

Brandon Brown
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
555 California Street
San Francisco, California 94104
Telephone: (415) 439-1400
Facsimile: (415) 439-1500
brandon.brown@kirkland.com

Gregory S. Arovas (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)
Todd M. Friedman (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
601 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10022
Telephone: (212) 446-4800
Facsimile: (212) 446-4900
Email: greg.arovas@kirkland.com
Email: todd.friedman@kirkland.com

David Rokach (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)
G. William Foster (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
300 N. LaSalle Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60654
Telephone: (312) 862-2000
Facsimile: (312) 862-2200
Email: david.rokach@kirkland.com
Email: billy.foster@kirkland.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs
Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. and
Samsung Electronics America, Inc.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD and)
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,)
INC.)
Plaintiffs,)
v.)
IXI MOBILE (R&D) LTD. and IXI IP,)
LLC,)
Defendants.)

CASE NO. _____

**COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY
JUDGMENT OF
NONINFRINGEMENT AND
INVALIDITY**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiffs Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (collectively,
2 “Samsung”) seek a declaratory judgment against Defendants IXI Mobile (R&D), Ltd. and IXI IP, LLC
3 that (1) Samsung does not infringe U.S. Patent No. 7,295,532 (the “’532 Patent”) and (2) the ’532
4 Patent is invalid.

5 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

6 1. This is an action for a declaratory judgment arising under the patent laws of the United
7 States, Title 35 of the United States Code. Samsung seeks a declaratory judgment that res judicata
8 bars IXI from asserting the ’532 Patent against Samsung. In the alternative, Samsung seeks a
9 declaratory judgment that Samsung does not infringe the ’532 Patent and that the ’532 Patent is invalid.

10 **PARTIES**

11 2. Samsung Electronics Corporation, Ltd. (“SEC”) is based in South Korea. SEC designs
12 and manufactures a wide variety of products, including cellular mobile devices.

13 3. Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (“SEA”) is a New York corporation with its
14 principal place of business at 85 Challenger Road, Ridgefield Park, New Jersey 07660.

15 4. On information and belief, Defendant IXI Mobile (R&D) Ltd. (“IXI Mobile (R&D)”),
16 formerly known as IXI Mobile (Israel) Ltd., is a company incorporated and registered under the laws
17 of Israel with a registered address of 11 Moshe Levi Street Lezion 75658, Israel. On information and
18 belief, IXI Mobile (R&D) is a subsidiary of non-party IXI Mobile, Inc. On information and belief, at
19 the time the ’532 Patent was prosecuted, and until at least 2007, IXI Mobile, Inc. and its subsidiary
20 IXI Mobile (R&D) were based in Belmont, California. IXI Mobile (R&D) has alleged that it
21 previously owned the ’532 Patent, and that it now has an exclusive license to the ’532 Patent.

22 5. On information and belief, Defendant IXI IP LLC (“IXI IP”) is a New York limited
23 liability company with its principal place of business at 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, New York
24 10174 and with a registered address for service of 1218 Central Avenue, Suite 100, Albany, New York
25 12205. IXI IP has alleged that it is the owner of the ’532 Patent and has exclusively licensed the ’532
26 Patent to IXI Mobile (R&D). On information and belief, IXI IP is a patent licensing entity formed in
27 April 2014 that produces no products, and instead exists solely to assert IXI’s patents.
28

**IXI, FOUNDED IN CALIFORNIA, DEVELOPS, PROSECUTES, ENFORCES, AND
LICENSES ITS PATENTS IN CALIFORNIA**

A. IXI Was Founded in California and Used California Counsel to Prosecute and Obtain the '532 Patent

6. On information and belief, IXI Mobile, Inc. was founded in 2000 and was headquartered in Redwood City or in Belmont, California, both of which are within this District. On information and belief, Defendant IXI Mobile (R&D), the alleged former owner and current exclusive licensee of the '532 Patent, was a subsidiary of IXI Mobile, Inc., and was also located in Redwood City or in Belmont, California, within this District, until at least 2007. A true and correct copy of IXI Mobile, Inc.'s SEC Form 8-K Report dated August 12, 2008, listing the location of IXI Mobile, Inc.'s headquarters in Belmont, California, is attached hereto as Ex. A (IXI Mobile, Inc., Current Report (Form 8-k) (Aug. 13, 2008)). IXI has alleged that during the time in which IXI Mobile, Inc. was headquartered in California, IXI Mobile, Inc. and its subsidiary IXI Mobile (R&D) designed, developed, and commercialized products, including the IXI Ogo family of mobile devices that IXI asserts practice the '532 Patent.

7. On information and belief, IXI retained patent prosecution counsel in California to prosecute and secure the '532 Patent. The '532 Patent was prosecuted by the California law firm Century IP Group.

8. The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office ("PTO") issued the '532 Patent, titled "System, Device and Computer Readable Medium for Providing Networking Services on a Mobile Device," on November 13, 2007. A true and correct copy of the '532 Patent is attached as Ex. B, which includes an *Ex Parte* Reexamination Certificate, issued June 17, 2020, that issued new and amended claims for the '532 Patent.

