

Ronald Abramson
David G. Liston
LEWIS BAACH pllc
The Chrysler Building
405 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10174
Tel: (212) 826-7001

Attorneys for Plaintiff

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

WAG ACQUISITION, L.L.C.,

Plaintiff,

v.

**MULTI MEDIA, LLC, f/k/a Zmedianow,
LLC, d/b/a chaturbate.com;**

**HEARILLE SERVICES LIMITED, d/b/a
chatbill.com;**

**CWIE, LLC, d/b/a Cavecreek
Wholesale Internet Exchange,
Cavecreek Web Hosting, and
highwebmedia.com;**

CCBILL, LLC;

CWIE HOLDING COMPANY, INC.; and

DOES 1-20,

Defendants.

Civil Action No.:

**COMPLAINT FOR PATENT
INFRINGEMENT**

and

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff WAG ACQUISITION, L.L.C., for its complaint against Defendants, alleges infringement of United States Patent Nos. 8,122,141 and 8,327,011 (the “patents-in-suit”). Plaintiff alleges that Defendants directly and indirectly infringe the patents-in-suit by conduct including without limitation their Internet delivery of live adult video web cam performances, as more particularly specified herein.

THE PARTIES

1. Plaintiff WAG Acquisition, L.L.C. is a New Jersey limited liability company with its principal place of business at 3 Gold Mine Road, Suite 104, Flanders, New Jersey 07836.

2. On information and belief, Defendant MULTI MEDIA, LLC (“MMLLC”) is a California limited liability company with its principal place of business at 23600 El Toro Road, #D344, Lake Forest, California 92630. On information and belief, MMLLC was formerly known as ZMEDIANOW, L.L.C., and located at 200 Goddard Drive, Irvine, California 92618. On information and belief, MMLLC is doing business under a number of trade names, including without limitation chaturbate.com.

3. On information and belief, Defendant HEARILLE SERVICES LIMITED (“Hearille”) is a United Kingdom private limited company with offices at 17 Rolling Mill, Consett, County Durham, DH8 6NH, United Kingdom, which also maintains an address at 10 Quentin Drive, Dudley, West Midlands, UK, DY1 2H, United Kingdom. On information and belief, Hearille performs billing and other services for Defendants.

4. On information and belief, Defendant CWIE, LLC (“CWIE”) is an Arizona limited liability company with offices at 2353 West University Drive, Tempe, Arizona 85281. On information and belief, Defendant CWIE is doing business under trade names including without limitation Cavecreek Wholesale Internet Exchange, Cavecreek Web Hosting, and highwebmedia.com.

5. On information and belief, Defendant CCBILL, LLC (“CCBILL”) is an Arizona limited liability company with offices at 2353 West University Drive, Tempe, Arizona 85281.

6. On information and belief, Defendant CWIE HOLDING COMPANY, INC. (“CWIE HOLDING”) is an Arizona corporation with offices at 2353 West University Drive, Tempe, Arizona 85281. On information and belief, Defendant CWIE HOLDING owns 100% of each of Defendants CWIE and CCBILL.

7. On information and belief, Defendants DOE 1 – DOE 20 are entities whose precise identities are unknown to Plaintiff at this time, which operate in concert with Defendants MMLLC, Hearille, CWIE, CCBILL, and CWIE HOLDING in connection with the conduct complained of herein.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

8. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a) because this action arises under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§ 1 et seq.

9. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b)-(c) and 1400(b).

PLAINTIFF'S BUSINESS AND DEVELOPMENTS

10.. Plaintiff, operating under the trade name SurferNETWORK, is in the business of providing Internet broadcasting services for live and on-demand audio and video program material. Plaintiff began this business in 1998, and has been one of the leading providers of such services to the terrestrial radio stations and other content providers that comprise its customer base.

11. Early in developing its business, two of Plaintiff's principals, William A. Grywalski, ("Grywalski") and Harry Emerson ("Emerson"), recognized a need that existed in the field of Internet delivery of broadcast media due to the shortcomings in then current Internet streaming technologies. They observed that long startup delays due to "buffering" and frequent program interruptions (sometimes referred to as "jitter") made the experience of trying to listen to or view streaming Internet content frustrating to the end user, and therefore impractical as a content delivery mechanism. They were interested in making the Internet streaming experience more like radio or television, including the immediacy of having the programming appear to start instantly on demand (e.g., turning on a radio or flipping channels), and continue playing once started without random interruptions.

12. Plaintiff engaged the assistance of a software design engineer, Harold Price ("Price"), to develop solutions for the shortcomings that Grywalski and Emerson saw in the current technology, with respect to streaming media playback performance, as well as other technological issues concerning Internet delivery of broadcast media. Price worked on several aspects of this matter for Plaintiff over the period 1999-2001.

13. Price was aware of the then current approach to streaming, which attempted to overcome streaming transmission delays and jitter by a variety of techniques, including, for example, establishing a content buffer of 20-seconds or so in duration, on the receiving (user or “client”) end of the communication, within the client’s media player or media player browser plugin. After the user selected (e.g., clicked on) a stream, the player would start filling this buffer at the playback rate and then start playing when the buffer was full. While this method did provide some protection against interruptions for the duration of whatever content was initially buffered, it entailed an undesirable startup delay for “buffering,” and provided no means for graceful recovery once the 20 seconds worth of content in the buffer was consumed.

14. Price conceived of solutions to these problems. He built a prototype that implemented one embodiment of those solutions, and he demonstrated that a system according to his new design could overcome the problems put to him by Grywalski and Emerson.

15. Plaintiff and its predecessors in interest filed a number of U.S. patent applications on these solutions, as enumerated below. To date, this family of patent applications has resulted in seven issued U.S. patents, including the two patents-in-suit. All of these patent applications were assigned to Plaintiff, or to a predecessor-in-interest of Plaintiff and reassigned to Plaintiff.

16. Plaintiff has been conducting an active, operating business ever since the developments described above, and has actively practiced under the technology taught in the patents-in-suit, from then to the present. Plaintiff has developed

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.