Company at 2711 Centerville Road, Suite 400, Wilmington, Delaware 19808.

3. On information and belief, defendant Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. is an indirect, wholly owned operating subsidiary of Wells Fargo & Co. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. is a national bank, subject to the National Bank Act, 12 U.S.C. § 1, *et seq.*, and regulations promulgated by the Office of the Controller of the Currency. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. does business in the Eastern District of Texas. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. is registered to do business in Texas, is doing business in the Eastern District of Texas, and can be served through its registered agent for service, Corporation Service Company dba CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Service Company, 211 E. 7th Street, Suite 620, Austin, Texas, 78701-3218.

4. On information and belief, Wells Fargo Advisors, LLC, is a limited liability company existing and organized under the laws of Delaware and has its principal place of business in Missouri. On information and belief, Wells Fargo Advisors, LLC is an indirect, wholly-owned operating subsidiary of Wells Fargo & Co. Wells Fargo Advisors, LLC is doing business in the Eastern District of Texas, and can be served through its registered agent for service, Corporation Service Company dba CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Service Company, 211 E. 7th Street, Suite 620, Austin, Texas 78701-3218.

5. On information and belief, Wells Fargo Advisors Financial Network, LLC, is a limited liability company existing and organized under the laws of Delaware and has its principal place of business in Missouri. On information and belief, Wells Fargo Advisors Financial Network, LLC is an indirect, wholly-owned operating subsidiary of Wells Fargo & Co. Wells Fargo Advisors Financial Network, LLC is doing business in the Eastern District of Texas, and can be served through its registered

agent for service, Corporation Service Company dba CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Service Company, 211 E. 7th Street, Suite 620, Austin, Texas 78701-3218.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. This action for patent infringement arises under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code.

7. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

8. This Court has general and specific personal jurisdiction over Wells Fargo & Co. On information and belief, Wells Fargo & Co. is registered to do business in Texas. Wells Fargo & Co. has substantial contacts with the forum as a consequence of conducting substantial business in the State of Texas and within this district. Wells Fargo & Co. is the parent corporation of Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. On information and belief, Wells Fargo & Co., individually or through joint and concerted action through its operating subsidiaries: maintains branches within Texas and this District; transacts business in Texas and/or in this district, including through the branches maintained within Texas and this district; offers for sale, sells, and advertises its products and services utilizing the claimed systems and methods with and for customers residing in Texas, including within this district; and provides products and services directly to consumers in Texas, including within this district. Wells Fargo & Co. is the owner of the service marks associated with the “Wells Fargo Mobile” smartphone applications through which Wells Fargo & Co.’s customers can access services provided by Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. Wells Fargo & Co. is the registered owner of the website (www.wellsfargo.com) from which Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. advertise the “Wells Fargo

Mobile” services to residents of Texas. Wells Fargo & Co. has committed and continues to commit acts of patent infringement in Texas and this district.

9. This Court has general and specific personal jurisdiction over Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. has substantial contacts with the forum as a consequence of conducting substantial business in the State of Texas and within this district. On information and belief, Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. individually or through joint and concerted action with its parent corporation, Wells Fargo & Co.: maintains branches within Texas and this District; transacts business in Texas and/or in this district, including through the branches maintained within Texas and this district; offers for sale, sells, and advertises its products and services utilizing the claimed systems and methods with and for customers residing in Texas, including within this district; and provides products and services directly to consumers in Texas, including within this district. Wells Fargo & Co. and Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. jointly advertise the “Wells Fargo Mobile” services to residents of Texas through the website (www.wellsfargo.com). Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. owns, operates, and controls bank branches that operate within this district, including in Plano, Texas. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. has committed and continues to commit acts of patent infringement in Texas and this district.

