

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| INGENIADOR, LLC | § | |
| | § | |
| Plaintiff, | § | CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:12-cv-812 |
| | § | |
| v. | § | JURY TRIAL DEMANDED |
| | § | |
| SAVVIS, INC. and | § | |
| CENTURLINK, INC. | § | |
| | § | |
| Defendants. | § | |

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

TO THE HONORABLE COURT:

COMES NOW, Plaintiff Ingeniador, LLC (“Ingeniador”), through the undersigned attorneys, and respectfully alleges, states, and prays as follows:

I. NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This is an action for patent infringement under the Patent Laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code (“U.S.C.”) to prevent and enjoin Defendants Savvis, Inc. (hereinafter “Savvis”) and CenturyLink, Inc. (hereinafter “CenturyLink”) (hereinafter, collectively “Defendants”) from infringing and profiting, in an illegal and unauthorized manner and without authorization and/or consent from Ingeniador, from U.S. Patent No. 6,990,629 (the “629 patent”, attached hereto as Exhibit “A”) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §271, and to recover damages, attorneys’ fees, and costs.

II. THE PARTIES

2. Plaintiff Ingeniador is a Puerto Rico limited liability company with its principal place of business at 1607 Colón St. #101, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00911.

3. Savvis is a Missouri corporation with its principal place of business at 100 Centurylink Drive, Monroe, L.A. 71203. Savvis can be served with process through its registered agent, C.T. Corporation System, located at 120S. Central Ave. Clayton, MO 63105. Savvis does business in the State of Texas and in the Eastern District of Texas.

4. CenturyLink is a Louisiana corporation with its principal place of business at 100 Centurylink Drive, Monroe, L.A. 71203. CenturyLink can be served with process through its registered agent located at, C.T. Corporation System, 5615 Corporate Blvd., Ste. 400B, Baton Rouge, LA. 70808. Defendant does business in the State of Texas and in the Eastern District of Texas.

5. Defendants are in the business of manufacturing, distributing, and selling web-based network, colocation, managed hosting and cloud services.

III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1331 and 1338(a) because the action arises under the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§ 1 *et seq.*

7. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants by virtue of their systematic and continuous contacts with this jurisdiction, as alleged herein, as well as because of the injury to Ingeniador and the cause of action Ingeniador has raised, as alleged herein.

8. Each of the Defendants is subject to this Court's specific and general personal

jurisdiction pursuant to due process and/or the Texas Long Arm Statute, due at least to its substantial business in this forum, including: (i) at least a portion of the infringements alleged herein; and (ii) regularly doing or soliciting business, engaging in other persistent courses of conduct, and/or deriving substantial revenue from goods and services provided to individuals in Texas and in this Judicial District.

9. Defendants have conducted and do conduct business within the state of Texas, including the geographic region within the Eastern District of Texas, directly or through intermediaries, resellers or agents, or offers for sale, sells, advertises (including, but not limited to, the use of interactive web pages with promotional material) products or services, or uses or induces others to use services or products in Texas that infringe the '629 Patent, knowingly induces others to infringe and/or contribute to infringement of the '629 Patent occurring within Texas and elsewhere.

10. In addition to Defendants' continuously and systematically conducting business in Texas, the causes of action against Defendants are connected (but not limited) to Defendants' purposeful acts committed in the state of Texas, including the geographic region within the Eastern District of Texas, including Defendants' making, using, importing, offering for sale, or selling web-based editing and publishing products which include features that fall within the scope of at least one claim of the '629 patent.

11. Venue lies in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1391 and 1400(b).

IV. JOINDER

12. Defendants are properly joined under 35 U.S.C. §299(a)(1) because a right to relief is asserted against the parties jointly, severally, and in the alternative with respect to the same transactions, occurrences, or series of transactions or occurrences relating to the making,

using, importing into the United States, offering for sale, and/or selling the same accused products. Specifically, as alleged in detail below, Defendants are alleged to infringe the ‘629 Patent with respect to a web-based editing and publishing system.

