## Case 4:17-cv-03745-PJH Document 18 Filed 07/10/17 Page 1 of 16

1	Patricia L. Peden (SBN 2064440) Patricia.Peden@leclairryan.com		
2	LECLAIRRYAN LLP		
3	44 Montgomery Street, Thirty First Floor San Francisco, California 94104 Phone: 415.391.7111		
4	Fax: 415.391.8766		
5	Pro hac vice motions to be filed for the follow counsel	wing	
6	Arthur Gollwitzer III	Kenneth M. Albridge, III	
7 8	agollwitzer@michaelbest.com MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP Terrace 7 Building	kmalbridge@michaelbest.com MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP One South Pinckney Street, Suite 700	
	2801 Via Fortuna, Suite 300	P.O. Box 1806	
9	Austin, Texas 78746 Phone: 512.640.3161	Madison, WI 53701-1806 Phone: 608.257.3067	
10	Fax: 512.640.3170	Fax: 608.283.2275	
11	Larry Saret llsaret@michaelbest.com	Rachel N. Bach rnbach@michaelbest.com	
12	MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP River Point	MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP 100 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite	
13	444 West Lake Street, Suite 3200	3300	
14	Chicago, Illinois 60606 Phone: 312.661.2116	Milwaukee, WI 53202-4108 Phone: 414.271.6560	
	Fax: 312.222.0818	Fax: 414.277.0656	
15			
16	Attorneys for Defendant DYNACRAFT BSC,	Inc.	
17	-		
18	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
19	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
20	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
21			
22	FISHER-PRICE, INC. and MATTEL, INC.,	Case No. 17-CV-03745-LB	
23	, , ,		
24	Plaintiffs,	DEFENDANT DYNACRAFT'S	
25	v.	ANSWER TO COMPLAINT	
	DYNACRAFT BSC, INC.,	I Trial Days and all	
26	Defendant.	Jury Trial Demanded	
27			
28			



	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
1	0	
1	1	
1	2	
1	3	
1	4	
1	5	
1	6	
1	7	
1	8	
1	9	
2	0	
2	1	
2	2	
2	3	
2	4	
2	5	
2	6	

Defendant Dynacraft BSC, Inc. ("Dynacraft") answers Plaintiffs Fisher-Price, Inc. and Mattel, Inc.'s Complaint as follows:

#### **The Parties**

1. Plaintiff Fisher-Price, a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware having its principal place of business in East Aurora, New York, is one of the world's leading designers and makers of children's products, including battery-powered ride-on products. Fisher-Price's battery-powered ride-ons are sold under the Power Wheels name, and Power Wheels is a recognized brand leader in the battery-powered ride-on market segment. Fisher-Price is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Mattel.

**ANSWER**: Dynacraft denies that Fisher-Price is one of the world's leading designers and makers of children's products, including battery-powered ride-on products. Dynacraft denies that Power Wheels is a recognized brand leader in the battery-powered ride-on market segment. Dynacraft lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations set forth in Paragraph 1 of the Complaint.

2. Plaintiff Mattel, a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware having its principal place of business in El Segundo, California, is one of the world's leading designers and makers of toys.

**ANSWER**: Dynacraft denies that Mattel is one of the world's leading designers and makers of toys. Dynacraft lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations set forth in Paragraph 2 of the Complaint.

3. On information and belief, defendant Dynacraft is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and having a principal place of business at 89 South Kelly Road, American Canyon, CA 94503.

**ANSWER**: Dynacraft admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 3.

### **Jurisdiction and Venue**

- 4. This action arises under the patent laws of the United States of America, 35 U.S.C. § 1, et seq.
  - **ANSWER**: Dynacraft admits that this is an action for patent infringement arising under

27

the patent laws of the United States of America, 35 U.S.C. §1 et seq. Dynacraft denies the remaining allegations set forth in Paragraph 4 of the Complaint.

5. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

**ANSWER**: Dynacraft admits the allegations set forth in Paragraph 5 of the Complaint.

6. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Dynacraft because upon information and belief, it conducts business in this judicial district and has committed acts of patent infringement in the judicial district including, *inter alia*, making, using, selling, offering for sale, and/or importing infringing ride-on products, including the 24V Disney Princess Carriage ride-on product (hereinafter "Accused Products") in this judicial district. In addition, Dynacraft regularly places its products within the stream of commerce, with the knowledge and/or understanding that such products will be sold in this judicial district.

**ANSWER**: Dynacraft admits that this is Court has personal jurisdiction over it.

Dynacraft admits that it conducts business in this judicial district including, inter alia, using, selling, and offering for sale the 24V Disney Princess Carriage ride-on product. Dynacraft denies the remaining allegations set forth in Paragraph 6 of the Complaint.

7. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 (b) and (c) and § 1400(b).

**ANSWER**: Dynacraft admits that venue is proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b). Dynacraft denies any remaining allegations set forth in Paragraph 7 of the Complaint.

