

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

MEMORY INTEGRITY, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

MOTOROLA SOLUTIONS, INC.

Defendant.

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

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

Plaintiff Memory Integrity, LLC (“MI”), by way of this Complaint for Patent Infringement (“Complaint”) against the above-named Defendant Motorola Solutions, Inc. (“Motorola” or “Defendant”), alleges as follows:

**NATURE OF THE ACTION**

1. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the Patent Laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code.

**THE PARTIES**

2. Plaintiff MI is a limited liability company organized under the laws of the State of Delaware with a place of business at 1220 N. Market Street, Suite 806, Wilmington, Delaware 19801.

3. On information and belief, Defendant Motorola Solutions, Inc. is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware with its principal place of business at 1303 E. Algonquin Rd., Schaumburg, Illinois 60196.

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

4. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338.

5. On information and belief, Defendant is subject to the jurisdiction of this Court by virtue of the fact that it is organized under the laws of the State of Delaware. On information and belief, Defendant is subject to the jurisdiction of this Court by reason of its acts of patent infringement which have been committed in this Judicial District, and by virtue of its regularly conducted and systematic business contacts in this State. As such, Defendant has purposefully availed itself of the privilege of conducting business within this Judicial District; has established sufficient minimum contacts with this Judicial District such that it should reasonably and fairly anticipate being haled into court in this Judicial District; and at least a portion of the patent infringement claims alleged herein arise out of or are related to one or more of the foregoing activities.

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

#### **THE PATENT-IN-SUIT**

7. On November 13, 2007, United States Patent No. 7,296,121 (the “’121 Patent”), entitled “Reducing Probe Traffic in Multiprocessor Systems,” was duly and legally issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. A true and correct copy of the ’121 Patent is attached as Exhibit A to this Complaint.

8. MI is the assignee and owner of the right, title and interest in and to the ’121 Patent, including the right to assert all causes of action arising under said patent and the right to any remedies for infringement of it.

#### **COUNT I – INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,296,121**

9. The allegations set forth in the foregoing paragraphs 1 through 8 are hereby realleged and incorporated herein by reference.

10. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), Motorola has directly infringed and continues to directly infringe, both literally and under the doctrine of equivalents, the ’121 Patent by

making, using, offering for sale, selling, and importing products (the “Accused Instrumentalities”) and by performing methods that practice the subject matter claimed in one or more claims of the ’121 Patent, including but not limited to claim 1, in the United States, including within this Judicial District, without the authority of MI. For example, Motorola has directly infringed the ’121 Patent by selling products that contain a multicore processor that utilizes a probe filtering unit to reduce probe traffic in a computer system. The Accused Instrumentalities include, but are not limited to the ET1 Enterprise Tablet.

11. Motorola has had actual knowledge of the ’121 Patent and its infringement of that patent since at least the date of service of this Complaint.

12. Motorola is also inducing infringement of the ’121 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b), since at least the date of service of this Complaint, by actively aiding and abetting others (including its direct and indirect customers) whose sale, offer for sale, importation, and use of the Accused Instrumentalities constitutes direct infringement. Motorola has engaged in these actions with either the specific intent to cause infringement or with willful blindness to the infringement that it is causing. For example, Motorola’s actions that actively induce its customers to directly infringe at least claim 25 of the ’121 Patent include selling the Accused Instrumentalities, providing user manuals regarding use of the Accused Instrumentalities, and providing technical support regarding the use of the Accused Instrumentalities, where the use of the Accused Instrumentalities during normal operation by Motorola’s customers infringes at least claim 25 of the ’121 Patent. The use of the Accused Instrumentalities identified above during normal operation directly infringes claim 25 of the ’121 Patent in at least the following manner:

(a) The Accused Instrumentalities comprise a plurality of processing nodes because they contain multicore processors. The cores are connected in a point-to-point architecture and each core has an associated L1 cache memory;

(b) One of the processor cores requests access to a memory line by transmitting a probe to the Snoop Control Unit (the probe filtering unit);

(c) The Snoop Control Unit evaluates the probe using a copy of the L1 data cache tag RAMs which is representative of the states associated with selected L1 caches to determine whether a valid copy of the memory line is in any of the L1 caches;

(d) The Snoop Control Unit transmits the probe only to selected ones of the cores identified in the evaluating step;

(e) The Snoop Control Unit accumulates responses from the selected cores;  
and

(f) The Snoop Control Unit responds to the original request from the first core.

13. Motorola is also committing contributory infringement of the '121 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(c) since at least the date of service of this Complaint by importing and selling the Accused Instrumentalities to others, including but not limited to its customers, knowing and/or being willfully blind to the fact that these products constitute a material part of the invention, were especially made or especially adapted for use in an infringement of the '121 Patent, and have no substantial non-infringing uses. For example, the Accused Instrumentalities constitute a material part of the claimed invention at least because they contain all of the components that perform the method of reducing probe traffic in a computer system as claimed in claim 25 of the '121 Patent. The Accused Instrumentalities were made or especially adapted

for use in an infringement of the '121 Patent and have no substantial non-infringing uses at least because they contain components whose only purpose is to reduce probe traffic in a computer system as claimed in claim 25 of the '121 Patent. The use of the Accused Instrumentalities identified above by Motorola's customers during normal operation directly infringes claim 25 of the '121 Patent in at least the following manner:

- (a) The Accused Instrumentalities comprise a plurality of processing nodes because they contain multicore processors. The cores are connected in a point-to-point architecture and each core has an associated L1 cache memory;
  - (b) One of the processor cores requests access to a memory line by transmitting a probe to the Snoop Control Unit (the probe filtering unit);
  - (c) The Snoop Control Unit evaluates the probe using a copy of the L1 data cache tag RAMs which is representative of the states associated with selected L1 caches to determine whether a valid copy of the memory line is in any of the L1 caches;
  - (d) The Snoop Control Unit transmits the probe only to selected ones of the cores identified in the evaluating step;
  - (e) The Snoop Control Unit accumulates responses from the selected cores;
- and
- (f) The Snoop Control Unit responds to the original request from the first core.

14. MI has been harmed by Motorola's infringing activities.

**JURY DEMAND**

MI demands a jury trial on all issues and claims so triable.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, MI prays for judgment as follows:

# 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.