10. This Court has general and specific personal jurisdiction over Wells Fargo Advisors, LLC. Wells Fargo Advisors, LLC has substantial contacts with the forum as a consequence of conducting substantial business in the State of Texas and within this district. On information and belief, Wells Fargo Advisors, LLC individually or through joint and concerted action with its parent corporation, Wells Fargo & Co.:

maintains branches in this district, including through the branches maintained within Texas and this district; offers for sale, sells, and advertises its products and services utilizing the claimed systems and methods with and for customers residing in Texas, including within this district; and provides products and services directly to consumers in Texas, including within this district. Wells Fargo Advisors, LLC advertise the “Wells Fargo Mobile” services to residents of Texas through the website “www.wellsfargoadvisors.com”. Investment services of Wells Fargo Advisors, LLC are provided to customers within Texas and this district and are accessible through the “Wells Fargo Mobile” smartphone applications. Wells Fargo Advisors, LLC owns, operates, and controls branches that operate within this district, including in Plano, Texas. Wells Fargo Advisors, LLC has committed and continues to commit acts of patent infringement in Texas and this district.

11. This Court has general and specific personal jurisdiction over Wells Fargo Advisors Financial Network, LLC. Wells Fargo Advisors Financial Network, LLC has substantial contacts with the forum as a consequence of conducting substantial business in the State of Texas and within this district. On information and belief, Wells Fargo Advisors Financial Network, LLC individually or through joint and concerted action with its parent corporation, Wells Fargo & Co.: maintains branches in this district, including through the branches maintained within Texas and this district; offers for sale, sells, and advertises its products and services utilizing the claimed systems and methods with and for customers residing in Texas, including within this district; and provides products and services directly to consumers in Texas, including within this district. Wells Fargo Advisors Financial Network, LLC advertise the “Wells Fargo

Mobile” services to residents of Texas through the website “www.wellsfargoadvisors.com”. Investment services of Wells Fargo Advisors Financial Network, LLC are provided to customers within Texas and this district and are accessible through the “Wells Fargo Mobile” smartphone applications. Wells Fargo Advisors Financial Network, LLC owns, operates, and controls branches that operate within this district, including in Tyler, Texas. Wells Fargo Advisors Financial Network, LLC has committed and continues to commit acts of patent infringement in Texas and this district.

12. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and (c), and 1400(b) because a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claims against Wells Fargo occurred and are occurring in this district, and/or because Wells Fargo has regular and established practice of business in this district and has committed acts of infringement in this district.¹

THE ASSERTED PATENTS

13. On August 17, 1999, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued U.S. Patent No. 5,940,510 (“the ’510 patent”), entitled “Transfer of Valuable Information Between a Secure Module and Another Module,” to Stephen M.

¹ This matter is related to seventeen other patent actions involving the same four asserted patents (ten of which were originally filed in this Court), which were recently centralized by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation and transferred to the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania for pre-trial proceedings. Because this matter is a tag-along case, Maxim will seek to transfer this case to the Western District of Pennsylvania for pre-trial proceedings, and nothing in this Complaint should be construed otherwise. *See* MDL No. 2354, Dkt. Nos. 101 (Corrected Transfer Order), 102 (Conditional Transfer Order); J.P.M.L. Rule Nos. 1.1(h), 7.1.

Curry, Donald W. Loomis, and Michael L. Bolan. A copy of the '510 Patent is attached to the Complaint as Exhibit A.

14. The '510 patent is directed to a system for communicating data securely, such as for secure mobile financial transactions, including a coprocessor for processing encryption calculations and a real time clock circuit for time stamping data transactions.

15. On September 7, 1999, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued U.S. Patent No. 5,949,880 (“the '880 patent”), entitled “Transfer of Valuable Information Between a Secure Module and Another Module,” to Stephen M. Curry, Donald W. Loomis, and Michael L. Bolan. A copy of the '880 Patent is attached to the Complaint as Exhibit B.

16. The '880 patent is directed to a method for electronically transferring units of exchange between two modules, such as for electronically transferring monetary equivalents or encrypted data, or where the method involves decrypting and/or encrypting the data.

17. On August 15, 2000, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued U.S. Patent No. 6,105,013 (“the '013 patent”), entitled “Method, Apparatus, System, and Firmware for Secure Transactions,” to Stephen M. Curry, Donald W. Loomis, and Christopher W. Fox. A copy of the '013 Patent is attached to the Complaint as Exhibit C.

