1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 110 111 112 113	Michael Liu Su (SBN 300590) michael.liu.su@finnegan.com FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP 3300 Hillview Avenue Palo Alto, CA 94304 Telephone: (650) 849-6600 Facsimile: (650) 849-6666 Lionel M. Lavenue (pro hac vice) lionel.lavenue@finnegan.com Bradford C. Schulz (pro hac vice) bradford.schulz@finnegan.com FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP Two Freedom Square 11955 Freedom Drive Reston, VA 20190 Telephone: (571) 203-2700 Facsimile: (202) 408-4400 Attorneys for Plaintiff	
12	ZTE (USA) Inc.	
13		
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
15	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
16	OAKLAND DIVISION	
17		
18	ZTE (USA) INC.,	Case No. 4:18-cv-06185-HSG
19	Plaintiff,	(Former Case No. 2:17-cv-00517-JRG) (E.D. Tex.)
20	v.	PLAINTIFF'S SECOND AMENDED
21	AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC,	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARTORY JUDGMENT
22	Defendant.	
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		



Plaintiff ZTE (USA) Inc. ("ZTE"), files this Second Amended Complaint against Defendant AGIS Software Development LLC ("AGIS") seeking declaratory judgment of non-infringement, and/or unenforceability as to U.S. Patent Nos. 8,213,970; 9,408,055; 9,445,251; 9,467,838; and 9,749,829 (collectively, the "Patents-in-Suit"). Additionally, ZTE hereby incorporates by reference the Complaint filed against Defendant AGIS on October 9, 2018 and the First Amended Complaint filed against Defendant AGIS on December 31, 2018. ZTE hereby alleges as follows:

NATURE OF ACTION

1. This is an action arising under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1 et. seq. and the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2202, seeking a declaratory judgment of: (i) non-infringement of the Patents-in-Suit; (ii) unenforceability of certain of the Patents-in-Suit due to inequitable conduct; and for such other relief as the Court deems just and proper. Additionally, ZTE further reserves the right to assert invalidity as an affirmative defense if AGIS asserts infringement.

THE PARTIES

- 2. Plaintiff ZTE (USA) Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the state of New Jersey, with its principal place of business at 2425 N. Central Expressway, Suite 600, Richardson, Texas 75080 with an office located at 1900 McCarthy Blvd, Milpitas, California 95035.
- 3. Upon information and belief, Defendant AGIS Software Development LLC is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the State of Texas, and maintains its principal place of business at 100 W. Houston Street, Marshall, Texas 75670. Upon information and belief, AGIS Software Development LLC is wholly owned by AGIS Holdings, Inc. Upon information and belief, AGIS Holdings, Inc. is organized and existing under the laws of the State of Florida, and maintains its principal place of business at 92 Lighthouse Drive, Jupiter, Florida 33469. Upon information and belief, Advanced Ground Information Systems, Inc. is organized and existing under the laws of the State of Florida, and maintains its principal place of business at 92 Lighthouse Drive, Jupiter, Florida 33469.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE



federal question jurisdiction, 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a), the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2202, and the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1 et seq.

- 5. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between ZTE and AGIS as to the alleged infringement and enforceability of the claims of the Patents-in-Suit.
- 6. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action based on a real and immediate controversy between ZTE and AGIS regarding whether various ZTE's mobile devices infringe the Patents-in-Suit, which AGIS purports to own, whether those AGIS patents are unenforceable, and whether AGIS is barred from asserting infringement of those patents. As described in more detail below, this controversy arises out of AGIS's infringement assertions demands over ZTE's products allegedly "pre-configured or adapted with map-based communication applications and/or features such as Google Maps, Android Device Manager, Find My Device, Google Messages, Android Messenger, Google Hangouts, Google Plus, and Google Latitude among other relevant applications and/or features." See Case No. 2:17-cv-00517-JRG (Dkt. No. 32) (E.D. Tex.); see also Dkt. No. 1-1 through 1-5 (Exs. A-E to Complaint (Infringement Contentions)).
- 7. On information and belief, AGIS is subject to this Court's specific and/or general personal jurisdiction, pursuant to due process and/or the California Long Arm Statute, due at least to (1) AGIS's activities purposefully directed at residents of this forum, (2) the claims arise out of or relate to the AGIS's activities with this forum, and (3) the assertion of personal jurisdiction is reasonable and fair.
- 8. On information and belief, AGIS asserted one or more of the Patents-in-Suit against Apple Inc. in *AGIS Software Development LLC v. Apple, Inc.*, Case No. 2:17-cv-00516-JRG (E.D. Tex.). Additionally, on information and belief, Apple Inc. is a California incorporated company and AGIS conducted meaningful enforcement activities in California. On information and belief, AGIS retained counsel in California, traveled there, and deposed witnesses there.
- 9. On information and belief, AGIS asserted one or more patents related to the Patents-in-Suit against Life360, Inc. in *Advanced Ground Information Systems, Inc. v. Life360, Inc.*, Case No. 9:14-cv-80651-DMM (S.D. Fla.). Additionally, on information and belief, Life360 Inc. is a



California. On information and belief, AGIS retained counsel in California, traveled there, and deposed witnesses there.