B. IXI Sued Samsung For Infringing Originally Issued Claims Of The '532 Patent In A Case That Was Transferred To And Currently Remains Pending In The Northern District of California

9. On June 17, 2014, IXI sued Samsung in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, alleging that Samsung devices that include "Wireless Hotspot" functionality (the

“accused products”) infringe certain originally issued claims of the ’532 Patent. *See* Complaint, *IXI Mobile (R&D) Ltd. et al. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. et al.*, No. 1:14-cv-7954-RJS (S.D.N.Y. June 17, 2014), Dkt. No. 1.

10. IXI similarly sued Apple Inc. (“Apple”) and BlackBerry Limited and BlackBerry Corporation (collectively, “BlackBerry”), in the Southern District of New York for purportedly infringing the same patents. *See IXI Mobile (R&D) Ltd. et al. v. Apple Inc.*, No. 1:14-cv-7954-RJS (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 2, 2014); *IXI Mobile (R&D) Ltd. et al. v. Blackberry Ltd. et al.*, No. 1:14-cv-4428-RJS (S.D.N.Y. filed Jun. 18, 2014). IXI’s lawsuits against Samsung, Apple, and BlackBerry (the “2014 Litigations”) were related, but not consolidated.

11. On February 3, 2015, Samsung, Apple, and BlackBerry moved to transfer the 2014 Litigations from the Southern District of New York to the Northern District of California. On August 6, 2015, the Southern District of New York granted the motions and transferred the cases to the Northern District of California. *See* Opinion and Order, *IXI Mobile (R&D) Ltd. et al. v. Apple Inc.*, No. 1:14-cv-7954-RJS (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 6, 2015), Dkt. No. 79. All of the cases were assigned to Judge Gilliam. *See IXI Mobile (R&D) Ltd. et al. v. Apple Inc.*, No. 4:15-cv-3755-HSG (N.D. Cal. filed Aug. 17, 2015); *IXI Mobile (R&D) Ltd. et al. v. Samsung Elecs. Co. et al.*, No. 4:15-cv-3752-HSG (N.D. Cal. filed Aug. 17, 2015); *IXI Mobile (R&D) Ltd. et al. v. Blackberry Ltd. et al.*, No. 4:15-cv-3754-HSG (N.D. Cal. filed Aug. 17, 2015)

12. In the 2014 Litigations, Samsung, Apple, and BlackBerry deposed a California-based co-inventor of the ’532 and ’033 Patents in Palo Alto, California, which is within this District, on July 1, 2015.

C. Cancellation of IXI’s Originally Asserted Claims of the ’532 Patent

13. On June 19, 2015, Samsung and Apple filed two petitions for *inter partes* review (“IPR”) with the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB”) on all of the originally issued claims of the ’532 Patent that were asserted in the 2014 Litigations. *Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. et al. v. IXI IP, LLC*, No. IPR2015-01442 (P.T.A.B. Jun. 19, 2015) (the “-01442 IPR”); *Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. et al. v. IXI IP, LLC*, No. IPR2015-01443 (P.T.A.B. Jun. 19, 2015) (the “-01443 IPR”). Each petition

1 challenged the same claims, but on different grounds based on different combinations of prior art
2 references.

3 14. On December 30, 2015, the PTAB instituted review of all the challenged claims of the
4 '532 Patent in the -01443 IPR petition except for claim 10. The PTAB declined to institute the -01442
5 IPR petition. On December 21, 2016, the PTAB found that all of the instituted claims in the -01443
6 IPR were obvious.

7 15. IXI did not appeal PTAB's final written decision regarding the '532 Patent. The PTO
8 issued an IPR certificate cancelling all challenged claims of the '532 Patent except for claim 10 on
9 February 27, 2018.

10 16. IXI subsequently disclaimed claim 10 on December 12, 2019.

11 **D. *Ex Parte* Reexamination of the '532 Patent and IXI's Accusations Against**
12 **Samsung for Infringement of Claims Involved in the Reexamination**

13 17. On April 3, 2018, Apple filed a request for ex parte reexamination of claims 2, 3, 6, 10,
14 and 11 of the '532 Patent. The PTO ordered the reexamination and subsequently rejected all
15 challenged claims. Ex. C (2018-09-25 Non-Final Office Action). In response, IXI cancelled or
16 amended the rejected claims of the '532 patent, and proposed new claims. Ex. D (2019-02-20 Office
17 Action Response).

18 18. On March 5, 2019, IXI sent an email to Samsung regarding the then-pending claims in
19 the ongoing ex parte reexamination of the '532 Patent. The letter stated: "Attached to this email is a
20 set of the new claims that IXI recently submitted in conjunction with that reexamination proceeding.
21 Please let this serve as notice of infringement to your clients in this matter for these new claims and
22 as notice that IXI intends to seek leave to amend its infringement contentions [in the 2014 Litigations]
23 to include the new claims of the '532 Patent." See Ex. E (Email from IXI to Samsung (March 5,
24 2019)).

25 19. On March 7, 2019, IXI filed a motion in the 2014 Litigations to amend its preliminary
26 infringement contentions to add, inter alia, unspecified pending claims of the ongoing ex parte
27 reexamination of the '532 Patent. Samsung argued that IXI's motion should be barred because the
28 Court did not have subject matter jurisdiction over claims that had yet to issue or, alternatively, that

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.