18. The '013 patent is directed to a secure transaction integrated circuit including a microcontroller core; a modular exponentiation accelerator circuit or a math coprocessor for performing or handling encryption and decryption calculations; an

input/output circuit for exchanging data information with an electronic device; and real-time clock or a clock circuit for providing a time measurement.

19. On May 22, 2001, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued U.S. Patent No. 6,237,095 (“the ’095 patent”), entitled “Apparatus for Transfer of Secure Information Between a Data Carrying Module and an Electronic Device,” to Stephen M. Curry, Donald W. Loomis, and Christopher W. Fox. A copy of the ’095 Patent is attached to the Complaint as Exhibit D.

20. The ’095 patent is directed to an apparatus for receiving and transmitting encrypted data, such as for secure transfers of financial information.

21. Maxim is the owner by assignment of all rights, title, and interest to and in the ’510, ’880, ’013, and ’095 patents (collectively, the “Asserted Patents”).

22. On information and belief, by no later than on or about July 5, 2012, Wells Fargo had actual notice of each of the Asserted Patents and actual notice that its individual actions and/or the joint or concerted actions of the other Wells Fargo defendants constituted and continue to constitute infringement of at least one claim of each of the Asserted Patents.

COUNT I: Infringement of the ’510 Patent

23. Maxim incorporates and realleges paragraphs 1 – 22 above as if fully set forth herein.

24. On information and belief, Wells Fargo has and continues to infringe one or more claims of the ’510 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, by making, using, selling, and/or offering to sell in the United States and without authority products, devices, systems, and/or components of systems that embody the patented invention, including for example products, devices, systems

and/or components of systems that include or make use of the “Wells Fargo Mobile” smartphone applications.

25. On information and belief, Wells Fargo has induced and continues to induce infringement of the '510 patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) by encouraging its customers and other third parties to make and/or use the claimed system for communicating data securely, including a coprocessor for processing encryption calculations and a real time clock circuit for time stamping data transactions. Such making and/or using of the claimed system for communicating data securely constitutes infringement, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, of one or more claims of the '510 patent by such customers or third parties. Wells Fargo's acts of encouragement include: providing and intending its customers to use the “Wells Fargo Mobile” smartphone applications; providing other components of the system that makes use of these applications, including, *e.g.*, servers and data storage; advertising these applications through its own and third-party websites; and providing instructions to use these applications.

26. Wells Fargo has proceeded in this manner despite its actual knowledge of the '510 patent and that the specific actions it actively induced on the part of its customers and other third parties constitute infringement of the '510 patent. At the very least, because Wells Fargo has been and remains on notice of the '510 patent and the accused infringement, it has been and remains willfully blind regarding the infringement it has induced and continues to induce.

27. On information and belief, Wells Fargo has contributed and continues to contribute to the infringement of the '510 patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(c) by,

without authority, selling and/or offering to sell within the United States, importing, and/or supplying components of the claimed system for communicating data securely, such as the “Wells Fargo Mobile” smartphone applications. When, for example, these applications are installed on a portable device, the claimed systems are made and/or used, thereby infringing, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, of one or more claims of the ’510 patent. These components supplied by Wells Fargo, including, *e.g.*, these applications, constitute material parts of the claimed inventions of the ’510 patent.

28. On information and belief, Wells Fargo knows, for the reasons described in detail above, that these components are especially made and/or especially adapted for use in infringing the ’510 patent. Moreover, these components are not staple articles of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing use at least because the components have no use apart from infringing the Asserted Patents, including the ’510 patent. For example, at least the “Wells Fargo Mobile” smartphone applications are used only in conjunction with or as part of the claimed systems for securely communicating data.

29. On information and belief, Wells Fargo has willfully infringed and continues to willfully infringe the ’510 Patent by making, using, offering to sell, and/or selling the applications and other components of the claimed system in the United States without authority, by actively inducing infringement of the ’510 patent, and by contributing to the infringement of the ’510 patent despite an objectively high likelihood that such actions constitute infringement and despite being on notice that its actions constitute infringement.

