

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

KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS N.V.,	)	
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION,	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
v.	)	C.A. No. 15-1170-GMS
ACER INC.,	)	
ACER AMERICA CORPORATION,	)	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
Defendants.	)	
MICROSOFT CORPORATION,	)	
Intervenor-Plaintiff,	)	
v.	)	
KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS N.V.,	)	
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION,	)	
Intervenor-Defendants.	)	

**MICROSOFT CORPORATION’S COMPLAINT IN INTERVENTION**

Pursuant to Rule 24(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Intervenor-Plaintiff Microsoft Corporation (“Microsoft”) alleges as follows for its Complaint in Intervention against Plaintiffs and Intervenor-Defendants Koninklijke Philips N.V. and U.S. Philips Corporation (collectively, “Philips” or “Plaintiffs”):

1. Microsoft seeks a declaratory judgment of non-infringement pursuant to the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201(a) and 2202.

**PARTIES**

2. Microsoft is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Washington, with its principal place of business at One Microsoft Way, Redmond, Washington 98052.

3. Plaintiff and Defendant in Intervention Koninklijke Philips N.V., formerly known as Koninklijke Philips Electronics N.V., purports to be a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Netherlands with its principal place of business at High Tech Campus 5, 5656 AE Eindhoven, the Netherlands.

4. Plaintiff and Defendant in Intervention U.S. Philips Corporation purports to be a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Delaware with its principal place of business at 3000 Minuteman Road, Andover, Massachusetts 01810.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

5. This action arises under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§ 1 et seq., and the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

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

7. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Philips due to its filing of the original and amended Complaints in this action.

### **FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND MICROSOFT'S INTEREST IN THIS ACTION**

8. Philips filed its original Complaint in this action on December 18, 2015, accusing Acer Inc. and Acer America Corp. (collectively, "Acer") of selling smartphones, tablet computers, laptops, and All-in-One PCs that infringe certain claims of United States Patent Nos. RE 44,913 ("the '913 patent"), 6,690,387 ("the '387 patent"), 7,184,064 ("the '064 patent"), 7,529,806 ("the '806 patent"), 5,910,797 ("the '797 patent"), 6,522,695 ("the '695 patent"), RE 44,006 ("the '006 patent"), 8,543,819 ("the '819 patent"), 6,772,114 ("the '114 patent"), and RE 43,564 ("the '564 patent") (collectively, the "Asserted Patents").

9. Acer is a customer of Microsoft's. Acer sells computer products that incorporate Microsoft's Windows Operating System.

10. On April 11, 2016, Philips filed a First Amended Complaint against Acer. D.I. 20 (“First Amended Complaint”). In the First Amended Complaint, Philips alleges that either Koninklijke Philips N.V. or U.S. Philips Corporation is “the assignee and owner” of each of the Asserted Patents and the sole owner of “the right to sue and recover for any and all infringements” of each of the Asserted Patents. *Id.* at ¶¶ 11-20, 38, 54, 72, 85, 101, 110, 119, 128, 145, 154.

11. On August 26, 2016, Philips served its Initial Infringement Contentions Against the Acer Defendants (“Infringement Contentions”) (filed herewith as Exhibit A). The Infringement Contentions specifically identify numerous Acer devices that run Windows as allegedly infringing products. *See* Ex. A, App. K. Additionally, the Infringement Contentions specifically assert that Windows provides the allegedly infringing functionality for certain Asserted Patents.

12. The ’913 patent is entitled “Text entry method and device therefor.” The Infringement Contentions allege that Acer infringes claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, and 16 of the ’913 patent, both literally and under the doctrine of equivalents. Ex. A at 2. The Infringement Contentions also allege that Acer infringes claims 1, 9, and 12 of the ’913 patent under theories of induced and contributory infringement. *Id.* at 2-3. The Infringement Contentions include allegations specifically directed to “’913 Windows Accused Products,” which Philips defines as products “preloaded with Microsoft Windows version 8 or higher.” *Id.*, App. A at 1. The Infringement Contentions state (*see id.*) that these accused Windows products are listed in Appendix K, which identifies more than 130 products that run Windows. The Infringement Contentions also cite to Microsoft Windows 8 and Windows 10 online documents and Windows 10-related books that refer to touch keyboards to support the allegations of

functionality for the '913 Windows Accused Products. *See id.*, App. A at 1, 4-6, 9-10, 12-14, 16-17, 19-21; *see generally id.*, App. A at Ex. B.

