

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

AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC,	§	Case No.
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	<u>JURY TRIAL DEMANDED</u>
	§	
v.	§	
	§	
HMD GLOBAL, HMD GLOBAL OY, and HMD AMERICA, INC.,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	
	§	

PLAINTIFF’S COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff, AGIS Software Development LLC (“AGIS Software” or “Plaintiff”) files this Complaint against Defendants HMD Global (“HMD Global”), HMD Global OY (“HMD Global OY”), and HMD America, Inc. (“HMD America”) (collectively, “HMD” or “Defendants”) for patent infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271 and alleges as follows:

THE PARTIES

1. Plaintiff AGIS Software is a limited liability company, organized and existing under the laws of the State of Texas, and maintains its principal place of business at 100 W. Houston Street, Marshall, Texas 75670. AGIS Software is the owner of all right, title, and interest in and to U.S. Patent Nos. 8,213,970, 9,445,251, 9,467,838, 9,749,829, and 9,820,123 (the “Patents-in-Suit”).

2. On information and belief, Defendant HMD Global is a company organized and existing under the laws of Finland, with its principal place of business located at Bertel Jungin aukio 9, 02600, Espoo, Finland. On information and belief, HMD Global may be served pursuant to the provisions of the Hague Convention. HMD Global is a leading manufacturer and seller of

smartphones in the world and throughout the United States. Upon information and belief, HMD Global does business in Texas, directly or through intermediaries, and offers its products and/or services, including those accused herein of infringement, to customers and potential customers located in Texas, including in the Judicial District of the Eastern District of Texas.

3. On information and belief, Defendant HMD Global OY is a company organized and existing under the laws of Finland, with its principal place of business located at Bertel Jungin aukio 9, 02600, Espoo, Finland. On information and belief, HMD Global may be served pursuant to the provisions of the Hague Convention. HMD Global OY is a leading manufacturer and seller of smartphones in the world and throughout the United States. Upon information and belief, HMD Global OY does business in Texas, directly or through intermediaries, and offers its products and/or services, including those accused herein of infringement, to customers and potential customers located in Texas, including in the Judicial District of the Eastern District of Texas.

4. On information and belief, Defendant HMD America is a corporation organized under the laws of Florida, with its principal place of business at 1200 Brickell Avenue, Suite 510, Miami, Florida 33131. HMD America is a leading manufacturer and seller of smartphones in the world and throughout the United States. HMD is registered to transact business in Texas. HMD America may be served with process through its registered agent InCorp Services, Inc., 815 Brazos Street, Suite 500, Austin, Texas 78701.

5. Defendants have authorized sellers and sales representatives that offer and sell products pertinent to this Complaint through the State of Texas, including in this Judicial District, and to consumers throughout this Judicial District, such as: Best Buy, 422 West TX-281 Loop, Suite 100, Longview, Texas 75605; AT&T Store, 1712 East Grand Avenue, Marshall, Texas 75670; Sprint Store, 1806 East End Boulevard North, Suite 100, Marshall, Texas 75670; T-Mobile,

900 East End Boulevard North, Suite 100, Marshall, Texas 75670; Verizon authorized retailers, including Russell Cellular, 1111 East Grand Avenue, Marshall, Texas 75670; Victra, 1006 East End Boulevard North, Marshall, Texas 75670; and Cricket Wireless authorized retailer, 120 East End Boulevard South, Marshall, Texas 75670.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§ 1, *et seq.* This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332, 1338, and 1367.

7. This Court has specific and personal jurisdiction over Defendants consistent with the requirements of the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution and the Texas Long Arm Statute. On information and belief, Defendants have sufficient minimum contacts with the forum because Defendants transact substantial business in the State of Texas and in this Judicial District. On information and belief, Defendants have also purposefully and voluntarily placed their products, including infringing products, into the stream of commerce with the expectation that they will be purchased and used by customers located in this State. Further, Defendants have, directly or through subsidiaries or intermediaries, committed and continue to commit acts of patent infringement in the State of Texas and in this Judicial District as alleged in this Complaint, as alleged more particularly below.