30. Maxim has suffered damages as a result of Wells Fargo infringement of the ’510 Patent. In addition, Maxim will continue to suffer severe and irreparable harm

unless this Court issues a permanent injunction prohibiting Wells Fargo, its agents, servants, employees, representatives, and all others acting in active concert therewith from infringing the '510 Patent.

COUNT II: Infringement of the '880 Patent

31. Maxim incorporates and realleges paragraphs 1 – 22 above as if fully set forth herein.

32. On information and belief, Wells Fargo has and continues to infringe one or more claims of the '880 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, by performing in the United States and without authority every step of the patented invention by using products, devices, systems and/or components of systems that include or make use of the “Wells Fargo Mobile” smartphone applications.

33. On information and belief, Wells Fargo has induced and continues to induce infringement of the '880 patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) by encouraging its customers and other third parties to perform the claimed methods for electronically transferring units of exchange. Such performing of the claimed method for electronically transferring units of exchange constitutes infringement, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, of one or more claims of the '880 patent by such customers or third parties. Wells Fargo's acts of encouragement include: providing and intending its customers to use the “Wells Fargo Mobile” smartphone applications; providing other components of the system that makes use of these applications, including, *e.g.*, servers and data storage; advertising these applications through its own and third-party websites; and providing instructions to use these applications.

34. Wells Fargo has proceeded in this manner despite its actual knowledge of the '880 patent and that the specific actions it actively induced on the part of its

customers and other third parties constitute infringement of the '880 patent. At the very least, because Wells Fargo has been and remains on notice of the '880 patent and the accused infringement, it has been and remains willfully blind regarding the infringement it has induced and continues to induce.

35. On information and belief, Wells Fargo has contributed and continues to contribute to the infringement of the '880 patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(c) by, without authority, selling and/or offering to sell within the United States, importing, and/or supplying components of a system for electronically transferring units of exchange, such system including the "Wells Fargo Mobile" smartphone applications, wherein use of the system constitutes performance of the claimed methods. When, for example, these applications are used on a portable device, the claimed methods are performed, thereby infringing, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, of one or more claims of the '880 patent. These components supplied by Wells Fargo, including, *e.g.*, these applications, constitute material parts of a system, the only use of which constitutes performance of the claimed inventions of the '880 patent.

36. On information and belief, Wells Fargo knows, for the reasons described in detail above, that these components are especially made and/or especially adapted for use in infringing the '880 patent. Moreover, these components are not staple articles of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing use at least because the components have no use apart from infringing the Asserted Patents, including the '880 patent. For example, at least using the "Wells Fargo Mobile" smartphone applications are used only in performing the claimed methods for electronically transferring units of exchange.

37. On information and belief, Wells Fargo has willfully infringed and continues to willfully infringe the '880 patent by performing in the United States and without authority every step of the claimed invention, by actively inducing infringement of the '880 patent, and by contributing to the infringement of the '880 patent despite an objectively high likelihood that such actions constitute infringement and despite being on notice that its actions constitute infringement.

38. Maxim has suffered damages as a result of Wells Fargo's infringement of the '880 patent. In addition, Wells Fargo will continue to suffer severe and irreparable harm unless this Court issues a permanent injunction prohibiting Wells Fargo, its agents, servants, employees, representatives, and all others acting in active concert therewith from infringing the '880 patent.

COUNT III: Infringement of the '013 Patent

39. Maxim incorporates and realleges paragraphs 1 – 22 above as if fully set forth herein.

40. On information and belief, Wells Fargo has and continues to infringe one or more claims of the '013 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, by making, using, selling, and/or offering to sell in the United States and without authority products, devices, systems, and/or components of systems that embody the patented invention, including for example products, devices, systems and/or components of systems that include or make use of the "Wells Fargo Mobile" smartphone applications.

