

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	C.A. No. 13-919-LPS
v.	:	
	:	<b>JURY TRIAL DEMANDED</b>
GOOGLE LLC,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

**AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff Arendi S.A.R.L. (“Arendi”) for its Complaint against Defendant hereby demands a jury trial and alleges as follows:

**Related Actions**

1. This case is related to two cases previously consolidated before Judge Stark, 09-cv-00119 (D. Del.) (LPS) and 11-cv-00260 (D. Del.) (LPS), both of which settled after extensive dispositive motion practice. This case is also related to the action filed by Arendi today against Yahoo Inc!, and the actions filed on November 29, 2012 in this District by Arendi, No. 12-1595 (LPS), No. 12-1596 (LPS), No. 12-1597 (LPS), No. 12-1598 (LPS), No. 12-1599 (LPS), No. 12-1600 (LPS), No. 12-1601 (LPS), No. 12-1602 (LPS), which involve the same patents-in-suit and common facts..

**The Parties and Accused Products**

2. Plaintiff Arendi is a corporation organized under the laws of Luxembourg with its principal place of business in Luxembourg.

3. On information and belief, Defendant Google LLC (“Google”) is a Delaware corporation with a principal place of business at 1600 Amphitheatre Parkway, Mountain View,

California 94043. Google has appointed The Corporation Trust Company, Corporation Trust Center, 1209 Orange Street, Wilmington, Delaware 19801, as its agent for service of process.

4. Google transacts substantial business, either directly or through its agents, on an ongoing basis in this judicial district and elsewhere in the United States.

5. Google makes, uses, imports, offers to sell, and sells (and/or has made, used, imported, offered to sell, and sold) in the United States and in this judicial district, Gmail, Google Documents/Docs, Google Sheets, Google Slides, Google Chrome, Google Translate, Google Calendar, Google Hangout, the Google App, Nexus, Pixel, Chromebook Pixel, Pixelbook, and other products and devices containing the same or similar information handling technology disclosed in the asserted patents described herein (collectively, the “Accused Products”).

#### **Nature of the Action**

6. This is a civil action for infringement of United States Patents No. 7,917,843 (the “843 Patent”), No. 7,496,854 (the “854 Patent”), No. 7,921,356 (the “356 Patent”), and No. 8,306,993 (the “993 Patent”). This action arises under the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1 *et seq.*

#### **Jurisdiction and Venue**

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

8. Personal jurisdiction is proper in this district because, among other reasons, Google has a continuous presence in this District, Google committed acts of infringement in this District and a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to this claim occurred in this District. Google placed, and continues to place, Accused Products into the stream of commerce,

through an established distribution channel, with the knowledge and/or understanding that such products are used and sold in this District. This causes injury to Arendi in this District. On information and belief, Defendant derives substantial revenue from the sale of Accused Products distributed within the District, and derives substantial revenue from interstate and international commerce.

9. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and (c), and 1400(b), because Google resides in this District, and has committed acts of infringement in this district and, upon information and belief, has a regular and established place of business in this District.

#### **The Patents-In-Suit**

10. United States Patent No. 7,917,843, entitled “Method, System and Computer Readable Medium for Addressing Handling from a Computer Program,” was duly and legally issued on March 29, 2011, by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. A copy of the ‘843 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

11. United States Patent No. 7,496,854, entitled “Method, System and Computer Readable Medium for Addressing Handling from a Computer Program,” was duly and legally issued on February 24, 2009, by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. A copy of the ‘854 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

12. United States Patent No. 7,921,356, entitled “Method, System and Computer Readable Medium for Addressing Handling from a Computer Program,” was duly and legally issued on April 5, 2011, by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. A copy of the ‘356 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

13. United States Patent No. 8,306,993, entitled “Method, System and Computer Readable Medium for Addressing Handling from an Operating System,” was duly and legally issued on November 6, 2012, by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. A copy of the ‘993 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit D.

14. Arendi is the exclusive owner of all rights, title, and interest in the ‘843 Patent, ‘854 Patent, ‘356 Patent and ‘993 Patent, including the right to bring this suit for injunctive relief and damages.

15. The ‘843 Patent, ‘854 Patent, ‘356 Patent and ‘993 Patent are valid and enforceable.

### **BACKGROUND**

16. Arendi filed suit in this District against Microsoft Corporation and Dell Inc. for infringement of the ‘854 Patent on February 24, 2009. 09-cv-00119 (D. Del.) (LPS). The case was assigned to the Honorable Leonard P. Stark, who held two Markman Hearings, on February 25, 2011 and November 21, 2011, and denied several summary judgment motions. The case was resolved by settlement and dismissed on November 29, 2011.

17. Arendi filed suit in this District against Microsoft Corporation for infringement of the ‘843 Patent on March 29, 2011. 11-cv-00260 (D. Del.) (LPS). The case was assigned to the Honorable Leonard P. Stark, who consolidated the 11-cv-260 case with the above-referenced case on May 10, 2011. After Judge Stark held a Markman Hearing on November 21, 2011, this case was also resolved by settlement and dismissed on November 29, 2011.

### **COUNT I**

#### **(Infringement of United States Patent No. 7,917,843)**

18. The preceding paragraphs are incorporated by reference as if stated fully herein.

19. Google has infringed and continues to infringe the ‘843 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271, including but not limited to claims 1, 20, 23, and 42, literally 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, Accused Products, without authorization. On information and belief, Google has also infringed and continues to infringe at least claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 39, 40, 41, 43, and 44 of the ‘843 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271, literally 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, Accused Products, without authorization.

20. Google’s acts of infringement have caused damage to Arendi and Arendi is entitled to recover from Google the damages it has sustained as a result of Defendant’s wrongful acts in an amount subject to proof at trial. Google’s infringement of Arendi’s exclusive rights under the ‘843 patent have damaged, and continue to damage, Arendi, causing irreparable harm for which there is no adequate remedy at law, unless the infringement is enjoined by this Court.

21. In addition to the foregoing and/or in the alternative, third parties, including Google’s customers, have infringed, and continue to infringe, one or more claims of the ‘843 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by making, using, selling, and/or offering for sale in the United States, and/or importing into the United States, Accused Products.

22. Google has had knowledge of and notice of the ‘843 patent and its infringement at least since the filing of this complaint.

23. To the extent Google continues to sell or otherwise supply Accused Products after the filing of this complaint, Google is inducing infringement of one or more claims of the ‘843 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b), including on information and belief at least the claims set forth

# 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.