

1 SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
Jason M. Richardson  
2 One Montgomery, Suite 2600  
3 San Francisco, California 94104  
Telephone: 415.544.1900  
4 Facsimile: 415.391.0281

5 Trent Webb (to be admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Ryan J. Schletzbaum (to be admitted *pro hac vice*)  
6 2555 Grand Blvd.  
7 Kansas City, MO 64108

8 Attorneys for Apple Inc.  
9 Apple Inc.

10 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
11 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
12 **SAN JOSE DIVISION**

13 APPLE INC., ) Case No. 19-cv-6352  
14 )  
Plaintiff, )  
15 vs. ) **COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY**  
16 ) **JUDGMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT**  
PRINCEPS INTERFACE TECHNOLOGIES ) **OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,703,963**  
17 LLC, ) **JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**  
18 Defendant. )

1 Plaintiff Apple Inc. (“Apple”) files this Complaint for Declaratory Judgment of  
2 Noninfringement against Defendant Princeps Interface Technologies LLC (“Princeps” or  
3 “Defendant”), and in support of its Complaint alleges as follows:

4 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

5 1. This is an action for a declaratory judgment of noninfringement arising under the  
6 patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code.

7 2. Apple is a leading designer and manufacturer of mobile communication devices,  
8 personal computers and portable digital media players. As a result of its significant investment in  
9 research and development, Apple has developed innovative technologies that have changed the face  
10 of the computing and telecommunications industries for four decades.

11 3. Apple’s many pioneering and revolutionary products spanning its history include the  
12 Macintosh PC (first released in 1984), PowerBook (first released in 1991), Newton (first released  
13 in 1993), PowerMac (first released in 1994), iMac (first released in 1998), iPod (first released in  
14 2001), iTunes Store (opened in 2003), MacBook (first released in 2006), iPhone and Apple TV (first  
15 released in 2007), Apple App Store (opened in 2008), Siri (first released 2010), iPad (first released  
16 in 2010), Apple Watch (first released in 2015), and AirPods (first released in 2016).

17 4. The United States Patent & Trademark Office has awarded Apple thousands of patents  
18 protecting the technological inventions underlying Apple’s groundbreaking products and services.  
19 Many well-known functionalities and features of Apple’s products were made possible with the  
20 inventions of Apple engineers.

21 5. Defendant, on the other hand, is a patent assertion entity formed for the sole purpose  
22 of generating revenue by asserting patents against other companies’ products. Defendant’s prior  
23 actions and statements have created a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to  
24 warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment of noninfringement as to whether Apple products  
25 practice U.S. Patent No. 6,703,963 (“the ‘963 Patent” or “Asserted Patent”).

26 6. Defendant has claimed, through claim charts and pleadings served on Apple, that  
27 certain Apple products infringe the ‘963 Patent. However, Apple’s products do not infringe the

1 7. This Court should not allow the threat of a future lawsuit to harm and cause  
2 uncertainty to Apple’s business.

3 **THE PARTIES**

4 8. Apple is a California corporation having its principal place of business at One Apple  
5 Park Way, Cupertino, California 95014. Apple has over 20,000 employees who work in or near its  
6 headquarters in Cupertino, California.

7 9. On information and belief, Princeps is a Delaware corporation with a place of business  
8 at Princeps Interface Technologies LLC, c/o Kustal and Kustal, P.C., 261 West 35th Street, Suite  
9 No. 1003, New York, New York 10001.

10 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

11 10. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§  
12 1331 and 1338(a) because this action involves claims arising under the patent laws of the United  
13 States, 35 U.S.C. § 1, *et seq.*, and under the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201  
14 and 2202.

15 11. Defendant is subject to personal jurisdiction in this Court because, on information and  
16 belief, Defendant has directed and continues to direct acts to this District, including acts pertaining  
17 to the Asserted Patent. For example, in connection with Defendant’s business, Defendant has  
18 targeted at least one other company located in this District by asserting infringement allegations in  
19 this District for the same ‘963 Patent at issue here. *See Princeps Interface Techs. LLC v. ASUSTek*  
20 *Computer Inc., et al.* Case No. 4-19-cv-04298-JSW (N.D. Cal.). For these reasons and for those  
21 stated below, Defendant has continuous and systematic contacts within the State of California,  
22 including this District, and has purposefully directed business activities into and in this District.