13. Defendants are properly joined under 35 U.S.C. §299(a)(2). Questions of fact will arise that are common to all defendants, including for example, whether the overlapping web-based electronic health record products alleged to infringe have features that meet the features of one or more claims of the ‘629 Patent, and what reasonable royalty will be adequate to compensate the owner of the ‘629 Patent for its infringement.

14. On July 15, 2011 Savvis and CenturyLink completed a merger. The merger was intended to combine CenturyLink's hosting and network assets with Savvis' solutions in colocation, managed hosting and cloud services in order to provide outsourced information technology and cloud services. Each Defendant offers the same web-based products that infringe on the ‘629 Patent.

15. Defendants offer web-based editing and publishing systems that allow users to edit and manage data online which infringe on the ‘629 Patent. For example, Defendants offer, Savvis Symphony Virtual Private Data Center (hereinafter, “SAVVIS VPDC”).

16. At least one right to relief is asserted against these parties jointly, severally, or in the alternative with respect to or arising out of the same transaction, occurrence, or series of transactions or occurrences relating to the making, importing into the United States, offering for sale, or selling, of the same accused products, and/or process.

V. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

17. On January 24, 2006, the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) duly and legally issued the ‘629 patent, entitled “Publishing System for Intranet” after a full and

fair examination. A true and correct copy of the '629 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit "A". Ingeniador is presently the owner of the patent and possesses all right, title and interest in and to the '629 patent. Ingeniador owns all rights of recovery under the '629 patent, including the exclusive right to recover for past infringement. The '629 patent is valid and enforceable.

18. The '629 patent contains two independent claims and twenty-three dependent claims. Defendants use methods that perform one or more steps of the claims, and also make, use and sell or offer for sale products that encompass one or more of the claims.

19. The invention claimed in the '629 Patent includes a system and process for web-based editing and publishing of files using a network of client computers, network file server and a Light Weight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) directory server.

20. The LDAP directory server is adapted to store information defining and limiting the rights of authors and readers in the system. For example, network content management products use this feature to restrain access or editing privileges to selected personnel.

21. The network file server is adapted to resolve file server pointers to one or more files on the file server and directory files on the LDAP directory server transmitted from client computer into requests for files and directory files. For example, network content management products use file servers to store shareable information. The LDAP directory server stores information on the identity and privileges of users of the network. Therefore, when a user requests information on a client computer, the file server and the LDAP directory server interact to identify if the user's identity is associated with the required access privileges in order to allow or deny access to that information.

22. The network file server is adapted to retrieve from the LDAP directory server directory content. The network file server is also adapted to convert the directory content into

web publishable information and including web publishable information as part of the requested files displayed on the client computer for editing further parts of the files. For example, network content management products display on client computers the name of a user or users and allow editing of the requested file.

VI. DEFENDANTS' PRODUCTS

23. Defendants offer applications which enable users to manage content files over a network. SAVVIS VPDC product is a web-based editing and publishing system which allows users to edit and manage data online.

24. SAVVIS VPDC provides a network of data centers accessible to client computers.

25. SAVVIS VPDC includes an LDAP as one of the configuration elements to allocate the required permissions and privileges among the users (e.g., authenticating such users).

26. SAVVIS VPDC product resolves file server pointers to one or more files on the file server. For example the SAVVIS VPDC is able to lists the Virtual Private Data Centers by profile and retrieves information from the Virtual Private Data Centers.

27. SAVVIS VPDC resolves file pointers into requests for directory files for authentication when users log in with their user credentials.

28. SAVVIS VPDC retrieves directory content (e.g., usernames), which is then converted into web-publishable information that is published on the website console, where users can further edit and manage content (for example, through a View/Modify option).

29. The Defendants' products use methods and systems for web-based content management which include features that fall within the scope of at least one claim of the '629 Patent.

VII. DIRECT INFRINGEMENT

30. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1-29.

31. Taken together, either partially or entirely, the features included in Defendants' products, including but not limited to, its "SAVVIS VPDC" product, perform the process recited in one or more claims of the '629 Patent.