13. The '387 patent is entitled "Touch-screen image scrolling system and method." The Infringement Contentions allege that Acer infringes claims 9, 11, and 12 of the '387 patent both literally and under the doctrine of equivalents. Ex. A at 3. The Infringement Contentions also allege that Acer infringes claims 9, 11, and 12 of the '387 patent under theories of induced and contributory infringement. *Id.* at 3-4. The Infringement Contentions include allegations specifically directed to "'387 Windows Accused Products," which Philips defines as products "preloaded with Microsoft Windows version 7 or higher." *Id.*, App. B at 1-2. The Infringement Contentions state (*see id.*) that these accused Windows products are listed in Appendix K, which identifies more than 130 products that run Windows. The Infringement Contentions also cite to Microsoft Windows 8 and Windows 10 support documents to support the allegations of functionality for the '387 Windows Accused Products. *Id.*, App. B at 2, 4-5, 7, 8, 10-12, 15, 18; *see generally id.*, App. B at Ex. C.

14. The '064 patent is also entitled "Touch-screen image scrolling system and method." The Infringement Contentions allege that Acer infringes claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 8 of the '064 patent both literally and under the doctrine of equivalents. Ex. A at 4; *see also id.*, App. C. The Infringement Contentions include allegations specifically directed to "'064 Windows Accused Products," which Philips defines as products "preloaded with Microsoft Windows version 7 or higher." *Id.*, App. C at 2. The Infringement Contentions state (*see id.*) that these accused Windows products are listed in Appendix K, which identifies more than 130 products that run Windows. The Infringement Contentions also cite to Microsoft Windows 8 and Windows 10 support documents to support the allegations of functionality for the '064 Windows

Accused Products. *Id.*, App. C at 2, 4-6, 8, 10-13, 16, 19-20, 24-25; *see generally id.*, App. C at Ex. C.

15. The '695 patent is entitled "Transmitting device for transmitting a digital information signal alternately in encoded form and non-encoded form." The Infringement Contentions allege that Acer infringes claims 14, 15, and 17 of the '695 patent both literally and under the doctrine of equivalents. Ex. A at 5; *see also id.*, App. F. The Infringement Contentions include allegations specifically directed to "'695 Windows Accused Products," which Philips defines as products "preloaded with Microsoft Windows version 10 or higher." *Id.*, App. F at 2. The Infringement Contentions state (*see id.*) that these accused Windows products are listed in Appendix K, which identifies more than 130 products that run Windows. The Infringement Contentions also cite to Microsoft Windows 10 support for FLAC audio to support the allegations of functionality for the '695 Windows Accused Products. *Id.*, App. F at 2; *see generally id.*, App. F at Ex. B.

16. The '564 patent is entitled "Hand-held with auto-zoom for graphical display of web page." The Infringement Contentions allege that Acer infringes claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 of the '564 patent both literally and under the doctrine of equivalents. Ex. A at 7; *see also id.*, App. J. The Infringement Contentions include allegations specifically directed to "'564 Windows Accused Products," which Philips defines as products "preloaded with Microsoft Windows version 7 or higher." *Id.*, App. J at 1. The Infringement Contentions state (*see id.*) that these accused Windows products are listed in Appendix K, which identifies more than 130 products that run Windows. The Infringement Contentions also rely on photos of an Acer Aspire Switch 10E running Windows 10 to support the allegations of functionality for the '564 Windows Accused Products. *Id.*, App. J at 3, 3-5, 7-8, 13-14, 16-17; *see generally id.*, App. J at Ex. C.

# 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.