## **Background**

8. United States Patent No. 7,222,684 ("the '684 patent"), entitled "System, Apparatus, and Method for Providing Control of a Toy Vehicle," was duly and legally issued on May 29, 2007 naming David A. Norman, Robert H. Mimlitch, III, and Richard Torrance as inventors, and is in full force and effect. A true and correct copy of the '684 patent is attached as Exhibit A.

**ANSWER**: Dynacraft admits that the '684 patent is entitled "System, Apparatus, and



Method for Providing Control of a Toy Vehicle." Dynacraft admits that the '684 patent names David A. Norman, Robert H. Mimlitch, III, and Richard Torrance as inventors. Dynacraft admits that a purported copy of the '684 patent is attached as Exhibit A to the Complaint. Dynacraft lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of any of the remaining allegations set forth in Paragraph 8 of the Complaint.

9. Plaintiff Mattel is the owner of the '684 patent by way of assignment from Innovation First, Inc.

**ANSWER**: Dynacraft lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations set forth in Paragraph 9 of the Complaint

10. United States Patent No. 7,487,850 ("the '850 patent"), entitled "Children's Ride-On Vehicles Having Improved Shifter Assemblies," was duly and legally issued on February 10, 2009 naming Christopher F. Lucas and John Rhein as inventors, and is in full force and effect. A true and correct copy of the '850 patent is attached as Exhibit B.

ANSWER: Dynacraft admits that the '850 patent is entitled "Children's Ride-On Vehicles Having Improved Shifter Assemblies." Dynacraft admits that the '850 patent names Christopher F. Lucas and John Rhein as inventors. Dynacraft admits that a purported copy of the '850 patent is attached as Exhibit B to the Complaint. Dynacraft lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of any of the remaining allegations set forth in Paragraph 10 of the Complaint.

11. Plaintiff Mattel is the owner of the '850 patent by way of assignments from Christopher F. Lucas and John Rhein.

**ANSWER**: Dynacraft lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations set forth in Paragraph 11 of the Complaint.

12. United States Patent No. 7,621,543 ("the '543 patent"), entitled "Blow-Molded Wheels Having Undercut Treads, Methods for Producing the Same, and Children's Ride-On Vehicles Including the Same," was duly and legally issued on November 24, 2009 naming Albert L. Arendt, James R. Carducci, and Christopher F. Lucas as inventors, and is in full force and effect. A true and correct copy of the '543 patent is attached as Exhibit C.



ANSWER:	Dynacraft admits that the '543 patent is entitled "Blow-Molded Wheels
Having Undercut Tre	ads, Methods for Producing the Same, and Children's Ride-On Vehicles
Including the Same."	Dynacraft admits that the '543 patent names Albert L. Arendt, James R
Carducci, and Christo	opher F. Lucas as inventors. Dynacraft admits that a purported copy of the
'543 patent is attache	d as Exhibit C to the Complaint. Dynacraft lacks knowledge or information
sufficient to form a be	elief about the truth of any of the remaining allegations set forth in
Paragraph 12 of the C	Complaint.

13. Plaintiff Mattel is the owner of the '543 patent by way of assignments from Albert L. Arendt, Christopher F. Lucas, and James R. Carducci.

**ANSWER**: Dynacraft lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations set forth in Paragraph 13 of the Complaint.

14. United States Patent No. 7,950,978 ("the '978 patent"), entitled "System, Apparatus and Method for Providing Control of a Toy Vehicle," was duly and legally issued on May 31, 2011 naming David A. Norman, Robert H. Mimlitch, III, and Richard D. Torrance as inventors, and is in full force and effect. A true and correct copy of the '978 patent is attached as Exhibit D.

ANSWER: Dynacraft admits that the '978 patent is entitled "System, Apparatus and Method for Providing Control of a Toy Vehicle." Dynacraft admits that the '978 patent names David A. Norman, Robert H. Mimlitch, III, and Richard D. Torrance as inventors. Dynacraft admits that a purported copy of the '978 patent is attached as Exhibit D to the Complaint. Dynacraft lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of any of the remaining allegations set forth in Paragraph 14 of the Complaint.

15. Plaintiff Mattel is the owner of the '978 patent by way of assignment from Innovation First, Inc.

**ANSWER**: Dynacraft lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations set forth in Paragraph 15 of the Complaint.

16. Plaintiff Mattel has granted Plaintiff Fisher-Price an exclusive license to the '684 patent, the '850 patent, the '543 patent, and the '978 patent and Plaintiff Fisher-Price has the sole



# DOCKET

# Explore Litigation Insights



Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

# **Real-Time Litigation Alerts**



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time** alerts and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

# **Advanced Docket Research**



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## **Analytics At Your Fingertips**



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

### API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

#### **LAW FIRMS**

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

#### **FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS**

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## **E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS**

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.

