

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

Steven W. Ritcheson, Esq. (SBN 174062)  
HENINGER GARRISON DAVIS, LLC  
9800 D Topanga Canyon Blvd. #347  
Chatsworth, California 91311  
Telephone: (818) 882-1030  
Facsimile: (818) 337-0383  
swritcheson@hgdllawfirm.com

Jacqueline Knapp Burt, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice Application To Be Filed*)  
HENINGER GARRISON DAVIS, LLC  
3350 Riverwood Parkway SE, Suite 1900  
Atlanta, Georgia 30339  
Telephone: (404) 996-0861  
Facsimile: (205) 547-5502  
jburt@hgdllawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff,  
NEWTHINK, LLC

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
LOS ANGELES DIVISION**

NEWTHINK, LLC

Plaintiff,

v.

VIEWSONIC CORPORATION

Defendant.

**CV 12-09424** STP (AGRx)

**COMPLAINT FOR PATENT  
INFRINGEMENT**

**Jury Trial Demanded**

12 NOV -2 PM 12:29  
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF.  
LOS ANGELES

FILED

BY: \_\_\_\_\_

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

**PLAINTIFF’S ORIGINAL COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff Newthink, LLC (“Plaintiff”), by and through its undersigned counsel, files this Original Complaint against Defendant Viewsonic Corporation (“Defendant” or “Viewsonic”) as follows:

**NATURE OF THE ACTION**

1. This is a patent infringement action to stop Defendant’s infringement of Plaintiff’s United States Patent No. 6,630,939 entitled “*Portable, Read-Only Electronic Display Unit*” (hereinafter, the “’949 patent”; a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A). Plaintiff is the owner of the ‘939 patent. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief and monetary damages.

**PARTIES**

2. Plaintiff is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the state of Florida. Plaintiff maintains its principal place of business at 20 Island Avenue, Suite 911, Miami, Florida 33139. Plaintiff is the owner of the patent-in-suit and possesses the right to sue for infringement and recover past damages.

3. Upon information and belief, Defendant is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its principal place of business located at 381 Brea Canyon Road, Walnut, California 91789.

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

4. This action arises under the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1 *et seq.*, including 35 U.S.C. §§ 271, 281, 283, 284, and 285. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this case for patent infringement under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

5. The Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because: Defendant is present within or has minimum contacts with the State of California and the Central District of California; Defendant has purposefully availed itself of the privileges of conducting business in the State of California and in the Central District of California; Defendant has sought protection and benefit from the laws of the State of California; Defendant regularly conducts business within the State of California and within the Central District of California; and Plaintiff’s causes of action arise directly

1 from Defendant's business contacts and other activities in the State of California and in the Central  
2 District of California.

3 6. More specifically, Defendant, directly and/or through authorized intermediaries,  
4 ships, distributes, offers for sale, sells, and/or advertises (including the provision of an interactive  
5 web page) its products and services in the United States, the State of California, and the Central  
6 District of California. Upon information and belief, Defendant has committed patent infringement in  
7 the State of California and in the Central District of California. Defendant solicits customers in the  
8 State of California and in the Central District of California. Defendant has many paying customers  
9 who are residents of the State of California and the Central District of California and who each use  
10 Defendant's products and services in the State of California and in the Central District of California.

11 7. Venue is proper in the Central District of California pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391  
12 and 1400(b).

13 **COUNT I – PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

14 8. The '939 Patent was duly and legally issued by the United States Patent and  
15 Trademark Office on October 7, 2003, after full and fair examination for thin, flat, self-contained  
16 electronic display units. Plaintiff is the owner of the '939 Patent and possesses all substantive rights  
17 and rights of recovery under the '939 Patent, including the right to sue for infringement and recover  
18 past damages.

19 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Viewsonic makes, uses, sells, distributes and  
20 otherwise provides thin, flat, self-contained display units including, but not limited to, the gTablet,  
21 the Viewpad 10, Viewpad 10e, and Viewpad 10pro tablets ("the Viewsonic Devices") and associated  
22 hardware and software. Upon information and belief, Viewsonic has infringed and continues to  
23 infringe one or more claims of the '939 Patent by making, using, providing, offering to sell, and  
24 selling (directly or through intermediaries), in this district and elsewhere in the United States, thin,  
25 flat, self-contained display units, including the Viewsonic Devices. Viewsonic has further willfully  
26 infringed the '939 patent, as Viewsonic has been aware of the patents-in-suit since at least April 16,  
27

1 2012, which is the date Plaintiff notified Viewsonic of the '939 patent and the accused product  
2 identified above.

3 10. Defendant's aforesaid activities have been without authority and/or license from  
4 Plaintiff.

5 11. Plaintiff is entitled to recover from the Defendant the damages sustained by Plaintiff  
6 as a result of the Defendant's wrongful acts in an amount subject to proof at trial, which, by law,  
7 cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under  
8 35 U.S.C. § 284.

9 12. Defendant's infringement of Plaintiff's exclusive rights under the '939 patent will  
10 continue to damage Plaintiff, causing irreparable harm for which there is no adequate remedy at law,  
11 unless enjoined by this Court.

12 **JURY DEMAND**

13 13. Plaintiff hereby requests a trial by jury pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of  
14 Civil Procedure.

15 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

16 Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court find in its favor and against Defendant, and that  
17 the Court grant Plaintiff the following relief:

- 18 A. An adjudication that one or more claims of the '939 Patent have been infringed, either  
19 literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, by the Defendant and that such  
20 infringement was willful;
- 21 B. An award to Plaintiff of damages adequate to compensate Plaintiff for the  
22 Defendant's acts of infringement together with pre-judgment and post-judgment  
23 interest;
- 24 C. A grant of permanent injunction pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 283, enjoining the Defendant  
25 from further acts of infringement with respect to the claims of the '939 Patent;
- 26 D. That this Court declare this to be an exceptional case and award Plaintiff its  
27 reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §285; and  
28

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

E. Any further relief that this Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,  
**HENINGER GARRISON DAVIS, LLC**



Dated: November 2, 2012

---

Steven W. Ritcheson,  
Attorney for Plaintiff  
NEWTHINK, LLC