41. On information and belief, Wells Fargo has induced and continues to induce infringement of the '013 patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) by encouraging its customers and other third parties to make and/or use the claimed secure transaction

integrated circuit. Such making and/or using of the claimed apparatus constitutes infringement, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, of one or more claims of the '013 patent by such customers or third parties. Wells Fargo's acts of encouragement include: providing and intending its customers to use the "Wells Fargo Mobile" smartphone applications; providing other components of the system that makes use of these applications, including, *e.g.*, servers and data storage; advertising these applications through its own and third-party websites; and providing instructions to use these applications.

42. Wells Fargo has proceeded in this manner despite its actual knowledge of the '013 patent and that the specific actions it actively induced on the part of its customers and other third parties constitute infringement of the '013 patent. At the very least, because Wells Fargo has been and remains on notice of the '013 patent and the accused infringement, it has been and remains willfully blind regarding the infringement it has induced and continues to induce.

43. On information and belief, Wells Fargo has contributed and continues to contribute to the infringement of the '013 patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(c) by, without authority, selling and/or offering to sell within the United States, importing, and/or supplying components of a system, including the "Wells Fargo Mobile" smartphone applications, which system as a result includes the claimed secure transaction integrated circuit. When, for example, these applications are installed on a portable device, the resulting systems are made and/or used, thereby infringing, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, of one or more claims of the '013 patent. These

components supplied by Wells Fargo, including, *e.g.*, these applications, constitute material parts of the claimed inventions of the '013 patent.

44. On information and belief, Wells Fargo knows, for the reasons described in detail above, that these components are especially made and/or especially adapted for use in infringing the '013 patent. Moreover, these components are not staple articles of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing use at least because the components have no use apart from infringing the Asserted Patents, including the '013 patent. For example, at least the “Wells Fargo Mobile” smartphone applications are used only in conjunction with or as part of the claimed secure transaction integrated circuit.

45. On information and belief, Wells Fargo has willfully infringed and continues to willfully infringe the '013 Patent by making, using, offering to sell, and/or selling the applications and other components of the secure transaction integrated circuit in the United States without authority, by actively inducing infringement of the '013 patent, and by contributing to the infringement of the '013 patent despite an objectively high likelihood that such actions constitute infringement and despite being on notice that its actions constitute infringement.

46. Maxim has suffered damages as a result of Wells Fargo's infringement of the '013 Patent. In addition, Maxim will continue to suffer severe and irreparable harm unless this Court issues a permanent injunction prohibiting Wells Fargo, its agents, servants, employees, representatives, and all others acting in active concert therewith from infringing the '013 Patent.

COUNT IV: Infringement of the '095 Patent

47. Maxim incorporates and realleges paragraphs 1 – 22 above as if fully set forth herein.

48. On information and belief, Wells Fargo has and continues to infringe one or more claims of the '095 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, by making, using, selling, and/or offering to sell in the United States and without authority products, devices, systems, and/or components of systems that embody the patented invention, including for example products, devices, systems and/or components of systems that include or make use of the "Wells Fargo Mobile" smartphone applications.

49. On information and belief, Wells Fargo has induced and continues to induce infringement of the '013 patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) by encouraging its customers and other third parties to make and/or use the claimed apparatus for receiving and transmitting encrypted data. Such making and/or using of the claimed apparatus constitutes infringement, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, of one or more claims of the '095 patent by such customers or third parties. Wells Fargo's acts of encouragement include: providing and intending its customers to use the "Wells Fargo Mobile" smartphone applications; providing other components of the system that makes use of these applications, including, *e.g.*, servers and data storage; advertising these applications through its own and third-party websites; and providing instructions to use these applications.

50. Wells Fargo has proceeded in this manner despite its actual knowledge of the '095 patent and that the specific actions it actively induced on the part of its customers and other third parties constitute infringement of the '095 patent. At the very least, because Wells Fargo has been and remains on notice of the '095 patent and the

accused infringement, it has been and remains willfully blind regarding the infringement it has induced and continues to induce.

51. On information and belief, Wells Fargo has contributed and continues to contribute to the infringement of the '095 patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(c) by, without authority, selling and/or offering to sell within the United States, importing, and/or supplying components of a system, including the "Wells Fargo Mobile" smartphone applications, which system as a result embodies the claimed apparatus. When, for example, these applications are installed on a portable device, the resulting systems are made and/or used, thereby infringing, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, of one or more claims of the '095 patent. These components supplied by Wells Fargo, including, *e.g.*, these applications, constitute material parts of the claimed inventions of the '095 patent.

