### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS TYLER DIVISION

LANDMARK TECHNOLOGY, LLC,

Plaintiff,

CASE NO. 6:13-cv-411

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

v.

**iROBOT CORPORATION**,

Defendant.

### **COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

Plaintiff Landmark Technology, LLC ("Landmark"), for its Complaint against iRobot, Corporation Inc. (Defendant"), alleges as follows:

### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This is an action for patent infringement in violation of the Patent Act of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§ 1 *et seq*.

2. This Court has original and exclusive subject matter jurisdiction over the patent infringement claims for relief under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

3. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because Defendant has transacted and is transacting business in the Eastern District of Texas that includes, but is not limited to, the use of products and systems that practice the subject matter claimed in the patents involved in this action.

4. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. §1391(b-c) and 1400(b) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in this District where Defendant has done business and committed infringing acts and continues to do business and to commit infringing acts.

#### **PARTIES**

5. Plaintiff Landmark Technology, LLC ("Plaintiff") is a limited liability company organized under the laws of the State of Delaware with its principal place of business at 719 W. Front Street, Suite 157, Tyler, Texas 75702.

6. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendant iRobot Corporation ("iRobot"), is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its principal place of business at 8 Crosby Drive, Bedford, Massachusetts 01730. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that iRobot is in the business of selling robots for cleaning homes, pools, and gutters, and derives a significant portion of its revenue from sales and distribution via Internet-based electronic commerce conducted on and using at least, but not limited to, the Internet website located at <a href="http://www.irobot.com/us/">http://www.irobot.com/us/</a> (the "Website"). Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that, at all times relevant hereto, iRobot has done and continues to do business in this judicial district, including, but not limited to, by selling products to customers located in this judicial district by way of the iRobot Website.

### FACTS

7. On November 19, 1996, United States Patent No. 5,576,951 entitled "Automated Sales and Services System" was duly and legally issued to Lawrence B. Lockwood ("Lockwood") as inve3ntor. A true and correct copy of United States Patent No. 5,576,951 is attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein by this reference. Following a reexamination of Patent No. 5,576,951, the United States Patent and Trademark Office issued an Ex Parte Reexamination Certificate, Number US 5,576,951 C1, on January 29, 2008, confirming the validity of all ten (10) original claims and allowing twenty-two (22) additional claims. A true and correct copy of Ex Parte Reexamination Certificate, Number US 5,576,951 C1 is attached hereto as Exhibit "B" and incorporated herein by this reference. Following a second reexamination on the '951 patent the United States Patent and Trademark Office issued an Ex Parte Reexamination Certificate, Number US 5,576,951 C2, on May 9, 2013, again confirming the validity of all thirty-two (32) claims. A true and correct copy of Ex Parte Reexamination Certificate, Number US 5,576,951 C2, on May 9, 2013, again confirming

**M** Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

OCKE

Certificate, Number US 5,576,951 C2 is attached hereto as Exhibit "C" and incorporated herein by this reference. (United States Patent No. 5,576,951, together with the additional claims confirmed and allowed by Ex Parte Reexamination Certificate, Number US 5,576,951 C1, and as confirmed by Ex Parte Reexamination Certificate, Number US 5,576,951 C2, shall hereinafter be referred to as the "951 Patent.") On September 1, 2008, Lockwood licensed all rights in the '951 Patent to Plaintiff. Plaintiff is the exclusive licensee of the entire right, title and interest in and to the '951 Patent, including all rights to enforce the '951 Patent and to recover for infringement. The '951 Patent is valid and in force.

8. On March 7, 2006, United States Patent No. 7,010,508 entitled "Automated Multimedia Data Processing Network" (the "'508 Patent") was duly and legally issued to Lawrence B. Lockwood as inventor. A true and correct copy of the '508 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit "D" and incorporated herein by this reference. On September 1, 2008, Lockwood licensed all rights in the '508 Patent to Plaintiff. Plaintiff is the exclusive licensee of the entire right, title and interest in and to the '508 Patent, including all rights to enforce the '508 Patent and to recover for infringement. The '508 Patent is valid and in force.

9. On or about September 28, 2012, Plaintiff sent Defendant a letter informing Defendant of the '951 Patent and the '508 Patent and that Defendant's actions, as more fully described below, constituted infringement of the '951 Patent and the '508 Patent.

10. As more fully laid out below, Defendant has been and is now infringing the '951 Patent and the '508 Patent, in this judicial district and elsewhere, by selling and distributing its products and services using electronic commerce systems, which, individually or in combination, incorporate and/or use subject matter claimed by the '951 Patent and the '508 Patent.

### FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

### (Direct Infringement of the '951 Patent, in Violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a))

11. Plaintiff refers to and incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1-9.

12. The claims of the '951 Patent relate to "a computer search system for retrieving information" and "a computerized system for selecting and ordering a variety of information, goods and services," each comprising a variety of features.

13. The iRobot Website is a "computer search system[s] for retrieving information" and "computerized system[s] for selecting and ordering a variety of information, goods and services" practicing the claims of the '951 Patent.

14. By way of example only, and not limited to it, Defendant's Website infringes Claim 10 of the '951 Patent in that, for example, the Defendant's Website provides a system that practices all of the limitations of the claim and on which it's customers search for information about products and purchase products, including:

a. The Website is a computerized system for selecting and ordering a variety of information, goods and services.

b. The Website includes a plurality of computerized data processing installations (the web server and its supporting systems) programmed for processing orders for said information, goods and services.

c. The Website is operated through at least one computerized station (the customer's computer).

d. The web server of the Website and that Defendant's customers' computers practice all of the remaining limitations of Claim 10 of the '951 Patent.

15. Defendant, therefore, by the acts complained of herein, is making, using, selling, or offering for sale in the United States, including in the Eastern District of Texas, products and/or services embodying the invention, and has in the past and is now continuing to infringe the '951 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

16. Defendant threatens to continue to engage in the acts complained of herein and, unless restrained and enjoined, will continue to do so, all to Plaintiff's irreparable injury. It would be difficult to ascertain the amount of compensation that would afford Plaintiff adequate

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

relief for such future and continuing acts, and a multiplicity of judicial proceedings would be required. Plaintiff does not have an adequate remedy at law to compensate it for the injuries threatened.

17. By reason of the acts of Defendant alleged herein, Plaintiff has suffered damage in an amount to be proved at trial.

18. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that the infringement by Defendant is willful, wanton, and deliberate, without license and with full knowledge of the '951 Patent, thereby making this an exceptional case entitling Plaintiff to attorneys' fees and enhanced damages.

### SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

### (Inducing Infringement of the '951 Patent, in Violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b))

19. Plaintiff refers to and incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1-12.

20. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendant has actively and knowingly induced infringement of the '951 Patent, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) by, among other things, inducing its customers (the end users of its Website) to utilize their own computers in combination with its Website, and incorporated and/or related systems, to search for and order information and products from its Website in such a way as to infringe the '951 Patent.

21. By reason of the acts of Defendant alleged herein, Plaintiff has suffered damage in an amount to be proved at trial.

22. Defendant threatens to continue to engage in the acts complained of herein and, unless restrained and enjoined, will continue to do so, all to Plaintiff's irreparable injury. Plaintiff does not have an adequate remedy at law.

23. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that the infringement by Defendant is willful, wanton, and deliberate, without license and with full knowledge of the '951 Patent, thereby making this an exceptional case entitling Plaintiff to attorneys' fees and enhanced damages.

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

# DOCKET A L A R M



# 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.