

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

_____)	
KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS)	
N.V. and PHILIPS ELECTRONICS NORTH)	
AMERICA CORPORATION,)	
)	
	Plaintiffs,)	Civil Action No. 10-cv-11041-NMG
)	
	v.)	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
)	
ZOLL MEDICAL CORPORATION,)	
)	
	Defendant.)	
_____)	

AMENDED COMPLAINT

Plaintiffs Koninklijke Philips Electronics N.V. and Philips Electronics North America Corporation (collectively “Philips”) bring this complaint for patent infringement against Defendant Zoll Medical Corporation (“Zoll”).

NATURE OF ACTION

1. This is an action for patent infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271, *et seq.*, by Philips against Zoll for infringement of United States Patent Nos. 5,607,454; 5,721,482; 5,735,879; 5,749,905; 5,773,961; 5,800,460; 5,803,927; 5,836,978; 5,879,374; 6,047,212; 6,178,357; 6,304,783; 6,356,785; 6,441,582; and 6,871,093 (the “Patents-in-Suit”).

PARTIES

2. Plaintiff Koninklijke Philips Electronics N.V. is a corporation organized under the laws of the Netherlands with a principal place of business in Eindhoven, the Netherlands.

3. Plaintiff Philips Electronics North America Corporation is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Delaware, with a place of business at 3000 Minuteman Road, Andover, Massachusetts 01810. Philips Electronics North America Corporation is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Philips Holding USA, Inc., which, directly and indirectly, is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Plaintiff Koninklijke Philips Electronics N.V. Philips Electronics North America Corporation is the assignee and owner of the Patents-in-Suit.

4. Upon information and belief, Defendant Zoll is a corporation organized under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with a principal place of business at 269 Mill Road, Chelmsford, Massachusetts 01824.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 271, *et seq.*

6. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338.

7. Upon information and belief, Zoll maintains its principal place of business within Massachusetts and has voluntarily placed automatic external defibrillator products into the stream of commerce, knowing that Massachusetts is the likely destination of a substantial quantity of such products.

8. Upon information and belief, a substantial part of the events giving rise to these claims for patent infringement occurred in Massachusetts and in this judicial district.

9. Upon information and belief, Zoll is subject to personal jurisdiction in this district because it is a corporation organized under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

10. Upon information and belief, Zoll is subject to personal jurisdiction in this district because it maintains or has maintained continuous and systematic contacts with Massachusetts and this judicial district.

11. Upon information and belief, Zoll is subject to personal jurisdiction in this district because it purposefully engaged in activities that gave rise to Philips' claims for patent infringement and which were directed to residents of Massachusetts and this judicial district.

12. Upon information and belief, Zoll resides in this district for purposes of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(c) and 1400(b) because it is subject to personal jurisdiction in this district.

13. Upon information and belief, venue for this civil action in this judicial district is proper under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b), 1391(c), and/or 1400(b), as Zoll is subject to personal jurisdiction in this district.

COUNT 1: PATENT INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 5,607,454

14. Philips incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-13 as if fully set forth herein.

15. On March 4, 1997, the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") duly and legally issued United States Patent No. 5,607,454 ("the '454 patent"), entitled "Electrotherapy Method and Apparatus," to the listed inventor David Cameron of Seattle, Washington, and other co-inventors in Washington. By assignment from the previous patent owner, Plaintiff Koninklijke Philips Electronics N.V. was the assignee and owner of the '454 patent, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A, until August 18, 2010, when it assigned the '454 patent to Plaintiff Philips Electronics North America Corporation.

16. Upon information and belief, Philips and its predecessors, including Heartstream, Inc., Hewlett-Packard Company, and Agilent Technologies, Inc., have continuously marked their products with the '454 patent number.

17. Upon information and belief, Zoll has infringed and continues to infringe the '454 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), (b), and/or (c), by making, using, offering for sale, selling, and/or importing in the United States automated external defibrillators, including the AED Plus and AED Pro automated external defibrillators, and by contributing to and/or inducing infringement of the '454 patent.

18. Zoll does not have a license or permission to use the '454 patent.

19. As a result of Zoll's infringement of the '454 patent, Philips has been irreparably injured. Unless such infringing acts are enjoined by this Court, Philips will continue to suffer additional irreparable injury.

20. As a result of Zoll's infringement of the '454 patent, Philips has suffered, and continues to suffer, damages, in an amount not yet determined, of at least a reasonable royalty and/or lost profits due to loss of sales, profits, and potential sales that Philips would have made but for Zoll's infringing acts.

21. In a letter dated November 17, 2008, Philips provided notice to Zoll of the '454 patent and its infringing conduct.

22. Despite knowledge of the '454 patent, Zoll has continued to infringe this patent. Zoll acted with reckless disregard of the '454 patent by continuing to infringe the patent when it knew or should have known that its actions constituted infringement.

COUNT 2: PATENT INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 5,721,482

23. Philips incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-13 as if fully set forth herein.

24. On February 24, 1998, the USPTO duly and legally issued United States Patent No. 5,721,482 ("the '482 patent"), entitled "Intelligent Battery and Method for Providing an Advance Low Battery Warning for a Battery Powered Device such as a Defibrillator," to the

listed inventor Carl E. Benvegar of McMinnville, Oregon, and other co-inventors in Oregon and Washington. By assignment from the previous patent owner, Plaintiff Koninklijke Philips Electronics N.V. was the assignee and owner of the '482 patent, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit B, until August 18, 2010, when it assigned the '482 patent to Plaintiff Philips Electronics North America Corporation.

25. Upon information and belief, Zoll has infringed and continues to infringe the '482 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), (b), and/or (c), by making, using, offering for sale, selling, and/or importing in the United States infringing products, including the Zoll Smart Battery and automated external defibrillators, including the AED Pro automated external defibrillator, and by contributing to and/or inducing infringement of the '482 patent.

26. Zoll does not have a license or permission to use the '482 patent.

27. As a result of Zoll's infringement of the '482 patent, Philips has been irreparably injured. Unless such infringing acts are enjoined by this Court, Philips will continue to suffer additional irreparable injury.

28. As a result of Zoll's infringement of the '482 patent, Philips has suffered, and continues to suffer, damages, in an amount not yet determined, of at least a reasonable royalty and/or lost profits due to loss of sales, profits, and potential sales that Philips would have made but for Zoll's infringing acts.

29. In a letter dated November 17, 2008, Philips provided notice to Zoll of the '482 patent and its infringing conduct.

30. Despite knowledge of the '482 patent, Zoll has continued to infringe this patent. Zoll acted with reckless disregard of the '482 patent by continuing to infringe the patent when it knew or should have known that its actions constituted infringement.

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.