52. On information and belief, Wells Fargo knows, for the reasons described in detail above, that these components are especially made and/or especially adapted for use in infringing the '095 patent. Moreover, these components are not staple articles of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing use at least because the components have no use apart from infringing the Asserted Patents, including the '095 patent. For example, at least the "Wells Fargo Mobile" smartphone applications are used only in conjunction with or as part of the claimed apparatus.

53. On information and belief, Wells Fargo has willfully infringed and continues to willfully infringe the '095 Patent by making, using, offering to sell, and/or selling the applications and other components of the claimed apparatus in the United States without authority, by actively inducing infringement of the '095 patent, and by

contributing to the infringement of the '095 patent despite an objectively high likelihood that such actions constitute infringement and despite being on notice that its actions constitute infringement.

54. Maxim has suffered damages as a result of Wells Fargo's infringement of the '095 Patent. In addition, Maxim will continue to suffer severe and irreparable harm unless this Court issues a permanent injunction prohibiting Wells Fargo, its agents, servants, employees, representatives, and all others acting in active concert therewith from infringing the '095 Patent.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

For the above reasons, Maxim respectfully requests that this Court grant the following relief in favor of Maxim and against Wells Fargo:

- (a) A judgment in favor of Maxim that Wells Fargo has infringed (either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents) one or more claims of the Asserted Patents;
- (b) A permanent injunction enjoining Wells Fargo and its officers, directors, agents, servants, affiliates, employees, divisions, branches, subsidiaries, parents, and all others acting in active concert or participation with Wells Fargo, from infringing the Asserted Patents;
- (c) A judgment and order requiring Wells Fargo to pay Maxim its damages, costs, expenses, and pre-judgment and post-judgment interest for Wells Fargo's infringement of the Asserted Patents;
- (d) An award of treble damages for Wells Fargo's willful infringement of the Asserted Patents;

- (e) A judgment and order finding that this is an exceptional case within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 285 and awarding Maxim its reasonable attorney fees; and
- (f) Any and all such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Pursuant to Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff Maxim demands a trial by jury of this action.

Dated: October 1, 2012

By: /s/Andrew W. Spangler
Andrew W. Spangler
State Bar No. 24041960
Spangler & Fussell P.C.
208 N. Green Street, Suite 300
Longview, Texas 75601
903-753-9300
Fax: 903-553-0403
Email: spangler@sfipfirm.com

James A. Fussell, III
AR State Bar No. 2003193
Spangler & Fussell P.C.
211 N. Union Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone: (903) 753-9300
Facsimile: (903) 553-0403
Email: fussell@sfipfirm.com

Co-Counsel:
Matthew. D. Powers
CA Bar No. 104795 (Admitted E.D. Tex.)
Steven S. Cherensky
CA Bar No. 168275 (Admitted E.D. Tex.)
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 360
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
Telephone: (650) 802-6000
Fax: (650) 802-6001
Email:
matthew.powers@tensegritylawgroup.com
steven.cherensky@tensegritylawgroup.com

James C. Otteson
CA Bar No. 157781 (Admitted E.D. Tex.)
Philip W. Marsh
CA Bar No. 276383 (Admitted E.D. Tex.)
Michael D.K. Nguyen
CA Bar No. 264813 (Admitted E.D. Tex.)
AGILITY IP LAW, LLP
149 Commonwealth Drive
Menlo Park, CA 94025
Telephone: 650-227-4800
Fax: 650-318-3483
Email: jim@agilityiplaw.com
phil@agilityiplaw.com
mnguyen@agilityiplaw.com

Of Counsel:

Michael North
NORTH WEBER & BAUGH LLP
2479 E. Bayshore Road, Suite 707
Palo Alto, CA 94303

*Attorneys for Plaintiff,
Maxim Integrated Products, Inc.*