

1 CHARLENE M. MORROW (CSB No. 136411)
cmorrow@fenwick.com
2 HECTOR J. RIBERA (CSB No. 221511)
hribera@fenwick.com
3 FENWICK & WEST LLP
4 Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
5 Mountain View, CA 94041
Telephone: (650) 988-8500
6 Facsimile: (650) 938-5200

7 BRYAN A. KOHM (CSB No. 233276)
bkohm@fenwick.com
8 FENWICK & WEST LLP
555 California Street, 12th Floor
9 San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 875-2300
10 Facsimile: (415) 281-1350

11 Attorneys for Plaintiff
12 Rovi Solutions Corporation

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

15 **CV 12 4209**

16 ROVI SOLUTIONS CORPORATION, a
17 Delaware corporation

18 Plaintiff,

19 v.

20 LENOVO (UNITED STATES) INC., a
21 Delaware corporation,

22 Defendant.

Case No.

**COMPLAINT FOR PATENT
INFRINGEMENT**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

23
24
25
26
27
28
COMPLAINT

14

FILED
2012 AUG -9 P 3:26

RICHARD W. WIEKING
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LB

FENWICK & WEST LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
MOUNTAIN VIEW

2

1 Plaintiff Rovi Solutions Corporation ("Rovi") hereby alleges as follows:

2 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

3 1. This is a civil action for patent infringement of United States Patents Nos.
4 5,583,936 ("the '936 Patent"), and 6,381,747 ("the '747 Patent") (collectively, the "patents-in-
5 suit").

6 2. This action arises under the Patent Laws of the United States, Title 35 of the
7 United States Code. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and
8 1338.

9 **THE PARTIES**

10 3. Plaintiff Rovi Solutions Corporation is a corporation organized under the laws of
11 Delaware having its principal office located at 2830 De La Cruz Boulevard, Santa Clara,
12 California 95050.

13 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes that defendant Lenovo (United States) Inc.
14 ("Lenovo") is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business 1009 Think Place,
15 Morrisville, North Carolina 27560.

16 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

17 5. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because Lenovo has engaged
18 in continuous and systematic activities and/or business in California, including without limitation
19 entering into contracts and/or business relationships with California businesses and/or residents
20 and seeking the protections of the courts in this District.

21 6. Lenovo has also committed intentional acts in or expressly aimed at the State of
22 California concerning the subject matter of this action. On information and belief, Lenovo
23 regularly transacts business within this District, including using, importing, marketing, selling,
24 reselling, offering for sale, and/or inducing others to use, sell, and/or offer for sale the accused
25 Lenovo Notebooks and Personal Computers, including Lenovo ThinkPad computers, throughout
26 this District.

27 //

1 7. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b), (c), (d),
2 and 1400(b).

3 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
4 **(Infringement of the '936 Patent)**

5 8. This claim is made under the provisions of the patent laws of the United States,
6 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 *et seq.* Rovi incorporates by reference the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 7
7 above.

8 9. On December 10, 1996, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and
9 legally issued the '936 Patent, entitled "Video copy protection process enhancement to introduce
10 horizontal and vertical picture distortions" to Peter Wonfor, Alistair J. Knox, Jeremy J. Corcoran,
11 John O. Ryan, and Ronald Quan. Rovi is the owner, by valid assignment, of all right, title and
12 interest in the '936 Patent.

13 10. Defendant has been, and currently is, directly and/or indirectly infringing the '936
14 Patent by manufacturing, using, importing, marketing, selling, reselling, offering for sale, and/or
15 inducing others to use, sell, and/or offer for sale Rovi-enabled chips and components, including
16 without limitation the GeForce Go 7300 G72, 945GM, G72MV, M56, C51M, 302LV, 910GML,
17 915GMS, Mobility Radeon 7500-9000, and Radeon X600 integrated chips among others, in the
18 Lenovo Notebooks and Personal Computers, including Lenovo ThinkPad computers, in less-than-
19 real-time applications to play back content downloaded from a network source through an analog
20 output port, without a license.

21 11. Defendant's acts of infringement are willful. Rovi notified Lenovo of its
22 infringement of the '936 patent at least as of October 2011. Defendant, therefore, knew of the
23 '936 Patent and that the Rovi-enabled chips and components practice the '936 Patent, yet
24 nevertheless continued its infringing activities.

25 12. As a direct and proximate consequence of Defendant's infringement of the '936
26 Patent, Rovi has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable injury and damages in an amount
27 not yet determined for which Rovi is entitled to relief. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284, Rovi is
28

1 entitled to damages for infringement and treble damages. Rovi is also entitled to recover
2 reasonable attorneys' fees.

3 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
4 **(Infringement of the '747 Patent)**

5 13. This claim is made under the provisions of the patent laws of the United States,
6 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 *et seq.* Rovi incorporates by reference the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 7
7 above.

8 14. On April 30, 2002, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally
9 issued the '747 Patent, entitled "Method for controlling copy protection in digital video networks,"
10 to Peter J. Wonfor and Derek T. Nelson. Rovi is the owner, by valid assignment, of all right, title
11 and interest in the '747 Patent.

12 15. Defendant has been, and currently is, directly and/or indirectly infringing the '747
13 Patent by manufacturing, using, importing, marketing, selling, reselling, offering for sale, and/or
14 inducing others to use, sell, and/or offer for sale Rovi-enabled chips and components, including
15 without limitation the GeForce Go 7300 G72, 945GM, G72MV, M56, C51M, 302LV, 910GML,
16 915GMS, Mobility Radeon 7500-9000, and Radeon X600 integrated chips among others, in the
17 Lenovo Notebooks and Personal Computers, including Lenovo ThinkPad computers, in less-than-
18 real-time applications to play back content downloaded from a network source through an analog
19 output port, without a license.

20 16. Defendant's acts of infringement are willful. Rovi notified Lenovo of its
21 infringement of the '747 patent at least as of October 2011. Defendant, therefore, knew of the
22 '747 Patent and that the Rovi-enabled chips and components practice the '747 Patent, yet
23 nevertheless continued its infringing activities.

24 17. As a direct and proximate consequence of Defendant's infringement of the '747
25 Patent, Rovi has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable injury and damages in an amount
26 not yet determined for which Rovi is entitled to relief. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284, Rovi is
27
28

1 entitled to damages for infringement and treble damages. Rovi is also entitled to recover
2 reasonable attorney's fees.

3 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

4 WHEREFORE, Rovi respectfully requests that this Court enter an order granting Rovi the
5 following relief:

- 6 a) An award to Rovi for the damage caused by Defendant's infringement of the '936
7 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 284;
- 8 b) An award to Rovi for the damage Defendant's infringement of the '747 patent
9 under 35 U.S.C. § 284;
- 10 c) Enhanced damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 for Defendant's infringement of the
11 '936 and '747 patents;
- 12 d) Attorneys' fees under 33 U.S.C. § 285 for prosecution and defense of all patent
13 counts herein;
- 14 e) An award to Rovi of compensatory damages;
- 15 f) An award to Rovi of exemplary damages;
- 16 g) An award to Rovi of its costs and expenses;
- 17 h) An award to Rovi of prejudgment and post-judgment interest; and
- 18 i) Such other and further relief as this Court deems proper.

19 Dated: August 9, 2012

Fenwick & West LLP

20
21 By: 
22 Bryan A. Kohm
23 Attorneys for Plaintiff
24 Rovi Solutions Corporation
25
26
27
28

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury of all issues triable of right by a jury.

Dated: August 9, 2012

Fenwick & West LLP

By: 

Bryan A. Kohm
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Rovi Solutions Corporation

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28