8. Venue is proper in this Judicial District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400(b) because Defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction in this Judicial District, have committed acts of patent infringement in this Judicial District, and have regular and established places of business in this Judicial District. Each Defendant, through its own acts and/or through the acts of others, makes, uses, sells, and/or offers to sell infringing products within this Judicial District,

regularly does and solicits business in this Judicial District, and has the requisite minimum contacts with this Judicial District, such that this venue is a fair and reasonable one. Further, venue is proper in this Judicial District because HMD Global and HMD Global OY are foreign corporations formed under the laws of Finland with principal places of business in Finland. Further, upon information and belief, Defendants have admitted or not contested proper venue in this Judicial District in other patent infringement actions.

PATENTS-IN-SUIT

9. On July 3, 2012, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued U.S. Patent No. 8,213,970 (the “’970 Patent”) entitled “Method of Utilizing Forced Alerts for Interactive Remote Communications.” On September 1, 2021, the United States Patent and Trademark Office issued an *Inter Partes* Review Certificate for the ’970 Patent cancelling claims 1 and 3-9. On December 9, 2021, the United States Patent and Trademark Office issued an *Ex Parte* Reexamination Certificate for the ’970 Patent determining claims 2 and 10 (as amended) and claims 11-13 to be valid and patentable. A true and correct copy of the ’970 Patent, which includes the September 1, 2021 *Inter Partes* Review Certificate and the December 9, 2021 *Ex Parte* Reexamination Certificate, is available at: <https://ppubs.uspto.gov/pubwebapp/external.html?q=8,213,970.pn.&db=USPAT>.

10. On September 13, 2016, the United States and Trademark Office duly and legally issued U.S. Patent No. 9,445,251 (the “’251 Patent”) entitled “Method to Provide Ad Hoc and Password Protected Digital and Voice Networks.” On June 8, 2021, the United States Patent and Trademark Office issued an *Ex Parte* Reexamination Certificate of the ’251 Patent determining claims 1-35 to be valid and patentable. A true and correct copy of the ’251 Patent, which includes

the June 8, 2021 *Ex Parte* Reexamination Certificate, is available at: <https://ppubs.uspto.gov/pubwebapp/external.html?q=9,445,251.pn.&db=USPAT>.

11. On October 11, 2016, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued U.S. Patent No. 9,467,838 (the “’838 Patent”) entitled “Method to Provide Ad Hoc and Password Protected Digital and Voice Networks.” On May 27, 2021, the United States Patent and Trademark Office issued an *Ex Parte* Reexamination Certificate for the ’838 Patent confirming the validity and patentability of claims 1-84. A true and correct copy of the ’838 Patent, which includes the May 27, 2021 *Ex Parte* Reexamination Certificate, is available at: <https://ppubs.uspto.gov/pubwebapp/external.html?q=9,467,838.pn.&db=USPAT>.

12. On August 29, 2017, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued U.S. Patent No. 9,749,829 (the “’829 Patent”) entitled “Method to Provide Ad Hoc and Password Protected Digital and Voice Networks.” On August 16, 2021, the United States Patent and Trademark Office issued an *Ex Parte* Reexamination Certificate for the ’829 Patent confirming the validity and patentability of claims 1-68. A true and correct copy of the ’829 Patent, which includes the August 16, 2021 *Ex Parte* Reexamination Certificate, is available at: <https://ppubs.uspto.gov/pubwebapp/external.html?q=9,749,829.pn.&db=USPAT>.

13. On November 14, 2017, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued U.S. Patent No. 9,820,123 (the “’123 Patent”) entitled “Method to Provide Ad Hoc and Password Protected Digital and Voice Networks.” On September 24, 2021, the United States Patent and Trademark Office issued an *Ex Parte* Reexamination Certificate for the ’123 Patent confirming the validity and patentability of claims 1-48. A true and correct copy of the ’123 Patent, which includes the September 24, 2021 *Ex Parte* Reexamination Certificate, is available at: <https://ppubs.uspto.gov/pubwebapp/external.html?q=9,820,123.pn.&db=USPAT>.

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.