

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

PAPST LICENSING GmbH & CO. KG,

Plaintiff,

v.

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. \_\_\_\_\_

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff Papst Licensing GmbH & Co. KG (“Papst”), for its Complaint against defendant Hewlett-Packard Company (“HP”), hereby alleges as follows:

**The Parties**

1. Plaintiff Papst is a company organized under the laws of The Federal Republic of Germany with its principal place of business at Bahnhofstrasse 33, 78112, St. Georgen, Germany.

2. HP is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 3000 Hanover Street, Palo Alto, California 94304. HP manufactures and sells a wide range of consumer electronics products, including tablets.

**Nature Of The Action**

3. This is a civil action for infringement of U.S. Patent No. 8,966,144 (“the ’144 patent”) (attached as Exhibit A) (the “Patent-in-Suit”) under the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1 *et seq.*

### **Jurisdiction And Venue**

4. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a) because this action arises under the patent laws of the United States, including 35 U.S.C. § 271 *et seq.*

5. This Court has personal jurisdiction over HP because, among other things, HP has committed, aided, abetted, contributed to, and/or participated in the commission of patent infringement in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271 in this judicial district and elsewhere that led to foreseeable harm and injury to Papst.

6. This Court also has personal jurisdiction over HP because, among other things, HP is a Delaware corporate citizen, and has established minimum contacts within the forum such that the exercise of jurisdiction over HP will not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice. For example, HP has placed products that practice and/or embody the claimed inventions of the Patent-in-Suit into the stream of commerce with the reasonable expectation and/or knowledge that purchasers and users of such products were located within this district. In addition, HP has sold, advertised, marketed, and distributed products in this district that practice the claimed inventions of the Patent-in-Suit. HP derives substantial revenue from the sale of infringing products distributed within the district, and/or expects or should reasonably expect its actions to have consequences within the district, and derives substantial revenue from interstate and international commerce. Additionally, HP has previously availed itself of this Court in previous lawsuits.

7. In addition, HP knowingly, actively induced and continues to knowingly actively induce (or is willfully blind to the) infringement of the Patent-in-Suit within this district by making, using, offering for sale, and selling infringing products, as well as by contracting with

others to use, market, sell, and offer to sell infringing products, all with knowledge of the asserted Patent-in-Suit, and its claims, with knowledge that its customers will use, market, sell, and offer to sell infringing products in this district and elsewhere in the United States, and with the knowledge and specific intent to encourage and facilitate infringing sales and use of the products by others within this district and the United States by creating and disseminating promotional and marketing materials, instructional materials, and product manuals, and technical materials related to the infringing products.

8. Moreover, HP knowingly contributed to the infringement of the Patent-in-Suit by others in this district, and continues to contribute to the infringement of the Patent-in-Suit by others in this district by selling or offering to sell components of infringing products in this district, which components constitute a material part of the inventions of the Patent-in-Suit, knowing of the patent-in-suit and its claims, knowing those components to be especially made or especially adapted for use to infringe the Patent-in-Suit, and knowing that those components are not staple articles or commodities of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.

9. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b), 1391(c), and 1400(b), because HP is subject to personal jurisdiction in this district and has committed acts of infringement in this district.

#### **The Patent-In-Suit**

10. United States Patent No. 8,966,144 (“the ’144 patent”), titled “Analog Data Generating And Processing Device Having A Multi-Use Automatic Processor,” was duly and lawfully issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on February 24, 2015. A copy of the ’144 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit B. Papst is the assignee of all rights, title, and interest in

the '144 patent, and it possesses all rights to sue and recover for any current or past infringement of the '144 patent.

11. Papst and HP have been engaged in litigation regarding United States Patent Nos. 6,895,449 and 6,470,399 in the case entitled *Hewlett-Packard Co. v Papst Licensing GmbH & Co. KG*, 5:08-cv-1732 (N.D. Cal.) filed on March 31, 2008 and consolidated in *In re Papst Licensing GmbH & Co. KG Litig.*, Misc. No. 07-493 (D. D.C.) since May 8, 2008.

12. On information and belief, HP has monitored Papst's patent prosecution activities at least since entering litigation with Papst in 2008.

### **COUNT I**

#### **Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 8,966,144**

13. Paragraphs 1 through 12 are incorporated by reference as if fully stated herein.

14. The '144 patent is valid and enforceable.

15. HP has infringed, and continue to infringe, one or more claims of the '144 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), either literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, by making, using, selling, and/or offering for sale in the United States, and/or importing into the United States, products encompassed by those claims, including for example, by making, using, selling, offering for sale, and/or importing into the United States HP tablets that use or are able to be accessed via Mass Storage Device/Mass Storage Class ("MSD"), Media Transfer Protocol ("MTP"), or Picture Transfer Protocol ("PTP"), including without limitation models Pro Slate 12, Pro Slate 8, 10 Tablet, 10 Plus, 8 G2, 7 G2, 7 Plus G2 Tablet, and all other tablet models that use or are able to be accessed via MSD, MTP, or PTP (collectively, "the '144 Infringing Products").

16. HP's customers (e.g., distributors, retailers, and online vendors) directly infringe one or more claims of the '144 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) by selling, offering to sell, or importing the '144 Infringing Products in the United States. HP has actively induced infringement of, and continue to actively induce infringement of, one or more claims of the '144 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b), either literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, by selling, importing, and/or offering for sale the '144 Infringing Products to its customers with the knowledge of the '144 patent and its claims, with knowledge that its customers will sell, offer to sell, and/or import into the United States the '144 Infringing Products, and with knowledge and specific intent to encourage and facilitate those infringing sales of the '144 Infringing Products through distributing the products to retailers, distributors, and online vendors and creating and disseminating promotional and marketing materials, instructional manuals, product manuals and other technical materials related to the '144 Infringing Products.

17. HP has contributed to the infringement of, and continues to contribute to the infringement of, one or more claims of the '144 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(c) and/or 271(f), either literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, by selling, offering for sale, and/or importing into the United States, the '144 Infringing Products, knowing that those products constitute a material part of the inventions claimed in the '144 patent, knowing that those products are especially made or adapted to infringe the '144 patent, and knowing that those products are not staple articles or commodities of commerce suitable for non-infringing use; rather that the components are used for or in systems that infringe one or more claims of the '144 patent.

18. HP has had knowledge of the '144 patent since at least as early as April 28, 2015, when Papst informed HP and the other defendants in the DC action that the '144 patent had

# 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.