32. Taken together, either partially or entirely, the features included in Defendants' web-based software products including, but not limited to, the software sold as "SAVVIS VPDC" use the system as recited in one or more claims of the '629 Patent.

33. Defendants directly infringe one or more of the claims of the '629 Patent by making, using, selling, offering to sell and/or importing products for web-based editing and publishing, such as SAVVIS VPDC, which illegally perform and use the process and system defined by the claims of the '629 Patent, in violation of 35 USC 271(a).

VIII. INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT

INDUCING INFRINGEMENT

34. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1-33.

35. Defendants have had knowledge of the '629 Patent for at least ten years because public records show that the '629 Patent has been cited as "Prior Art" by at least fourteen patents issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office over that time period.

36. Additionally and independently, Defendants have had knowledge of their infringement at least as of service of the present complaint.

37. Defendants have been and now are indirectly infringing by way of inducing infringement by others of the '629 Patent in the State of Texas, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States, by, among other things, illegally making, using, importing, offering for sale, and/or selling, products for performing processes and using systems that fall within the scope of one or more claims of the '629 Patent, in violation of 35 USC § 271(b). Such products include, without limitation, one or more of the Defendants' products. For example, Defendants indirectly infringes one or more claims of the '629 Patent by actively inducing its customers, users, subscribers and licensees who directly infringe due to their use of the SAVVIS VPDC.

38. Furthermore, Defendants indirectly infringe one or more claims of the '629 Patent by actively inducing third-party developers to create applications enabling functionality including, without limitation, the function to make use of the services offered and sold by Defendants, who directly infringe one or more of the claims of the '629 Patent due to their use of the Defendants products.

CONTRIBUTORY INFRINGEMENT

39. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1-38.

40. Defendants contribute to the infringement of one or more of the claims of the '629 Patent in violation of 35 USC § 271(c).

41. With knowledge of the patent in suit, Defendants indirectly infringe the '629 Patent by contributing to the direct infringement of a class of actors which includes the end-users of the Defendants' products, as well as consumers, users, subscribers and licensees, by

encouraging the class of actors to operate the Defendants' products, aware of the fact that such acts amount to infringement of one or more claims of the '629 Patent.

42. Products sold by Defendants for the implementation of Defendants' products (including SAVVIS VPDC) are components of a patented device covered by one or more of the claims of the '629 Patent, which constitute a material part of the invention and are not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing use. The Defendants' products lack substantial non-infringing uses and are for use in product configurations that infringe the '629 Patent.

43. Defendants have known that devices that implement the Defendants' products are especially made or especially adapted for use in infringement of the '629 Patent at least as of the service of the present complaint.

VIII. DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Ingeniador demands a trial by jury of any and all causes of action.

IX. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Ingeniador prays for the following relief:

1. That Defendants be adjudged to have infringed the '629 Patent, directly and/or indirectly, by way of inducement and/or contributory infringement, literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents;
2. That Defendants, its officers, directors, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, affiliates, divisions, branches, parents, and those persons in active concert or participation with any of them, be preliminarily and permanently restrained and enjoined from directly and/or indirectly infringing the '629 Patent;

3. An award of damages pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §284 sufficient to compensate Ingeniador for the Defendants' past infringement and any continuing or future infringement up until the date that Defendants are finally and permanently enjoined from further infringement, including compensatory damages;
4. An assessment of pre-judgment and post-judgment interest and costs against Defendants, together with an award of such interest and costs, in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §284;
5. That Defendants be directed to pay enhanced damages, including Ingeniador's attorneys' fees incurred in connection with this lawsuit pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §285; and
6. That Ingeniador have such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: December 19, 2012

Respectfully Submitted,

By: /s/ William E. Davis, III
William E. Davis, III
Texas State Bar No. 24047416
The Davis Firm, PC
111 West Tyler Street
Longview, Texas 75601
Telephone: (903) 230-9090
Facsimile: (903) 230-9661
Email: bdavis@bdavisfirm.com

**ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF
INGENIADOR, LLC**