

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
WACO DIVISION**

Richman Technology Corporation, Plaintiff, v. Samsung Electronics America, Inc., Defendant.	Case No. 6:20-cv-770 Patent Case Jury Trial Demanded
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff Richman Technology Corporation (“Plaintiff”), through its attorneys, complains of Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (“Defendant”), and alleges the following:

PARTIES

1. Plaintiff Richman Technology Corporation is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Delaware that maintains its principal place of business at 7840 Mission Center Ct, San Diego, CA 92108.
2. Defendant Samsung Electronics America, Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of New York that maintains an established place of business at 12100 Samsung Blvd, Austin, TX 78754.

JURISDICTION

3. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code.
4. This Court has exclusive subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

5. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because it has engaged in systematic and continuous business activities in this District. As described below, Defendant has committed acts of patent infringement giving rise to this action within this District.

VENUE

6. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b) because Defendant has committed acts of patent infringement in this District, and has an established place of business in this District. In addition, Plaintiff has suffered harm in this district.

PATENTS-IN-SUIT

7. Plaintiff is the assignee of all right, title and interest in United States Patent Nos. 8,350,698 (the “’698 Patent”); 8,981,933 (the “’933 Patent”); 9,449,484 (the “’484 Patent”); (collectively the “Patents-in-Suit”); including all rights to enforce and prosecute actions for infringement and to collect damages for all relevant times against infringers of the Patents-in-Suit. Accordingly, Plaintiff possesses the exclusive right and standing to prosecute the present action for infringement of the Patents-in-Suit by Defendant.

The ’698 Patent

8. The ’698 Patent is entitled “Method and protocol for real time security system,” and issued 1/8/2013. The application leading to the ’698 Patent was filed on 6/30/2011. A true and correct copy of the ’698 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated herein by reference.

9. The ’698 Patent is valid and enforceable.

The ’933 Patent

10. The ’933 Patent is entitled “System for real time security monitoring,” and issued 3/17/2015. The application leading to the ’933 Patent was filed on 12/28/2012. A true and

correct copy of the '933 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 2 and incorporated herein by reference.

11. The '933 Patent is valid and enforceable.

The '484 Patent

12. The '484 Patent is entitled "System for real time security monitoring," and issued 9/20/2016. The application leading to the '484 Patent was filed on 2/17/2015. A true and correct copy of the '484 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 3 and incorporated herein by reference.

13. The '484 Patent is valid and enforceable.

COUNT 1: INFRINGEMENT OF THE '698 PATENT

14. Plaintiff incorporates the above paragraphs herein by reference.

15. **Direct Infringement.** Defendant has been and continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the '698 Patent in at least this District by making, using, offering to sell, selling and/or importing, without limitation, at least the Defendant products identified in the charts incorporated into this Count below (among the "Exemplary Defendant Products") that infringe at least the exemplary claims of the '698 Patent also identified in the charts incorporated into this Count below (the "Exemplary '698 Patent Claims") literally or by the doctrine of equivalents. On information and belief, numerous other devices that infringe the claims of the '698 Patent have been made, used, sold, imported, and offered for sale by Defendant and/or its customers.

16. Defendant also has and continues to directly infringe, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, the Exemplary '698 Patent Claims, by having its employees internally test and use these Exemplary Products.

17. The service of this Complaint upon Defendant constitutes actual knowledge of infringement as alleged here.

18. Despite such actual knowledge, Defendant continues to make, use, test, sell, offer for sale, market, and/or import into the United States, products that infringe the '698 Patent. On information and belief, Defendant has also continued to sell the Exemplary Defendant Products and distribute product literature and website materials inducing end users and others to use its products in the customary and intended manner that infringes the '698 Patent. Thus, on information and belief, Defendant is contributing to and/or inducing the infringement of the '698 Patent.

19. **Induced Infringement.** Defendant actively, knowingly, and intentionally has been and continues to induce infringement of the '698 Patent, literally or by the doctrine of equivalents, by selling Exemplary Defendant Products to their customers for use in end-user products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '698 Patent.

20. **Contributory Infringement.** Defendant actively, knowingly, and intentionally has been and continues materially contribute to their own customers' infringement of the '698 Patent, literally or by the doctrine of equivalents, by selling Exemplary Defendant Products to their customers for use in end-user products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '698 Patent. Moreover, the Exemplary Defendant Products are not a staple article of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing use.

21. Exhibit 4 includes charts comparing the Exemplary '698 Patent Claims to the Exemplary Defendant Products. As set forth in these charts, the Exemplary Defendant Products practice the technology claimed by the '698 Patent. Accordingly, the Exemplary Defendant Products incorporated in these charts satisfy all elements of the Exemplary '698 Patent Claims.

22. Plaintiff therefore incorporates by reference in its allegations herein the claim charts of Exhibit 4.

23. Plaintiff is entitled to recover damages adequate to compensate for Defendant's infringement.

COUNT 2: INFRINGEMENT OF THE '933 PATENT

24. Plaintiff incorporates the above paragraphs herein by reference.

25. **Direct Infringement.** Defendant has been and continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the '933 Patent in at least this District by making, using, offering to sell, selling and/or importing, without limitation, at least the Defendant products identified in the charts incorporated into this Count below (among the "Exemplary Defendant Products") that infringe at least the exemplary claims of the '933 Patent also identified in the charts incorporated into this Count below (the "Exemplary '933 Patent Claims") literally or by the doctrine of equivalents. On information and belief, numerous other devices that infringe the claims of the '933 Patent have been made, used, sold, imported, and offered for sale by Defendant and/or its customers.

26. Defendant also has and continues to directly infringe, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, the Exemplary '933 Patent Claims, by having its employees internally test and use these Exemplary Products.

27. The service of this Complaint upon Defendant constitutes actual knowledge of infringement as alleged here.

28. Despite such actual knowledge, Defendant continues to make, use, test, sell, offer for sale, market, and/or import into the United States, products that infringe the '933 Patent. On information and belief, Defendant has also continued to sell the Exemplary Defendant Products and distribute product literature and website materials inducing end users and others to use its products in the customary and intended manner that infringes the '933 Patent. Thus, on

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.