

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

VIRTUAL CREATIVE ARTISTS, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

TWITTER, INC.,

Defendant.

C.A. No. 1:22-cv-06890

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

PATENT CASE

ORIGINAL COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff Virtual Creative Artists, LLC files this Original Complaint for Patent Infringement against Twitter, Inc. and would respectfully show the Court as follows:

I. THE PARTIES

1. Plaintiff Virtual Creative Artists, LLC. (“VCA” or “Plaintiff”) is a Delaware limited liability company, having business address at 338 Gracious Way, Henderson, NV 89011.

2. On information and belief, Defendant Twitter, Inc. (“Defendant”) is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Delaware. Defendant has a place of business at 111 N. Canal St., Chicago, IL 60606. Defendant has a registered agent at C T Corporation System, 208 S. LaSalle St., Suite 814, Chicago, IL 60604.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. This action arises under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction of such action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

4. On information and belief, Defendant is subject to this Court’s specific and general personal jurisdiction, pursuant to due process and the Illinois Long-Arm Statute, due at least to its

business in this forum, including at least a portion of the infringements alleged herein at 111 N. Canal St., Chicago, IL 60606.

5. Without limitation, on information and belief, within this state, Defendant has used the patented inventions thereby committing, and continuing to commit, acts of patent infringement alleged herein. In addition, on information and belief, Defendant has derived revenues from its infringing acts occurring within Illinois. Further, on information and belief, Defendant is subject to the Court's general jurisdiction, including from regularly doing or soliciting business, engaging in other persistent courses of conduct, and deriving substantial revenue from goods and services provided to persons or entities in Illinois. Further, on information and belief, Defendant is subject to the Court's personal jurisdiction at least due to its sale of products and/or services within Illinois. Defendant has committed such purposeful acts and/or transactions in Illinois such that it reasonably should know and expect that it could be haled into this Court as a consequence of such activity.

6. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b). On information and belief, Defendant has businesses in this district at 111 N. Canal St., Chicago, IL 60606. On information and belief, from and within this District Defendant has committed at least a portion of the infringements at issue in this case.

7. For these reasons, personal jurisdiction exists and venue is proper in this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b).

III. COUNT I
(PATENT INFRINGEMENT OF UNITED STATES PATENT NO. 9,501,480)

8. Plaintiff incorporates the above paragraphs herein by reference.

9. On November 22, 2016, United States Patent No. 9,501,480 ("the '480 Patent") was duly and legally issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. The '480 Patent is

titled “Revenue-Generating Electronic Multi-Media Exchange and Process of Operating Same.” A true and correct copy of the ‘480 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference.

10. VCA is the assignee of all right, title, and interest in the ‘480 Patent, including all rights to enforce and prosecute actions for infringement and to collect damages for all relevant times against infringers of the ‘480 Patent. Accordingly, VCA possesses the exclusive right and standing to prosecute the present action for infringement of the ‘480 Patent by Defendant.

11. The invention relates to the field of creating and distributing media content, in particular, creating media content based upon submissions received on an electronic media exchange. At the time of the original invention in 1998, there was an Internet-centric problem that required a technical solution—how to develop a computer system that would allow remote contributors of electronic content to share and collaborate their content to develop new media content. The claimed invention, which predates modern crowdsourcing solutions, offers a unique, unconventional, and specially configured combination of “subsystems” in which to address the Internet-centric problem.

12. As set forth in the claims, the claimed invention has a collection of unconventional and particularly configured subsystems, including:

- “an electronic media submissions server subsystem,”
- “an electronic multimedia creator server subsystem,”
- “an electronic release subsystem,”
- “an electronic voting subsystem,” and
- their corresponding specialized databases.

13. Each of these subsystems are configured in a very specific (and not generic), unconventional and non-routine manner to offer the novel and non-obvious claimed invention.

For example, claim 1 requires an “electronic media submissions database,” which is a subsystem that receives media submissions from Internet users. This is not a generic database but rather a scalable database that must be able to receive, store, and manage multiple petabytes of multimedia data received from users all over the world. This is one of the many specialized databases required in the claim. In fact, the specification discloses the use of a sophisticated database management system known in the art at the time that was capable of handling data at this level, Oracle7. This type of database management system cannot operate on a generic computing system but rather requires specialized hardware and software.

14. As another example, the claim requires a specifically configured “electronic media submission server subsystem.” This subsystem is defined as specifically having:

- “one or more data processing apparatus,”
- “an electronic media submission database stored on a non-transitory medium,” and
- “a submissions electronic interface.”

The “submissions electronic interface” is further specifically “configured” [1] “to receive electronic media submissions from a plurality of submitters over a public network, and [2] store the electronic media submissions in the electronic media submission database.” Further, “the electronic media submissions database” in this subsystem is further required to “store[] [1] data identifying the submitter and [2] data indicating content for each electronic media submission.” Collectively, the level of detail included in this very particular, well-defined, and unconventional subsystem makes clear that the claims include substantially more than the alleged abstract idea or merely performing an alleged abstract idea on a computer.

15. Similarly, the claim also requires a separate specifically configured “an electronic multimedia creator server subsystem.” The claim specifically defines how this second subsystem

interacts with other components including being “operatively coupled to the electronic media submissions server subsystem.” The claim also specifically defines this subsystem as “having”:

- “one or more data processing apparatus” and
- “an electronic creator multimedia database stored on a non-transitory medium.”

16. This subsystem is also specifically “configured [1] to select and [2] retrieve a plurality of electronic media submissions from the electronic media submissions database using an electronic content filter located on the electronic multimedia creator server.” The “filter” also includes a very specific algorithm of “being based at least in part on at least one of the one or more user attributes to develop multimedia content to be electronically available for viewing on user devices.” Even more detail is provided by requiring “the identification of the submitter [be] maintained with each selected and retrieved submission within the multimedia content.” Here again, collectively, the level of detail included in this very particular and well-defined and unconventional subsystem makes clear that the claims include substantially more than an alleged abstract idea or merely performing an alleged abstract idea on a computer.

17. The claim also includes “an electronic release subsystem,” which is well defined and not conventional or routine. The claim defines how this subsystem is “operatively coupled to the electronic multimedia creator server subsystem.” The claim also defines the components of this subsystem as having “one or more data processing apparatus” and being particularly “configured to make the multimedia content electronically available for viewing on one of more user devices.” These details, collectively, also make this very particular and well-defined and unconventional subsystem substantially more than an abstract idea or performing an abstract idea on a computer.

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.