- 10. On information and belief, AGIS asserted one or more patents against ZTE (USA), Inc. and ZTE (USA), Inc.'s sister company ZTE (TX) Inc. in *AGIS Software Development LLC v. ZTE Corp. et al.*, Case No. 2:17-cv-00517-JRG (E.D. Tex.) (the "Former Case"). Additionally, ZTE (TX) Inc.'s primary place of business is in California and AGIS conducted meaningful enforcement activities in California. For example, AGIS retained counsel in California, traveled there, and deposed witnesses there including at least a 30(b)(6) deposition of ZTE (USA), Inc. in Redwood Shores, California.
- 11. On information and belief, twenty days before bringing an action against ZTE TX Inc. in the Eastern District of Texas, AGIS Holdings, Inc. formed and incorporated Defendant AGIS Software Development LLC in Texas. Of note, only two months prior, the sister company of AGIS Software Development LLC, Advanced Ground Information Systems, Inc., was litigating in the Southern District of Florida with patents from the same family as the Patents-in-Suit. Once the Florida matter was resolved, in a loss (with non-infringement and attorneys' fees awarded against AGIS for almost \$750,000 due to litigating "an exceptionally weak case"), AGIS then sought a new district. See Advanced Ground Information Systems, Inc. v. Life360, Inc. Case No. 14-cv-80651 (Dkt. No. 200) (S.D. Fla.) ("While I stop short of finding of bad faith, . . . these claims seemed designed to extract settlement not based upon the merits of the claim but on the high cost of litigation.").
- 12. On information and belief, on June 21, 2017, AGIS filed the original Complaint (Dkt. No. 1 in 2:17-cv-00517) in the Former Case in the Eastern District of Texas, asserting four patents against ZTE (TX), Inc. and ZTE Corporation. On September 26, 2017, ZTE (TX) filed a Motion to Dismiss AGIS's original Complaint for (1) failure to state a claim and (2) improper venue under 28 U.S.C. § 1400, or in the alternative, to transfer under § 1404. Case No. 2:17-cv-00517-JRG, Dkt. No. 28 (E.D. Tex.). Rather than responding to ZTE (TX) Inc.'s motion, AGIS took advantage of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a)(1)(B) and amended its Complaint, without leave of Court, on October



6

7

9

8

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

1718

19

20

21

22

2324

25

2627

DOCKET

Amended Complaint, which allowed AGIS to avoid responding to ZTE (TX) Inc.'s motion, AGIS added new legal theories of infringement, including a fifth patent, and added theories against the newly-added ZTE defendant, ZTE (USA), Inc.

- 13. On information and belief, on November 21, 2017, ZTE moved to dismiss AGIS's Amended Complaint under § 1400, or in the alternative, to transfer for convenience to the Northern District of California under § 1404. See Case No. 2:17-cv-00517-JRG, Dkt. No. 38 (E.D. Tex.). In response, not only did AGIS contest that venue was proper for ZTE (USA), Inc., but AGIS also dismissed the relevance, location, and convenience of non-party Google in the Northern District of California. Case No. 2:17-cv-00517-JRG, Dkt. No. 46 at 2, 24 (E.D. Tex.). AGIS eventually admitted Google's importance in these matters when they subpoenaed Google, indicating that Google possesses relevant documents in the Northern District of California. See Case No. 2:17-cv-00517-JRG, Dkt. No. 85 at 7 (E.D. Tex.). On September 28, 2018, the Eastern District of Texas court found that "AGIS [] failed to meet its burden" and found that venue is improper as to ZTE (USA), Inc. in the Eastern District of Texas. Id. at 5-7. Rather than dismissing this case under § 1400, the Eastern District of Texas transferred the Former Case to the Northern District of California under § 1406. *Id.* The court specifically found that "[a] transfer, rather than dismissal, is also appropriate where the plaintiff is certain to 'almost immediately' refile the action in the proper venue and, as here, 'discovery has already begun' and the Parties have 'already invested a considerable amount of time and money' in the case." *Id.* at 7. Additionally, in transferring to the Northern District of California and not another district, the court noted (A) that AGIS never proposed an alternative district to which this case should be transferred; and (B) that "transfer to the Northern District of California serves the interests of justice." *Id.* (citing AGIS's service of subpoenas on Google in the Northern District of California).
- 14. On information and belief, AGIS circumvented the Eastern District of Texas's transfer order (Case No. 2:17-cv-00517-JRG, Dkt. No. 85 (E.D. Tex.)) to the Northern District of California by filing a Notice of Voluntary Dismissal without Prejudice (Case No. 2:17-cv-00517-JRG, Dkt. No. 86 (E.D. Tex.)).

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.

