

1 MANDOUR & ASSOCIATES, APC  
2 JOSEPH A. MANDOUR, III (SBN 188896)  
3 Email: jmandour@mandourlaw.com  
4 BEN T. LILA (SBN 246808)  
5 Email: blila@mandourlaw.com  
6 8605 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 1500  
7 Los Angeles, CA 90069  
8 Telephone: (858) 487-9300  
9 Attorneys for plaintiff,  
10 API Systems, Inc.  
11

12  
13  
14 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
15  
16 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
17  
18

19 \_\_\_\_\_ )  
20 API Systems, Inc., a California ) **Civil Case No. 8:21-CV-00507**  
21 corporation, )  
22 Plaintiff, ) **COMPLAINT FOR COPYRIGHT**  
23 ) **INFRINGEMENT AND BREACH**  
24 ) **OF CONTRACT**  
25 v. )  
26 ) **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**  
27 Clarvue, Inc., a California )  
28 corporation, )  
29 Defendant. )  
30 )  
31 )  
32 )  
33 )  
34 )  
35 )  
36 )  
37 )  
38 )

39 Plaintiff API Systems, Inc., by and through its counsel, alleges for its  
40 complaint against defendant Clarvue, Inc. as follows:  
41  
42

1 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

2 1. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 17 U.S.C. §  
3 501, *et seq.* (copyright infringement) and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 (federal question  
4 jurisdiction), 1338(a) and 1338(b) and supplemental jurisdiction for state causes  
5 of action.

6 **THE PARTIES**

7 2. Plaintiff API Systems, Inc. (“API Systems,”) is a corporation  
8 organized under the laws of the State of California with its principal place of  
9 business in Tustin, California.

10 3. Defendant Clarvue, Inc. is a corporation organized under the laws of  
11 the State of California with, on information and belief, its principal place of  
12 business at 17320 Red Hill Avenue, Irvine, California.

13 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

14 4. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this lawsuit under 28  
15 U.S.C. § 1338, because, *inter alia*, the action arises under the copyright laws of  
16 the United States.

17 5. This Court has personal jurisdiction over defendant Clarvue, Inc.,  
18 because it is a California corporation residing in California. Also, defendant has  
19 transacted business in the Central District of California. Further, defendant  
20 systematically and continuously direct business activities toward and into the  
21 Central District of California, including selling the infringing material and  
22 entering into a contract with plaintiff.

23 6. Venue is proper and reasonable in this district under 28 U.S.C. §  
24 1391(b)(2) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to  
25 these claims for copyright infringement and breach of contract occurred in this  
26 district and defendant has significant contacts with the district.

**FACTS**

1  
2 7. Plaintiff API Systems is a corporation engaged in the development,  
3 sale and marketing of software, including software used to generate customizable  
4 surveys, user forms and databases.

5 8. API Systems' software may be hosted on internet-accessible web  
6 servers for client companies in a variety of industries to use to create database  
7 management systems.

8 9. For example, API Systems' software has been used by companies in  
9 the facility management industry to allow property management companies to  
10 provide a platform where workflow can be managed in databases.

11 10. In 2005, certain software entitled SURVEY Web Code (the "2005  
12 SURVEY Web Code") was created and subsequently assigned to API Systems.

13 11. API Systems' work is the subject of U.S. Copyright Registration No.  
14 TX0008830022. A true and correct copy of said copyright registration is attached  
15 hereto as Exhibit A.

16 12. An exemplary and true and correct copy of a portion of the 2005  
17 SURVEY Web Code is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

18 13. In 2019, API Systems licensed and delivered software comprising the  
19 copyrighted 2005 SURVEY Web Code (the "2019 SURVEY Web Code") to  
20 Clarvue.

21 14. On March 21, 2020, API Systems and Clarvue formalized the license  
22 by entering into a Limited Software License Agreement ("Software Agreement").  
23 A true and correct copy of the Software Agreement is attached hereto as Exhibit  
24 D.

25 15. The Software Agreement, among other things, provides Clarvue with  
26 a license to software entitled "nFormz" comprised of 2019 SURVEY Web Code.  
27 The 2019 SURVEY web code comprises nearly all the protectable portions of the  
28 2005 SURVEY Web Code and contains further improvements.

1 16. API Systems delivered the 2019 SURVEY Web Code in compiled,  
2 executable object code format to Clarvue.

3 17. On information and belief, in or around May 2020, Clarvue, its  
4 employees and contractors proceed to reverse engineer, replicate, and copy API's  
5 object code to generate the source code version of the 2019 SURVEY Web Code.

6 18. The Software Agreement explicitly provides that Clarvue shall not  
7 reverse engineer the 2019 SURVEY Web Code. The Software Agreement further  
8 provides that Clarvue shall not make any derivative works based on API Systems'  
9 copyrighted material.

10 19. An exemplary, true and correct copy of Clarvue's infringing code is  
11 attached hereto as Exhibit C. On information and belief, the infringing code will  
12 generate output that is substantially similar to the output of the copyrighted code  
13 in Exhibit B.

14 20. API Systems uses the copyright symbol, ©, on its copyrighted works,  
15 including the SURVEY Web Code.

16 21. Defendant's copying, republication and exploitation of plaintiff's  
17 copyrighted work(s) was without authorization from plaintiff. Defendant's  
18 copying was willful, oppressive, malicious and with wrongful intent to infringe  
19 the rights of plaintiff.

20 **CLAIMS OF RELIEF**

21 **FIRST CLAIM OF RELIEF**

22 **(Copyright Infringement – 17 U.S.C. § 501)**

23 22. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference the statements and  
24 allegations in paragraphs 1 to 21 of the complaint as though fully set forth herein.

25 23. At all times relevant hereto, plaintiff has been the owner, author  
26 and/or assignee of all copyright rights or rights to assert copyright claims for its  
27 works and all derivative works.

28 24. Without authorization, defendant used, copied, reproduced, and

1 republished the copyrighted material. Defendant's copying, reproduction, and  
2 republication were commercial in character and purpose. Defendant either  
3 completely or substantially used plaintiff's copyrighted content. Because the  
4 copying was for commercial purposes, it did not constitute fair use under any  
5 doctrine of copyright law.

6 25. Plaintiff did not authorize defendant's copying, displaying, or  
7 republishing of the works. Defendant infringed the copyrights of plaintiff's  
8 creative works by, *inter alia*, reproducing, republishing, publicly displaying, and  
9 creating derivatives of the works.

10 26. As a result of defendant's infringement, plaintiff has suffered, and  
11 will continue to suffer, substantial losses.

12 27. Defendant knew the infringed works belonged to plaintiff and that  
13 they did not have authorization to exploit plaintiff's works. Defendant's  
14 infringements were, therefore, willful.

15 28. On information and belief, defendant induced, caused and materially  
16 contributed to the infringing acts of others by encouraging, inducing, allowing,  
17 and assisting others to reproduce and republish plaintiff's works. Further, on  
18 information and belief, defendant had knowledge of the infringing acts of others  
19 relating to plaintiff's copyrighted works.

20 29. On information and belief, defendant has the right and ability to  
21 control the infringing acts of the individuals and entities that directly infringed  
22 plaintiff's works. Further, on information and belief, defendant obtained a direct  
23 financial benefit from the infringing activities of the individuals or entities that  
24 directly infringed plaintiff's works.

25 30. Defendant's actions, as set forth above, constitute copyright  
26 infringement in violation of the Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. § 501, *et seq.*, all to the  
27 damage of plaintiff as previously alleged.

28 31. By reason of the foregoing unlawful acts recited in the above

# 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.