

EXHIBIT A

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

**ALACRITECH, INC., A California
corporation,**

Plaintiff,

v.

TIER 3, ET AL.,

WISTRON CORPORATION ET AL.,

DELL INC., A Delaware corporation,

Defendants.

and

INTEL CORPORATION,

Intervenor.

2:16-cv-00693-JRG (LEAD CASE)

2:16-cv-00692-JRG

2:16-cv-00695-JRG

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

INTEL CORPORATION'S COMPLAINT IN INTERVENTION

Pursuant Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(c), Intervenor Intel Corporation ("Intel") hereby alleges for its Complaint in Intervention as follows:

PARTIES

1. Intel seeks a declaratory judgment of non-infringement pursuant to the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201(a) and 2202.
2. Intel is a Delaware corporation with its worldwide headquarters in Santa Clara, California. Intel designs, manufactures, and sells networking products for use in computer systems.
3. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff and Defendant in Intervention, Alacritech Inc., is a California corporation with its principal place of business in San Jose, California.

4. This action arises under the patent law of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 et seq., and the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

5. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Alacritech by virtue of, inter alia, its filing of the Complaint in this action.

BACKGROUND AND INTEL'S INTEREST IN THIS LAWSUIT

6. On June 30, 2016, Alacritech filed its Complaint in this action accusing Dell Inc. – an Intel customer – of making, using, selling, offering to sell and/or importing products that allegedly infringe United States Patent Nos. 7,124,205; 7,237,036; 7,337,241; 7,673,072; 7,945,699; 8,131,880; 8,805,948; 9,055,104 (respectively, the 205 Patent, the 036 Patent, the 241 Patent, the 072 Patent, the 699 Patent, the 880 Patent, the 948 Patent, and the 104 Patent; collectively, the “Asserted Patents”).

7. Dell designs, manufactures, and sells certain computer systems that incorporate Intel networking products.

8. Alacritech’s allegations under the Asserted Patents are directed against Dell’s products that incorporate Intel’s networking technology.

9. Alacritech’s assertion that computer systems in which Intel products provide networking functionality infringe certain of its patents is tantamount to accusing Intel of infringement. For example, the Complaint alleges that Dell has infringed seven of the asserted patents based on its making, using, selling, offering for sale, and/or importing “the Intel Ethernet Network Daughter Card X520-DA2 /1350-T2,” among other products.” [Complaint (Dkt. 1), ¶35 (emphasis added)]. Alacritech’s infringement allegations are also based in large part on Intel’s 82599 Ethernet Controller. The Intel 82599 Datasheet is cited extensively throughout

Alacritech's Complaint. [Complaint (Dkt. 1), ¶35, 49, 62, 75, 101, 114, 127]. Thus, Intel has a direct and substantial interest in defending against and defeating Alacritech's infringement claims.

10. Intel has agreed to a request from Dell to defend and partially indemnify Dell in connection with Alacritech's claims directed at Intel technology used in their products. As a result, Intel has a substantial financial interest in the outcome of this litigation.

11. As a result of Alacritech's infringement allegations against Dell products and Intel technology, Intel has an objectively reasonable apprehension that Alacritech will claim that Intel's products directly or indirectly infringe one or more of the Asserted Patents. Therefore, an actual controversy exists between Intel and Alacritech. By intervening in this action, Intel seeks the Court's assistance and declaration concerning these matters, which have been and are subject of disagreement among the parties.

COUNT 1

DECLARATORY JUDGMENT REGARDING U.S. PATENT NO. 7,124,205

12. Intel incorporates by reference the allegations in paragraphs 1-12.

13. A valid and justiciable controversy has arisen and exists between Intel and Alacritech regarding the 205 Patent.

14. By making, using, selling, offering to sell, marketing, licensing or importing its products, Intel does not directly or indirectly infringe any claim of the 205 Patent.

15. Dell does not directly or indirectly infringe any claim of the 205 Patent by making, using, selling, offering to sell, marketing, licensing or importing products that incorporate Intel networking technology.

16. A judicial declaration concerning these matters is necessary and appropriate at this time so that Intel can ascertain its rights and duties with respect to the parties and with regard to designing, developing, manufacturing, marketing, and selling its products.

COUNT II

DECLARATORY JUDGMENT REGARDING U.S. PATENT NO. 7,237,036

17. Intel incorporates by reference the allegations in paragraphs 1-18.

18. A valid and justiciable controversy has arisen and exists between Intel and Alacritech regarding the 036 Patent.

19. By making, using, selling, offering to sell, marketing, licensing or importing its products, Intel does not directly or indirectly infringe any claim of the 036 Patent.

20. Dell does not directly or indirectly infringe any claim of the 036 Patent by making, using, selling, offering to sell, marketing, licensing or importing products that incorporate Intel networking technology.

21. A judicial declaration concerning these matters is necessary and appropriate at this time so that Intel can ascertain its rights and duties with respect to the parties and with regard to designing, developing, manufacturing, marketing, and selling its products.

COUNT III

DECLARATORY JUDGMENT REGARDING U.S. PATENT NO. 7,337,241

22. Intel incorporates by reference the allegations in paragraphs 1-24.

23. A valid and justiciable controversy has arisen and exists between Intel and Alacritech regarding the 241 Patent.

24. By making, using, selling, offering to sell, marketing, licensing or importing its products, Intel does not directly or indirectly infringe any claim of the 241 Patent.

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.