23 12. Defendant served Apple with claim charts alleging that Apple’s iPhone X, iPhone 8,  
24 iPad, iPad Pro, iPad Air, and iPod Touch using Apple’s iOS operating system (the “Apple Accused  
25 Products”) sold or offered for sale in this District infringe at least claims 1-3, 9, 12, and 60 of the  
26 ‘963 Patent. Furthermore, on information and belief, Defendant has engaged in conduct with other  
27 companies in efforts to monetize Defendant’s intellectual property through litigation, including at

1 *Techs. LLC v. ASUSTek Computer Inc., et al.* Case No. 5-19-cv-04298-JSW (N.D. Cal.).  
2 Defendant's Complaint in its lawsuit against *ASUSTek Computer Inc. et al*, acknowledges that the  
3 ASUS Computer International has its U.S. headquarters in Fremont, California, which is also in this  
4 District. *Id.*, ECF. No. 1, at 2. Defendant's conduct further includes serving claim charts and  
5 asserting infringement allegations for the '963 Patent against other corporations that have a principal  
6 place of business in this District, including Google LLC (headquarters located in Mountain View,  
7 California) and Samsung Semiconductor, Inc. (U.S. Regional Office located in San Jose,  
8 California). *See Princeps Interface Techs. LLC v. Google LLC, et al.*, Case No. 1:19-cv-01102-  
9 CFC (D. Del.); *Princeps Interface Techs. LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd, et al.*, Case No. 1:19-cv-  
10 01103-CFC (D. Del.). Defendant also asserts the above alleged infringers that all have principal  
11 places of business in this District (*i.e.*, ASUS Computer International, Google LLC, Samsung  
12 Semiconductor, Inc.) infringe the same patent claims being asserted against Apple: claims 1-3, 9,  
13 12, and 60 of the '963 Patent.

14 13. This Court also has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because Defendant has  
15 purposefully availed itself of the benefits of California law and has more than sufficient minimum  
16 contacts with California, including within this District, such that this declaratory judgment action  
17 meets the requirements of California's long-arm statute.

18 14. For example, Apple resides in this District and Defendant has alleged that Apple has  
19 committed acts of infringement in this District related to the Asserted Patent and the Apple Accused  
20 Products. This District is also the most convenient District for the present declaratory judgment  
21 claims because, among other things, witnesses and evidence concerning the Apple Accused  
22 Products are located in this District.

23 15. Additionally, Defendant is subject to specific personal jurisdiction in this Court and  
24 has consented to venue in this Court for purposes of litigating the '963 Patent because Defendant  
25 has initiated litigation in this Court concerning the '963 Patent. *See Princeps Interface Techs. LLC*  
26 *v. ASUSTek Computer Inc., et al.* Case No. 5-19-cv-04298-NC (N.D. Cal.).

27 16. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and 1391(c) because

1 District and Defendant is subject to the Court’s personal jurisdiction with respect to this civil action.

2 17. For these reasons and the reasons set forth below, a substantial controversy exists  
3 between the parties which is of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant declaratory relief.

4 **INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT**

5 18. This is an intellectual property action subject to district-wide assignment pursuant to  
6 Local Rules 3-2(c) and 3-5(b).

7 **THE ASSERTED PATENT**

8 19. On March 9, 2004, the United States Patent and Trademark Office (the “Patent  
9 Office”) issued the ‘963 Patent, entitled “Universal Keyboard” to Timothy B. Higginson. A true  
10 and correct copy of the ‘963 Patent is attached as Exhibit A. On information and belief, Princeps  
11 purports to own by assignment the ‘963 Patent.

12 20. The ‘963 Patent issued from U.S. Patent Application No. 10/247,065 (“the ‘065  
13 Application”) filed on September 12, 2002.

14 21. On June 20, 2003, the Patent Office rejected all claims in the ‘065 Application as  
15 either anticipated or obvious in view of the prior art.

16 22. In response to this rejection, the applicant amended claim 1 of the ‘065 Application  
17 to require, among other things, that “the input keys and domain control are simultaneously presented  
18 by the input device.”

19 23. Also in response to the Patent Office rejection, the applicant for the ‘065 Application  
20 argued that amended claim 1 was patentable over the prior art. In particular, the applicant stated:

21 [I]n contrast to simultaneously presenting the input keys and domain (level) control,  
22 as recited in claims 1, 36, and 64, the Platte ‘949 patent discloses replacing a  
23 previously displayed set of input/level selection keys, including a selected input  
24 key that initiated displaying a next input key level, by a new set of input keys. Thus,  
25 even in the event that an input (e.g., PLAY) key in the Platte remote control device  
26 is considered the claimed ‘domain control,’ the selected ‘domain control’  
27 disappears from the input interface when the new set of input keys are presented on  
28 the input interface. Therefore, Platte does not disclose *simultaneously presenting  
the input keys and the domain control* (that selects one of multiple domain levels)  
as recited in amended claim 64 as well as claims 1 and 36.

# 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.