

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

GUADA TECHNOLOGIES LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

**FLOOR AND DECOR OUTLETS OF
AMERICA, INC.,**

Defendant.

CIVIL ACTION NO.

PATENT CASE

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

ORIGINAL COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff Guada Technologies LLC files this Original Complaint for Patent Infringement against Floor and Decor Outlets of America, Inc. and would respectfully show the Court as follows:

I. THE PARTIES

1. Plaintiff Guada Technologies LLC (“Guada” or “Plaintiff”) is a Texas limited liability company with its principal place of business at 3000 Custer Rd., Ste. 270 - 7058, Plano, TX 75075.

2. On information and belief, Defendant Floor and Decor Outlets of America, Inc. (“Defendant”) is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 2233 Lake Park Dr., Suite 400, Smyrna, GA, 30080. Defendant has a registered agent at The Corporation Trust Company, 1209 Orange Street, Wilmington, DE 19801.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. This action arises under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction of such action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

4. On information and belief, Defendant is subject to this Court's specific and general personal jurisdiction, pursuant to due process and the Delaware Long-Arm Statute, due at least to its business and existence in this forum, including at least a portion of the infringements alleged herein. Furthermore, Defendant is subject to this Court's specific and general personal jurisdiction because Defendant is a Delaware corporation.

5. Without limitation, on information and belief, within this state, Defendant has used the patented inventions thereby committing, and continuing to commit, acts of patent infringement alleged herein. In addition, on information and belief, Defendant has derived revenue from its infringing acts occurring within Delaware. Further, on information and belief, Defendant is subject to the Court's general jurisdiction, including from regularly doing or soliciting business, engaging in other persistent courses of conduct, and deriving revenue from goods and services provided to persons or entities in Delaware. Further, on information and belief, Defendant is subject to the Court's personal jurisdiction at least due to its sale of products and/or services through the Accused Instrumentality within Delaware. Defendant has committed such purposeful acts and/or transactions in Delaware such that it reasonably should know and expect that it could be haled into this Court as a consequence of such activity.

6. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b). On information and belief, Defendant is incorporated in Delaware. On information and belief, from and within this District Defendant has committed at least a portion of the infringements at issue in this case.

7. For these reasons, personal jurisdiction exists and venue is proper in this Court.


III. COUNT I
(PATENT INFRINGEMENT OF UNITED STATES PATENT NO. 7,231,379)

8. Plaintiff incorporates the above paragraphs herein by reference.

9. On June 12, 2007, United States Patent No. 7,231,379 (“the ‘379 Patent”) was duly and legally issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. The ‘379 Patent is titled “Navigation in a Hierarchical Structured Transaction Processing System.” The application leading to the ‘379 Patent was filed on November 19, 2002. A true and correct copy of the ‘379 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference.

10. Plaintiff is the assignee of all right, title and interest in the ‘379 patent, including all rights to enforce and prosecute actions for infringement and to collect damages for all relevant times against infringers of the ‘379 patent. Accordingly, Plaintiff possesses the exclusive right and standing to prosecute the present action for infringement of the ‘379 Patent by Defendant.

11. The ‘379 patent is directed to addresses a problem of navigating network vertices in a programmed computer that has a hierarchically configured decisional network that must be navigated as part of the processing, and that is constructed to accept inputs or data. (Ex. A at col. 2:25-30). Although Defendant argues that such a network exists outside of computers, that argument is inconsistent with the specification. The specification states that the “invention is implemented in a programmed computer that has a hierarchically configured decisional network that must be navigated as part of the processing.” (*Id.* at col. 2:25-30). The network “is constructed to accept inputs or data and process them in a manner that facilitates navigation of the network vertices more efficiently.” (*Id.*). A hierarchically arranged decisional network is an arrangement of nodes (numbered boxes below) connected by edges (lines connecting the boxes) that are used to traverse from one node to another node through decisions at a particular node:



(*Id.* at Fig. 1). The object of navigating the system is to get from the start to the desired node quickly and efficiently. (*Id.* at col. 2:9-12). This system is different from a “circuit” or “cycle” in which edges can loop back on themselves to create a closed path. (*Id.* at col. 2:67 – col. 3:3).

12. To navigate a hierarchically arranged decisional network, a user provides responses to prompts, or inputs data, to navigate up or down through adjacent nodes in the hierarchy to reach a certain node to obtain information, perform a transaction, or accomplish a similar goal. (*Id.* at col. 2:22-25; col. 3:5-28). For example, an interactive television program guide can be arranged as a hierarchically arranged decisional network. A user starts at the first node with a selection between films and shows. (*Id.* at Fig. 4). Upon the selection of films, the user is presented with another set of nodes to select, such as genres of films (*e.g.*, comedies, horror, drama). The user could then continue navigating down through additional nodes levels until reaching a goal node.

13. This method of navigating through specific pathways between nodes is inefficient. For example, if the user navigates down the wrong hierarchy of nodes, the user must either backtrack up the nodes or start over, thereby frustrating the user. (Ex. A at col. 2:9-12).

As networks become larger with more node levels, the ability to achieve the goal node becomes more difficult because it requires navigating an excessive number of nodes. (*Id.* at col. 2:15-18).

14. The invention solves the prior art problems by not locking the user into movement to adjacent nodes or having to start over at the top node. Instead, the invention allows the system to “jump” laterally from one branch to another. (*Id.* at col. 3:35-37). The problem is solved by supplementing the allowed movement between adjacent nodes with navigation to nonadjacent nodes by associating the nodes with keywords and matching words in a user’s request/response to the keywords so that the system can jump to those nodes. (*Id.* at col. 3:35-43). In other words, the user is not bound by the rigid hierarchical arrangement because an input or response can cause a direct jump to a different node, thereby bypassing intervening nodes that would otherwise need to be traversed according to approaches of the prior art.

15. The ‘379 patent has been cited as prior art during the prosecution history of United States patents assigned to IBM, Fujitsu Limited, and Harris Corporation.

16. **Direct Infringement.** Upon information and belief, Defendant has been and now is directly infringing at least claim 1 of the ‘379 patent in the State of Delaware, in this District, and elsewhere in the United States, by actions comprising making, using, and/or performing a method for navigating multiple navigable nodes interconnected in a hierarchical arrangement using the website at <https://www.flooranddecor.com> and associated subsites, web pages and functionality within that website (the “Accused Instrumentality”). For example, the Accused Instrumentality utilizes a method performed in a system having multiple navigable nodes (the Accused Instrumentality has different product categories (nodes) for selection by a user (*e.g.*, “Tile,” “Stone,” “Wood,” etc.)) interconnected in a hierarchical arrangement (*e.g.*, from the home page node, users can go to nodes such as “Tile,” “Stone,” “Wood,” etc.; and then within a

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.